
ICANN84 | AGM – SSAC RIDE Work Party Meeting
Tuesday, October 28, 2025 – 16:30 to 17:30 IST

KATHY SCHNITT:

Hello and welcome to the SSAC work session on the RIDE work party. My name is Kathy and I'm the participation manager for this session.

Please note this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN community participant code of conduct, the ICANN expected standards of behavior, and the ICANN community antiharassment policy.

Please be aware that this session is primarily designed for the internal work of the SSAC, however we may be able to take questions from the audience at the discretion of the chair and time permitting.

With that, I'm going to hand the floor over to Rick Wilhelm.

RICK WILHELM:

Very good. Thank you, Kathy. Not used to the...usually I have to do all that stuff myself. So I have to do something else to loosen up my voice. Thanks, everybody, for coming. It is Tuesday. Welcome to Block 5. I'm not sure if we're...we're either well over halfway or just at halfway, depending on what sort of hats you're wearing during this meeting.

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

For those of you that are regular work party members, thanks for coming back and sorry for your judgment. For those of you that are not regular work party members, thanks for joining us. We're going to spend some time. We're going to try and make this as normal of a work party meeting as we can, although it's different because it's different a little bit so there's not much we can do about that.

So where we are in the activity itself is that the work party has been going on for a bit. This is just to recap for those that are relatively new to this thing. RIDE is our acronym. Responsible Integration into the DNS Ecosystem is our backronym. We have been chartered for a while and we have our outline working, and we are at the stage where we are starting to do some writing.

Recently we have accomplished sending out our invitations to our invited guests. It's hard to pronounce that word even if you're a native English speaker. So we have...I don't know if we have both in attendance today. We have one in attendance today. We have two invited guests. Tom Barrett who is here in the room and Swapneel Sheth who is not on the call. The invites just went out today. And so they're both going to be joining us as invited guests.

The work party is going to be also bringing in other outside experts to provide input into our activity with whom we will engage and inform the work party to get their perspective and experience, answer some questions and things like that. But as invited guests, they're like full and ongoing participants in the work party. They might be leaned upon to contribute some text, that sort of thing.

Whereas the people that we will interview it's more of a meeting-by-meeting basis. But that's sort of an SSAC process as opposed to anything that's RIDE specific.

That's kind of where we are overall in the RIDE working party process. RIDE, as most of you know, we took a little bit of a detour over the early springtime and round about May the RIDE group authored jointly SAC 130 which is a document that we put together to provide comments to the Applicant Guidebook to help inform. It was during a public comment for the Applicant Guidebook to help inform the next gTLD round, to provide some additional input. To provide some points of emphasis to the NCAP report for the name collision analysis project, to the output of that, in order to get some additional emphasis on some points that the NCAP group made. This didn't put out anything new. It didn't change any of the findings or outputs of NCAP, but it just put the highlighter to the NCAP report on some things which were important things that we needed.

That impacted our timelines a little bit, otherwise we would probably be a little bit farther along. But RIDE and the SSAC were driven by the timelines of the Applicant Guidebook public comment period because that had a closing window. And so we couldn't make that stuff about new gTLDs be part of our RIDE output because otherwise I think the English language metaphor is the cows would have been out of the barn and so it wouldn't have mattered anymore. So we took care of that.

So where we are right now is, like I said, in this writing phase. We are relatively early in the writing stuff. The outline has been in reasonable draft form for about two meetings, I would say. The group meets weekly, and we're settling along.

Before we pivot into talking about the outline and actually probably talking about some text and things like that, mostly because we're here in a little bit different context, I want to just stop and take a break. Not so much a break. I would love to take a break because I didn't get a coffee at the last break, although others of you probably did.

Stop and take a pause to see if there are any questions that anybody has or if there are any of our regular attendees that are either in the room or online. And I'll note that I'm just looking at the list of attendees. I know that my regular attendees, I've got Russ and [inaudible] online who are among our regular attendees that are also attending remotely.

If there is anybody that wants to put a hand in the queue to ask a question, I want to offer that opportunity since we're at a face-to-face meeting. I'll just wait a second here. We are using the Zoom room queue to manage the queue as we are wont to do. That's not quite an artful alliteration, but it almost rhymes. I'm prone to scating to take up time.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Oh!

RICK WILHELM: Yeah, exactly. Yes, very good. All right, seeing that that drummed up actually no interest, I will take that as a sign that at least Elaine thinks that I'm doing a good job of providing the overview. Thank you, Elaine. Very good.

Okay, so Michael has the document here, and so let's go ahead and take a gander at the outline. Michael, at some point I believe I saw the link go into the chat. The link to the document I believe went into the chat. Did the link to the document go into the chat, Michael?

KATHY SCHNITT: I took it out because it's only for internal purposes.

RICK WILHELM: Oh, it is? Okay, gotcha. Okay, so it's only for internal purposes. Thank you, Kathy. Yeah, I forget that we're sort of in and out.

Okay, so let's go ahead and scan the document. We have our overview. By the way, the outline is form follows function. And so if in our writing we find that the outline no longer serves its purpose, we will modify the outline. We will not necessarily change what we're writing. So the outline is here to serve us, not we the other way around. It represents our best thinking at the time that we wrote it. And if our thinking evolves, we will bend the outline to the

needs of current data. So that's just so everybody knows, which is a fancy way of saying it's not written in stone. It's written in English.

So we've got the Executive Summary. We've got the Introduction. We're going to write those when we are done or mostly done because if we write them now, they'll be summarizing that which we don't know what it is.

Then we'll do some work on the Context and Background, which includes an overview of past work. We're going to talk about Third-Party Naming Systems. Now important context here is this is a colloquial use that we have written right now in this Number 4. When we say "third-party" we mean the non-ICANN route. So that's what we mean by third-party there just to preempt a question about what that means.

We're going to provide an overview of these blockchain-based and decentralized name services. Talk with B how they interact with or bypass the public DNS. And then talk about the naming models that they use. As we get into this Number 4 topic, those A, B, Cs may change. This is what we think is the best point of view as of present.

Okay, scrolling down, Topic 5 which is the main topic here which we have is Domain Lifecycle Considerations. This is probably one of the anchor points of the paper. You can go ahead and scroll down, Michael, please.

The first topic here is challenges related to regulation, renewal, expiration, transfer, and lifecycle consideration. Pretty broad topic,

and the fact that that broad topic is only A is sort of a tip that we've got a ways to go in this thing. You can keep scrolling because we're not trying to speed read this.

And then the rest of this is Bravo, Charlie, Delta. We go into B, the risks of uncoordinated domains. This is when the domain gets out of sync with something. The thing that it is supposedly synced with is no longer in sync with the underlying domain registration. Regulation disputes which also can threaten when you're keeping something in sync. And then conflicting control models which is when the control model of the domain could get inconsistent with the control model of the thing that is attempting to be synced with it. Let's say a blockchain name or something like that.

Topic C, variety in domain names. There is sort of a vanilla domain name like a food.org or example.org, something like that. But not all domains are the same. We have a lot of different data models. Also, you have IDNs, different TLD registration policies. The domain name world is no longer simple, and it hasn't been for quite some time as those within earshot know.

And then we get into what we're presently calling atypical state changes to a domain record. And then we've got these currently subdivided into these different romanettes i, ii, iii, which you can see there and I won't read out. But this is probably going to get recast as we get deeper into this because there are a lot of different state changes that can happen to a domain record. It's a very nuanced topic.

And these are really to catalog these things because many of the readers of this paper will not know all of the things that are in A, B, C, D or they may know them but not fully apprehend all of their implications and impacts. And so what we want to do here is have a catalog of all of these things such that those who wish to integrate with the domain names really can appreciate and understand the nuance and complexity. Because again as a lot of you know if you spend enough time around domain names, it doesn't take long for you to learn something new even if you've been working with them for 20-25 years or even more.

So that's Number 5. And just to remind you, go up just a little bit, Michael, so folks can see what Number 5 is, what the main topic Number 5 is. That was topic Number 5. It had to do with Domain Name Lifecycle. So that's all a big bucket of domain name lifecycle considerations. Okay, those are domain name lifecycles. That's going to be a really substantial section.

Then we've got this one. This one is going to be interesting to see where Section 6 takes us. I think that Section 5, I personally have a really good understanding of where Section 5 is going and could probably just sit down and write that if I was left alone for a fair bit of time.

Number 6 is I think going to end up being a very interesting discussion. Now there may be some within earshot that know exactly where that one is going. I don't exactly know off the top of my head where Number 6 is going. When we were working on the

outline we came up with these A, B, Cs: passive DNS analysis results, case studies of overlapping naming conventions, potential risks to DNS integrity.

As we get deeper into this it will be interesting to see if we come up with another D, if these evolve, something like that. I think it's going to just be very interesting to see how that evolves. I think it's an important topic, so I definitely think that 6 is going to stay with us. I think it's going to be interesting to see how it comes into shape.

JOHN LEVINE:

Rick?

RICK WILHELM:

Yes, please, John.

JOHN LEVINE:

I agree that 6 is important. I also expect it's going to be among the most contentious as people say that's not a collision, nobody does that. So I think for me the reason it's important to have this is to give the background like, yeah, these issues are real. And then we can go on to Section 7 to say why they matter.

RICK WILHELM:

Yeah, thank you, John. I share that. I think that it will be interesting to see how we come about on where things come out on that. So I

completely agree and I think that we're going to have some very interesting discussions there.

I think that also we as the SSAC need to be, and this feels a little bit extemporaneous but I don't think it's going to be super surprising, we need to be very aware of what we the SSAC have published regarding, well, not so much we the SSAC but what the NCAP report says. And I think we need to make sure that we are taking that into context and not reploting that ground and such.

So other comments related to 6? Very good. Thank you, John.

Number 7, Security and Stability Risks. Unsurprisingly the SSAC is going to have something to say about security and stability risks. Any of you that were betting the under on that, those tickets are worthless.

We're going to talk about summary of observed vulnerabilities. And it looks like somebody was working today. Somebody had coffee today. Is that Georgia [inaudible]? Somebody was working today. Good for y'all. Bueno. Excellent. I didn't look at the document today, hence my...good, fantastic.

So we're going to talk about security risks and risks potentially introduced by integration. Here what we're going to be doing is trying not to catalog everything that's all the risks of blockchain or all the risks of the DNS but really things that happen when they come together. And so one of our challenges here is going to be avoiding being, not too verbose, but too all encompassing and

really pointing to other documents and really focusing on the intersection of the Venn diagram. Go ahead and scroll down, please, Michael. If you could.

Then we've also got analysis of hybrid naming models and then DNS abuse trends related to third-party integrations. Like also here this is going to be important for us to also try to have this paper be timeless. Or maybe not timeless but enduring, to have it be relevant beyond more than a point in time.

This is also going to be a challenging section for us to write because we need to also have it matter as opposed to just say, oh, everything is terrible. We have to be able to talk about what kind of things we can do to mitigate and such. So Security and Stability Issues is Section 7.

Section 8, User Confusion and Trust Issues. Right now we have that separated from security and stability issues in this current version of the outline. It's going to be interesting as we go along if that remains separate. And you can see how those items are currently separated out because we have case studies about user confusion and usability issues which we've separated from security and stability. We've brought in something about public complaints. Brought in some things about certificate and browser resolution inconsistencies.

So right now we've separated these things out. It will be interesting as we go along. Does it make sense to merge these together? Right now we've separated them out mostly to help focus our thinking in

the area of security and stability so we don't unnecessarily blur the topics.

And then if we scroll down to Number 9, Policy and Governance Issues, we've got a review of ICANN policies. Right now are wording here is a little bit loose. It says right now compliance issues. We don't mean to imply with those wordings, and no one should take this away, that we think that we are going to be, that we plan on citing issues where ICANN Compliance is failing to do its job. I'm sitting here reading this out loud and the way that sits on the page it could be read like that. But we're not intending to go in that regard, in that direction just so if anybody, since this is a more public meeting.

And then if you can scroll down, Michael, to B. And then ICANN Policy Consensus Impact and then coordination with other standards efforts. We list IETF, M3AAWG, FIRST, W3C, etc.

One of the things that I should note, and I mentioned this in the session that we had with the Board, there's a IETF draft that is active. Swapneel Sheth is a co-author on this draft. It's active in DNSOP. The IETF is working on this notion of integration between blockchain in the DNS at the IETF level.

And so in a certain respect our efforts are complimentary. Well, not in a certain respect. It should be clear that we're viewing this as complimentary to that IETF work and by no means competitive to that IETF work. Because IETF handles its area regarding the Internet. ICANN handles its area regarding the Internet. And they

are complimentary in nature by structure. It's baked into their structural intent, and so we're respecting that. But this work is definitely complimentary to that.

Section 10, Findings. We don't know what those will be. And then at present we're planning Section 11 and 12 and 13 to be recommendations that are separate for registries, registrars, and third-party applications respectively. As the document evolves we may end up with one recommendations section and subpoints or we may have one set of recommendations that is variably applicable to various parties at different times. We'll organize that depending on how the recommendations shake out.

For example, we could have a recommendation...if we have the same recommendation that is applicable to all of registries, registrars, and third-party applications, then we might just have one recommendation section and then list those to which it is applicable as a separate tag on the recommendations as opposed to having three sets of recommendations. So in other words, if the final outline doesn't come with three sections of recommendations, don't be disappointed. It might just mean that we're organizing them differently. So once again, the outline exists to serve it. We do not serve the outline.

So that's a tour of the outline. Any questions, comments, concerns now that you've seen the whole thing? Or are there topics that you're saying, well, I was expecting to hear you have a section that talks about cat pictures and there isn't a section that talks about

cat pictures and why isn't that? So if you have a question about something similar to where we're going to talk about cat pictures, we could talk about where we're going to deal with a particular topic. Cat pictures was intended.... Ram, please go ahead.

RAM MOHAN: Rick, in the, I thought it was the session this morning where David Lawrence was suggesting a couple of things. How do we reflect on those questions from this morning's conversation into what we're doing here?

RICK WILHELM: Thank you, Ram, for the question. You'll have to reload those into my ram because I'm really focused right now on the present and that took place at least four hours ago.

RAM MOHAN: Well, I may have a better handle on "ram." I thought he was talking about not just the IETF DNSOP work that was happening, but I thought he was also referring to other related work that had to do with DNS integration. And I thought he was asking you, are you considering it? And you said, that's a good question, we will consider it.

RICK WILHELM: Okay, I'm recalling a question from Wes who was also to my right. But Wes asked about Swapneel's draft in DNSOP. He asked about

that and I said, yes, it's in there. It's complimentary. David asked someone a different question about PCQ, I think. So that might be entangled in your brain. Sorry, Suzanne. But yeah, Wes asked me about Swap's draft...

RAM MOHAN:

Gotcha.

RICK WILHELM:

...which we are obviously. And it's actually a bit of the origin story of the work party because when that draft started before way before when it was still an individual draft one of the concerns—and I shouldn't say it was a concern—but more of an observation is that there was this talk about integrating with the DNS going on in the IETF. And more than one person was like ICANN's not really. OCTO was talking about it at this level, at a very high level, but it wasn't really at a practical level about what it means for registries and registrars that want to do something. It was just really about the ICP-3 root.

And this gets a little bit...what we want to do is really get a little bit farther down and say if you're going to integrate with this, here are some things you want to do to not break your application. Because one of the things that comes to mind is there was a time several years ago, probably five years ago now when I think it was ENS wanted to do some integration and they wanted to rely on who

controlled nic.tld. And they didn't apprehend that you could not rely on nic.tld, right? That sort of thing.

And to those in this room not relying on nic.tld is something that we all kind of know. You just can't. You can do it for some, but you can't do it for all. And they required education so that they didn't set their integration up on a shaky foundation. And this kind of goes in that direction and is sort of our goal. Hope that helps.

RAM MOHAN:

One more thing. And I haven't read this version of the document, so maybe it's already covered. And if it has, then it's easy enough to handle it. But are we also looking at the semantics and the collision in semantics and context and nomenclature? Because you have in this other namespace the same nomenclature. Maybe not the same hierarchical structure, but assertions. To some extent simply using the name a resolver has an indication that it's going to be used the same way. So is that already covered? I'm speaking less technical and more semantic and what the user perceives.

RICK WILHELM:

That's a great question. It's in the outline, but that text is not written. Well, at least I believe it's in the outline, but I don't think it's written yet. I think it's a little bit farther down, Michael. Maybe farther down. Somewhere we talk about terminology or something like that. It would be farther. It would be northbound from there.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, I will say that within the charter we do talk about the resolution context and nomenclature.

RICK WILHELM: Oh, convention. There's a convention. Possible case studies of overlapping naming conventions kind of gets close. I'm not sure of that. But your point about terminology is one that is an important one. I mean, whether it be the confusion around the semantic, the similar syntax of dot separated labels is important. And then also taking and using similar terminology and things like that. And so I think that's an important point that we'll need to make sure to bring out. And I think your point there, we'll need to make sure that we stir that into the point. Thank you for that.

RAM MOHAN: Thanks, Rick. One add-on from there is the impact it has on the trust and integrity of the naming system. Particularly because if you allow or if you have the same terminology being used and in the other spaces that fails, for the regular end user they're unlikely to know the difference. It's unreasonable to expect them to know the difference. And then recourse may fall on the DNS space operators who may or may not have the ability to affect anything in the failed space which is outside of their control.

So I wonder whether we should be looking at the larger scale erosion of trust or the potential for erosion of trust if you don't have clear delineation when there is integration happening.

RICK WILHELM:

Yeah, all very good points. These are all risks. Especially because the DNS service providers rarely control the point of interaction with the user. It's the browser. It's the app. It's the whatever. And those queries get handed off, and then the results come back. And the DNS might get the query and go, well, this doesn't make any sense. Hands back an NXDOMAIN or something like that, and then the user is like what's that mean? That sort of thing. Yeah, very true. Thank you.

Other questions? Thank you for that, Ram. Other questions or comments? Danny has a comment in the chat. Let me move my chat window. "To Ram's point, in one of the briefings yesterday someone reported 10.5% overlap of names in blockchain that were used for abuse had a corresponding name in the global DNS,"—that's lovely—"if I recall correctly. That might be worth considering here." Yeah, 10.5% names of blockchain that were used for abuse had corresponding names in the global DNS.

DANNY MCPHERSON:

Yeah, I rewrote that twice, Rick. So I was trying to say it. I think you get the point. I forgot who provided that and where it was provided, but it might be something worth factoring here if that's in fact what they were referring to. I could be confused, but I'm pretty sure I saw that yesterday.

RICK WILHELM: Sure. Very good. Thank you, Danny. Thank you very much. Tom has his hand in the air. Tom, please go ahead.

TOM BARRETT: Hi, everyone. I'm Tom Barrett. First of all, thank you for inviting me as a guest. It's not working?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Move a little closer.

TOM BARRETT: Oh, okay. My name is Tom Barrett, one of the invited guest. So thank you for that. And again, I have not had a chance to read through your archive which I will do to catch up. But my general question—maybe if this is scope creep, let me know—but I don't see any discussion or topic here about the resolvers and perhaps enablers of Web3 names. So certain DNS providers, the web browsers that are making these names accessible on the mainstream Internet. Again, that may be scope creep. I wonder what your thoughts are about that.

RICK WILHELM: Go ahead and say a little more, Tom.

TOM BARRETT: Sure. For example, you're probably familiar with some of some of the Unstoppable and ENS Web3 TLDs. There are browser vendors

such as Brave that resolve those natively in the browser. So this doesn't require a plug-in. It just works. And so certainly would lead to some consumer/customer confusion, especially if they start getting introduced into the ICANN root. So again, maybe scope creep, but I'm wondering if you want to address those sorts or leakage in a way. It's leakage that is enabled by some of the current resolvers on the Internet.

RICK WILHELM:

So I think it's worth considering. I think it's a discussion point. I mean, one could argue that perhaps a browser like that is actually a better way where at least there the user has a little bit feedback about what's going on. If the browser is aware that they're typing this in and they're typing something in and the browser there could provide some feedback to the user about what they're getting. Some informed feedback and things like that.

So I think it's worth a discussion about what the users are doing and things like that because we might find that to your point there that hypothetically one of our findings is that if the registrars are going to sell these things, they need to educate their customers on proper use which includes you need to be not using Safari, Chrome, Edge. You need to be using Brave. That sort of thing, and then dot, dot, dot. I'm freelancing which is really ill-advised when the camera is going and the mic is hot, right? Suzanne is shaking her head. I can feel it.

So that might end up being one of our findings, something like that, right? And that you say, look, use one of these browsers instead of a plug-in, hypothetically. Thanks.

TOM BARRETT: A browser is just one example. There are also DNS resolvers that are wild-carding at the third level, for example.

RICK WILHELM: Yeah. Thank you very much. Yep, do you want to go to the mic, Matt?

MATTHEW THOMAS: Sure. I was just piling on Tom's there. I think you could also look at unilateral changes in software like via the browsers. That also could be considered an implementation of an alternative root in code.

RICK WILHELM: Yeah, a lot of this is about. Warren, please go ahead.

WARREN KUMARI: Yeah, I was fighting with Zoom. Yeah, I mean, to that point there is Brave and also Opera does this. And it is sort of mentioned in passing on their website. [I think it has] future proof. You can get access to AI and Web3 in advanced features. But if somebody doesn't know what that means, they download this and suddenly they go somewhere and are confused why they're getting a

different site. Or they send a link to their Auntie who is like this doesn't work for me.

But it's not just things like browsers. There are also browser extensions which a bunch of things offer to install for you. And they promise great features, but you don't quite know what you're getting when you install it. I of course have seen a number of websites that sort of helpfully suggest how you can update your DNS resolver in your machine. And then it points you at a resolver which either does interesting things or resolves some set of the Web3 names and not others. And I've seen users become wildly confused why they can get to blahblahblah.crypto and they send this link to somebody else who is just like that doesn't work for me. Or why are you sending me this? I'm getting a completely different page to you.

Whether it's something we can say I don't know. But it does seem like something which is leading to a lot of confusion. Potentially, that's a feature for some set of people. Potentially, it's not. Who knows? I mean, if the user understands what they're doing and intentionally installs Brave, Opera, one of the many different updates, changes their resolver because they want that behavior, that's all fine and good. Consenting adults do what consenting adults do. I think the concern is when different users install different trust source and end up getting different sites, or when one set of people get different content to others. You have a lot of risk for bad things happening.

I don't know what we can say about that because I think many people are viewing this as a feature. You know, you get to see my version of [.wantit] or .crypto or .happycats, but some people view it as a bug.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It could set off anti competitive red flags even though it's a good idea.

WARREN KUMARI: Yes, but one man's freedom fighter is another man's guerilla type thing, right? It depends on if your ideal outcome is to get users to a specific site working well for you not necessarily well for them. Soapbox over.

RICK WILHELM: That wasn't quite a proper soapbox.

WARREN KUMARI: Believe me, I can do more soapboxing if you like.

RICK WILHELM: No, I'm just saying by your standards you can soapbox a little better if you really want to soapbox. I said it with love.

So furthermore, yes and to all of that. Very good input. Thank you, Warren. I think that these are important things for us to cover because I'm don't think that we as we're writing this should assume

that all of that stuff that Warren said and everyone here is like yeah, yeah, yeah like a Pez dispenser pretty much while Warren was saying it. Almost able to finish Warren's sentences as they were coming out of his mouth. Because we're like, yeah, yeah, yeah, we get it Warren.

But what is obvious to hear within earshot is not obvious to everybody that's going to lay eyes on this eventual work product. And so we need to coherently memorialize that stuff to help people understand the tradeoffs. And also to help them apprehend that when they undertake these projects to do these sorts of integrations, and I think that this is something for example that Tom understands, if you're going to sell these things on your website, you need to be prepared to support them.

And that's something that Tom understands, and so he understands—and these are compliments, Tom, just so we're super...anyone within earshot just bear in mind I'm complementing Tom—that he knows that he is going to sell them at a scale that he can support his users. He's not going out and throwing a \$100 million marketing budget at it and getting hundreds of thousands of users because that would overwhelm his ability to support them. He's selling them to his customer base, to his audience that he knows that he can support. It's not necessarily the right product for a mass market audience.

And I think that one of the things that we can do here is take the sorts of things that Warren was saying, memorialize those, capture

those and help educate people that are considering these types of integrations, considering marketing these integrations and say, look, here's what it entails. If this is what you want to do, just be cognizant that you're going to have to do this.

Because somewhere there's going to be someone that knows these things that's going to be appreciative that we've written this down because they're trying to get budget for support and for these other things. So I think we can do that to help memorialize those things that we know are facts or considerations to be concerned about. That sort of thing. So thank you, Warren, for that point.

Other comments in this vein or discussions about some of these things or some other things? Thank you. I think, Ram, you get credit for kicking that off. Thank you. Very good. Very good, thank you. Other questions or comments as we go on here? Not seeing any.

Okay, very good. So we've gotten some new text in the document. I said before that we weren't going to do line editing in this session. And I said it before, and we're going to stick to that. But thank you for the comments and text that Georgia and Nabil put in the document since our last meeting. But I think that we're getting some good thinking and things like that going on.

So I would encourage folks to dip your pen into the water, into the document and find a spot that interests you and to go ahead and start writing. As before, we're not at the point where I'm going to assigning people things because I think it's much better for you to write where you feel moved by your own spirit as opposed to

getting an assignment. Because writing on something that you're not interested in is called school, and we're not at school last I checked. You pay to go to school. You don't pay in here.

So I think that about sums this up. So unless anybody has any questions or comments, I'm going to give you back 12 minutes of your day. Anybody have any last thoughts? Yes?

THOMAS [CLOWES]:

A comment that will potentially open the floor to a fair bit of commenting. For the record, I'm Thomas from the Ethereum Name Service. Yeah, in terms of the title of this document, Responsible Integration into the DNS Ecosystem, we have a large contingent of people across the spectrum here at ICANN because this is very much the path that we're traveling down. We very much want to responsibly integrate into the DNS ecosystem and are trying to discern exactly how to do that.

I have been made aware of various pieces of research in the past from OXIL. Georgia invited me to this having conversed with her at one of the previous sessions. I'm happy to have a look through this document and provide insight from our end and also happy to answer questions now or in the context of this document. But yeah, I just wanted to acknowledge that we're aware of these discussions and that we're happy and interested to contribute wherever we can.

RICK WILHELM:

Very good. Thank you, Thomas. Let's chat after the meeting. We'll probably end up having you join us for one of our meetings and discuss some points and things like that. So thank you.

Very good. Other questions, comments, thoughts? Is that a hand, Suzanne? No? Okay, very good. Then we will wrap for the day. Thank you, everyone, for your attendance, and we will see you next week, same time, same station. A bunch of us will be at IETF, but we're just going to plow right on through at the usual time. Cheers. You can stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]