ICANN84 | AGM – Joint Session: CPH and SSAC
Sunday, October 26, 2025 – 15:00 to 16:00 IST

SUE SCHULER

Hello and welcome to the meeting of the Contracted Party House Membership with the SSAC. Please note that 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 Anti-Harassment Policy.

Please observe the following guidelines to participate in this session. I will also post them in the chat for your reference. Only questions posted in the Zoom chat identified as a question will be read aloud during this session as time permits and when directed by the chair of the session. If you wish to speak, please raise your hand in Zoom or otherwise as directed. When speaking, please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a moderate pace. I will now hand the floor over to Beth Bacon, Owen Smigelski, and Ram Mohan.

BETH BACON

We did this. It's just a stare off and I lost. I'm Beth Bacon. I'm the chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group. Thank you guys very much for making time. It's a busy schedule. I don't know how we have more days, but less time somehow that works out. But I'm glad that we're making the CPH-SSAC bilateral time more regular. There's a lot of, I think, joint topics of interest coming up and lots

of areas for us to collaborate. And I look forward to us being more intentional about that and proactive instead of figuring out later that we cared about the same things, but forgot to ask each other, which is the ICANN way.

So we've got some CPH topics, and then some SSAC topics. I think there is one more that we did discuss and it was to talk a little bit about the code of conduct and implementing that. So maybe we'll throw a little audible for the CPH topic. Are we starting with CPH or SSAC topics? Okay. So Owen, do you want to kick off on that?

RAM MOHAN: Let me just take a moment to just have the SSAC members who are here just raise their hands so you know who they are. And if you don't know their names, why don't we just quickly ask them to just say who they are and who they work with. Start from down there.

VASYL BRATCHENKO: Hello, Vasyl Bratchenko, Namecheap and SSAC.

JOHN LEVINE: John Levine, a variety of small organizations you never heard of, SSAC.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Laurin Weissinger, similar to John, too complicated.

GEORGIA OSBORN	Georgia Osborne, real SSAC, but also day job Ofcom.
ROD RASMUSSEN	Rod Rasmussen, similarly, a lot of places you actually have heard of, but mostly just volunteering for stuff.
PETER THOMASSEN	Hi, I'm Peter Thomassen. I work for the SSAC, and SSAC member.
SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB	SSAC, ICANN, OCTO.
TARA WHALEN	Tara Whelan, SSAC vice chair, working at the World Wide Web Consortium.
RAM MOHAN	Suzanne.
TARA WHALEN	Suzanne Wolf, PIR and SSAC.
RAM MOHAN	And I see two more SSAC members just walk in. There's Andrei Kolesnikov and Layal Jebran.

OWEN SMIGELSKI	Well, we should probably also do CPH introductions. Oh, come on. It's only fair. It's only fair. So I'm going to pick on Benny first over there.
BENNY SAMUELSEN	Benny, NameSRS and domain name job.
MICHAEL BAULAND	Michael Bauland from KNIPP, Registrar Stakeholder Group.
NIKKI SCHULER	Nikki Schuller, Registry Stakeholder Group Secretariat.
SUE SCHULER	Sue Schuller, Registry Stakeholder Group Secretariat.
OWEN SMIGELSKI	Owen Smigielski, Namecheap, Registrar Stakeholder Group Chair.
BETH BACON	I've already done me. Beth Bacon, Registry Stakeholder Group Chair and PIR.
ZOE BONYTHON	I'm Zoe. I'm the Registrar Secretariat.

CHRIS DISSPAIN	Hi, everyone. Chris Disspain, Identity Digital.
CATHERINE PALETTA	Hi, there. I'm Catherine Paletta from Identity Digital, and I'm the Vice Chair for Policy of the Registry Stakeholder Group.
CRYSTAL ONDO	Crystal Ando, Google, Registry Stakeholder Group.
ROGER CARNEY	Roger Carney, GoDaddy, Registrar Stakeholder Group.
KALINA OSTALSKA	Kalina Ostalska, Registry Stakeholder Group.
ESSIE MUSAILOV	Esti Musailov, Namecheap Registrar.
NATALIE HOWATSON	Natalie Howitson, Registrar Stakeholder Group, Com Laude.
ERIC ROKOBAUER	Eric Rokobauer, Squarespace Domains, Registrar Stakeholder Group.

BETH MARTY	Beth Marty with Name.com, Registrar Stakeholder Group.
MEGHAN BOYCE	Meghan Boyce, New Fold Digital Registrar.
REG LEVY	Reg Levy, TuCows Domains. We are a voting member of the Registrar Stakeholder Group, but also a registry backend.
BRIAN CIMBOLIC	Brian Cimbolic, PIR with the Registries.
DENNIS TAN	Dennis Tan, Verisign.
GREG AARON	Greg Aaron, SSAC.
UNKNOWN SPEAKER	Hi, everyone. [inaudible - 00:05:29] Registrar Stakeholder Group.
BETH BACON	I think the most important thing to let you know first is that Sue has the candy for the SSAC friends, so she can pass that down if you're feeling under sugared or caffeinated as we go into some very spicy discussions now. We're going to talk first about the DNS abuse. So

we can click over. Do we have a slide or do we have a-- No slide. Okay.

So I think DNS abuse generally, I think the plan was to just exchange our views going in. We had a really nice, I thought, kudos to Jen who's not in the room, really well run community session today. And we could share back and forth some maybe takeaways from there for folks who have participated. And then any thoughts and feelings on priorities as we go forward. We also have, we've made as registries and registrars, and then jointly as well, some comments into the public comments. So we're happy to cover those as well. And then hear from the SSAC on similar.

RAM MOHAN Sounds good. I think we have both Rod and Greg who've been participating in this area.

OWEN SMIGELSKI So I guess, kind of put it out there, anything that we want to talk about. I know we didn't really come with anything too formal here, but like Beth said, the registrars and registries each did our own individual comments supporting what was in the issues report.

We also did a joint white paper, or I guess kind of like, it started out as a white paper, I guess it's a joint comment. And then there were some other registrars and registries in there. So it's pretty much all supportive of doing the PDPs, at least for us, also is doing them sequentially, trying to do them at the same time could, and I know

I can't indicate it about how that could be problematic in terms of resources for them, staffing, but our concern also is the community.

Some of us are actually paid to kind of do this job, but a lot of the community people are not. And so that might just be difficult to throw too many bodies out there, and we want to make sure these really important topics are fully staffed and attended in that. So I don't know, but in terms of priority, if we've really said that other than I think, was it API accesses that we had first in there? I'm trying to look around the room. Somebody who might know better than me? No. Okay. Well, I think that's what we discussed there, but I think certainly supportive of it moving forward.

Also, the other point is, having looked at some of the comments out there, is making sure that it's narrowly scoped. I do know that earlier today at the session, some things about other things outside of what's in the scope of that were included in there. Oh, if associated domain checks should include verification, that's kind of outside of that, and that could be kind of a problematic that. So in order to make sure these things go through and are short, we need to keep them narrowly scoped and not add on.

So there may be other, and this is, I think also part of it is we want to do these topics now because these are the ones we think would get the most bang for the buck, but it's not the end of it. There can be more work later on, and who knows what we may need to address in two years. I mean, think about where things were two

or five years ago. There's a pretty good chance stuff might change by then, and we may need to adapt. So I'll pause here and give anybody an opportunity to chime in. Oh, Roger, go ahead.

ROGER CARNEY

Thanks on this. Roger. Yeah, and I think the sequential part is the interesting part, and staff actually come up with several different options, but the sequential isn't that we're going to take one of these and wait until the Board approves it before we start the next one. It's just the focused work, especially on getting to that report, should be streamlined. Once that report is done, even if it's the initial report that is public comment, I think the next one could start. I just don't want to do two at the same time and get, again, a lot of the resources will be the same. So it's obviously not the same, but it'll be a similar group. So I don't want to get that compressed together.

And the GAC, I completely support their idea of trying to move things fast enough, and trying to do them both at the same time is not going to do that. So I think that we have to pick one of them, and I think, Own, you were right, I think the associated checks was the one people thought could move the fastest. Yeah, associated checks was, yep. I think it was what people thought would move the fastest. Less contention, anyway, I think is the issue. So I think that if we do jump on, I just can't imagine how long it would take if we tried to do them together. So thanks.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Sure. Yeah, I remember there was, I think it was in Prague, there was, maybe it was more of a closed meeting, but ICANN staff trying to determine what is the minimum from the start of a PDP until the very end, what is it? Because there are certain things, like there's a certain amount of time, you know, for a review of public comments, public comment period of time, so there are certain things that we can't necessarily shorten or compress.

But I have mentioned to staff that, is there a way to get creative on how we do that? Like, can a public comment period overlap with when there would be the start of a new PDP? You know, can we do things like that? Is there a way to, you know, yes, it's not doubling the staff or the participation, but maybe, you know, 1.25% or something. There's a way to adjust. So I certainly think they're incentivized for that, and at least I, you know, from the registrar's side, I support that. Ram, you've got a hand?

RAM MOHAN

Yeah, thank you so much. Associated Domain Checks has received some attention from within the SSAC. We, at a recent meeting, we had a lightning talk in particular about one case, IANA 3775, who had been reported as being significantly over-indexed on several components of DNS abuse. We've had some SSAC members who reported significant concerns about the actual harms that are

being created because of the registration pattern and the mitigation one-at-a-time mechanism, right?

So that mismatch of, you know, large-scale registrations, but the mitigation is one domain at a time. So we've had some members concerned about actual harm to users as a result of that. So I think you'll find lots of support for the work that, you know, you're initiating on Associated Domain Checks. And from speaking personally, not on behalf of the SSAC, but personally, I like the idea of doing this one-at-a-time because you want to get it done as swiftly as possible, but you also don't want to compromise on either qualitative analysis or actionable outcomes.

And when you munch through things and you're trying to do some policy development, particularly when it comes to things that have a kind of a, what's the right word for it? A mandate that then, you know, all contracted parties have to conform to, there's a great deal of care and caution that has to go into that process, right? So I think it's better done one-at-a-time, even if it takes longer.

I will say this one last thing. I think the measure of success is not how swiftly this gets done. I think the measure of success is how well the types of abuse we're trying to put down actually go down. So I would suggest that as the PDP gets started, one of the important things to do is to measure the baseline. Where are you at before you began the PDP? And then once, you know, you have the policy and then, you know, hopefully the Council approves it and it becomes actual contractual commitments, what is the

before and after? Because I think it'll also serve as a good example of how this model works and community-based policymaking is the better way to do it than somebody trying to crack the whip.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Thanks, Ram. And just two things I'd like to take Chair's prerogative is I agree that this is kind of more of similar to what we did during the DNS abuse amendments is we weren't creating necessarily new quote-unquote obligations, but it was a lot of the best practices that registrars and registries were already doing.

And so the things that are being considered here are that, so we can raise that floor for others. And then also, I agree with trying to show that this model can work faster. I know it was being tossed around in the chat about oh, there should be an EPDP, but because people here expedited and think that means it moves faster, people always forget that that just means you skip a step, you skip the issues report, which we've already done.

So it can't be an EPDP. But if there's a way to make a faster PDP or an agile PDP, or I don't want to use that because that's got a tech industry term. But if there's a way that we can show that, yes, there can be a good PDP or whatever term we come up with. But I think we can prove that and show that with doing that and making sure that it moves forward as fast as possible. Rod?

ROD RASMUSSEN

Would that be a PDP with alacrity? So the SSAC had a concurrent session during that GNSO one this morning. So I don't know that many of the members, the rest of the members, besides Greg and myself, were aware of what the discussions were, et cetera. I'd said there was a couple of things I wanted to highlight. One is that there seemed to be some confusion of whether DGAs were in or out. And the focus was on the two topic areas, which is, I'm going to call it bulk registration or large scale registration, because that was one of the other points I wanted to focus on, and the associated domain check bit.

So it seemed there wasn't some difference of opinion of whether that third DGA topic was still as part of that. So it'd be good to clear that up. Greg brought it up live. I said something in the comments that we do want to make sure the scoping on what's being termed API access is not just limited to API access, because the real issue is around being able to register large numbers of domains by one entity. And that may be through an API, but it could also be through a web interface or automated process on the client side, even. And so it's really looking at that.

So just wanted to bring that up for just to surface that to the SSAC and also just bring it up here, because I think that's something we definitely want to make sure we're very good on the language. Narrow scoped, but not too narrow. One last point I wanted to make on the preferences on doing things in parallel or one after the only thing that I have no preference other than if there's some dependencies in one of the topic areas, because they aren't

related, if you think about it, that some of the related domains were probably registered in bulk, right? So is there any dependencies there that would augur for having working on one versus the other first? Thanks.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Thanks, Rod. I'm going to call Brian quick. Can you do the DGA thing?

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Thanks. Sure, Owen. Thanks. Yeah, and I put my hand up to address that. So yeah, you'll see the preliminary issue report focused on the two issues that you noted, Rod. I think the registry certainly think that there should be further community work on DGAs, maybe potentially to include a PDP.

What I mentioned in an earlier session, though, is just because of the nature of DGAs, which I certainly don't need to explain to the SSAC, but because it involves potentially a fair number of ccTLDs, we just want to make sure that whatever solution is built has sufficient participation from our friends in the ccTLD world, that if we intend to create this centralized spot to help facilitate and deal with DGAs, we build something in such a way that CCs don't look at it and say, well, I'm not doing that. Not to say, and obviously we know we can't bind them, but we just want to make sure that whatever solution comes from that process actually has a

meaningful impact to address the solution, to address the problem that it's trying to solve.

I did just want to note, too, just really wanted to recenter the dialogue around what we're trying to cover in each of these respective PDPs. And from the very beginning, from the GNSO, DNS abuse small team, from 22 onwards, each publication since has really tried to note that the best chance of success for these are if we keep them narrowly scoped. And I appreciate that for each one of these issues, we're each going to see the problem and say like, yeah, I get it. But maybe if we tweak it a little bit this way, it gets a little bit more of the problem. The issue is if 10 interest groups do that 10 different ways, then all of a sudden we've lost the plot and we are faced with something that is no longer narrowly scoped.

So just kind of for my own personal space here, just to encourage us to try and keep these to the core issues we're trying to address, try and keep these narrowly scoped, but still meaningful, just because I think ultimately keeping it narrowly scoped gives us the best chance for success for both having a meaningful PDP, but also getting these done quickly so we can move on to the additional PDPs.

OWEN SMIGELSKI Thanks, Brian. Catherine?

CATHERINE PALETTA

Sorry about that. This is Catherine Paletta from Identity Digital. I wanted to let these folks know, I guess, the CPH is planning to bring DNS abuse up to the ICANN Board as one of our priorities in response to the board question that I think was the same to the whole community of what their priorities in 2026 should be. So we know that there's so much work that the PDP and the GNSO can do to make PDPs move quickly, but then the Board has a role to play. And certainly the board has a role to play in making sure that staff are appropriately staffed. I don't have a better phrase for that.

And so this will be something that we bring up as very important that both the Board quickly approve, to the extent that they are ready to be approved, the recommendations that come out of these PDPs, but also that staff is given appropriate resources to be able to accomplish these PDPs in quick succession, because it is a priority for the entire community. Thanks.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Thanks, Catherine. Reg?

REG LEVY

Thanks. I just wanted to thank Ram for his focus on data and measurable impact. We see regular reports coming out from various interest groups about the state of DNS abuse, and it's not often well defined and not really able, not really useful in terms of what we're doing here. So I really agree that we want to make sure that we can measure where we are now.

And then as we move forward, measure where we are after they've been implemented, after they've been used for a while. I think that was an issue that the community felt widely with regard to the DNS abuse amendments, that they didn't feel that there was a real measurable impact. And that's kind of why we're here now. So if we can get that impact and define it in an ongoing manner, I think that's going to be very useful.

To Owen's point about EPDPs just skipping a step, it sounds like they're already EPDPs then, since we've already got an issues report. And Rod was addressing bulk registrations instead of API. I also dislike the framing of API, because EPP is an API. So every registration is done via API. But bulk is completely and entirely undefined. I've heard somebody define it as being registrations across registrars, which is not something that at least registrars are ever going to be able to identify unless we become the same entity.

So I want to kind of stay away from bulk as a word in this, because it's undefined or undefinable. And as soon as we start saying bulk is 10 domains, bulk is five domains, then things are just going to fly in right under that. And that doesn't get us anywhere. It hasn't actually caused the friction that we're looking to cause. It seems that generally the primary determiner of whether or not abuse occurs is pricing. I'm not saying we start talking about pricing. Just that there are other factors that are weighing in here, and using API seems to be the best thing that we've got right now.

OWEN SMIGELSKI Thanks, Reg. Yeah, I've actually heard people suggest that five is considered bulk, which, boy, what that would do to a lot of our business models and customers. So let's see. Roger?

ROGER CARNEY Thanks so much, Roger. Going to the two or three topics issue confusion, I think it was the way the draft charter was drafted, in that it talked about three things at the beginning, but then it only enumerated two of them later on. So I think that why some thought it was three and some thought it was two is because of that. And again, I think we can stay focused on the two and move on from there.

As far as Rod's comment on the interdependencies between those two things, I think that that's fair. And I don't think you ever get away from interdependencies when you're talking about it. But I think that they're unique enough that doing one, even if you find an interdependency, the next one can fix anything that comes up. So I think that they're unique enough that they can be worked individually. Thanks.

OWEN SMIGELSKI Thanks, Roger. And I must admit, I'm one of those people confused by two versus three. So thank you for that clarification. Beth?

BETH MARTY Yes. Hi, Beth Marty with Name.com. I echo Reg's comment about being data-driven, which was brought about by your comment,

Ram. It would make sense that a narrowly scoped PDP would also have narrowly scoped outcomes. And so that should be communicated, and that should be a good outcome. It should not be feelings-led.

There were some feelings that were raised earlier in the room. And there was a suggestion that there are innovations that are moving so fast that PDPs can't keep up, which is not accurate because abuse should be identified, and then the CPH should be able to react to it and provide thoughtful policy. And so that's what we intend to do. And the SSAC appreciate also the anecdote about why you find associated checks interesting. The feedback loop also from the SSAC and what you find interesting is so vital to the CPH's work as well. Thank you.

OWEN SMIGELSKI Thanks, Beth. Ram?

RAM MOHAN Just briefly, I wanted to say on behalf of the SSAC that we're very appreciative that we have two seats on the DNS abuse PDP per year charter. That's a really welcome thing. In the past, we've often had to, or maybe not had to, but we've often taken the practice of something comes out and then we publish a comment after the fact when we could have been in there helping shape it and inform it. So I think this is a step in the right direction. And from within the

SSAC, there is strong support for that, not just as a model for this time, but to make that the model for all future times. So thank you.

BETH BACON

This is the other Beth from PIR, the less Beth, less good Beth. I went to plus one, the other Beth. All the bests are together. I think that part of the efficiency is that we are going to get to really targeted, implementable outcomes, and I think that's key to making this actually efficient and speedy. We can have a targeted, well-scoped PDP charter, but if then we have SSAC comes in and then the GAC comes in and then we have the Board thing, it can all unravel.

So I think I was going to flag also that I think this is the spot for us to be really deliberate about our coordination. You guys have representatives. We have representatives. Let's make sure that we are kind of solving those problems before we're even done so that it can simply be a report and just the beautiful recommendations that the Board has no problem checking off and approving, and then we aren't beholden to kind of that follow-up process. So I think it is a step in the right direction. I think it's going to lend to efficiency. And I did want to say that we are at 30 minutes, and I don't want us to short your time. So I'm happy to call some audibles.

RAM MOHAN

Understood. And I just want to say just based on what you just shared, I think, and I'll discuss this within SSAC, but when we talk

to the board, they ask the same question that they've asked you about priorities. We'd be happy to also come in and endorse and say, hey, DNS abuse ought to be high on your list and pay attention when you get the recommendations because it's good for the ecosystem, good for the entire community.

BETH BACON I think that sounds great.

OWEN SMIGELSKI All right. So as Beth said, we're kind of a little behind here. So yeah, obviously important topic, but we want to make sure we get to the SSAC stuff. So do we just kind of want to gloss over the other stuff here or?

BETH BACON I did just want to the one thing that I did want to flag, and maybe this is another spot for us to collaborate intersessionally, is just to flag the registries were very involved in kind of promoting and pushing the code of conduct on SOIs. And we have started internally a little bit of due process saying, let's take a look at this. This is do we need them? Do we need as registries a form? Probably, yes. Do we need to make this more accessible to members as well as public?

We'll talk about that. What's the process for someone to come to the registries and say, we think we might have a problem or then hey, registry chair, this SSAC man out of control. Can you say,

which would never happen. But so I think that's something that we've been talking about. So I just want to flag that as an item that I would love for us to follow up on just making sure that after we've pushed for this, we're going through the motions and the due diligence of implementing it. And then I will zip it and we can listen to you guys say all your good stuff.

RAM MOHAN

Yeah, Beth. I think you'll find strong support there for a very long time. The SSAC has been operating on a equivalent track, but it's not exactly the same. We work with disclosure of interest because almost by definition, the members of the SSAC are involved in the community, have conflicts and things like that. We don't take an approach of if you work for a contracted party, you cannot participate on issues that affect contracted parties, right?

But we do require, in our own code of conduct, this idea that you disclose, when there is a change, you disclose and we publish all of our disclosure of interest publicly. It's a requirement for every member. So I think you'll find strong support or not just endorsing but enforcing that kind of a code of conduct.

BETH BACON

And just to follow, I think that sounds great. And I think that's in line with the code as written. It's very much a disclosure policy and not something where you're actively complying with compliance. And one of the, I think one of the good caveats is that if you have

disclosed clearly, there's likely not a conflict of interest and they say it right in there. So I think that we're all on the right path and just trying to walk the walk on that one. So I appreciate that.

RAM MOHAN

I don't know that we need 30 minutes for our topics, because it's mostly updates. There might be a couple of things where there might be, I think it'd be useful to have an interaction with you. So I would say, if you want to take the other two and go through that, we can try to drive through that reasonably quickly.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Well, I will handle update on automation initiatives and confess that this is something that registrars added, but we don't know what it is. So if anybody here at the table. What?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER

Not a registrar. I thought this was about DS automation and about-- okay, so I know I said something about checking in on which not a registrar. So maybe I'm thinking the wrong thing. But there was Board action on DS automation, which was something I think we talked about in Prague. And I was like, should we check in? Does that mean anything? What does the Board action mean? Do we need to do anything? And that's as much thought as I put into it. And if that's not what registrars think this was about, I might be wrong, but that's what I thought I was asking about. And it could be something different. Sorry.

RAM MOHAN That's it's the same thought that got tickled in our minds. When we saw automation, we thought, it must be the DS automation because you put a report on it, it went to the Board and there was some endorsement of it. And Peter is here. He was one of the co-chairs of that DS automation work group. So I don't know if you want to speak briefly about what the report said and kind of where you think that might have a relationship to registrars.

PETER THOMASSEN Okay, sure. So in a nutshell, the report observes that configuring DNSSEC and putting the DS records into the parent zone is usually when it's manually complicated and you have to do it manually today if the DNS service is not provided by the registrar. And so there seems to be an opportunity for automation and the report explains how that can be done. And there is some operational choices one can make. For example, what happens if there is an update prohibited lock, for example, in the registration? Would you then think that the DS automation should continue or should maybe be suspended?

So those sorts of questions are listed in the report. And then it gives a few recommendations, which essentially, I think, are that registries and registrars that want to do that automation today should not be disencouraged or something. And ICANN or should work together with the ITF and other people to sort of come up with best practice guidelines for these questions I've just mentioned.

And so there's actually an update in that area. So the ITF DNS self-working group has adopted a document on guidelines for DS automation and that has been worked on over the past few months. I think we've just presented once in August at the GNSO tech op session.

And yes, anyway, the document now is pretty much stabilized and I would expect it to be probably published sometime next year. And so that is an ITF document. It's not a requirement for anyone to do anything. It's just that if there are new deployments for DS automation, then it would make sense if they make the same choices with regards to such questions like locks, for example, so that domain owners that have a portfolio under different TLDs can expect the same thing to happen.

And so one last thing, one of these questions is who should be actually doing the automation? Should it be the registry or should it be the registrar who then through EPP forwards things to the registry? And in fact, it turns out both as possible and the SSAC and also the ITF document doesn't really take a position on it. It's rather saying that the registry shouldn't be doing it if the registrar wants to do it. And yeah, so that's pretty much it.

From practical experience, usually registrars don't want to do it. At least in .cz for the Czech Republic, they have done a survey, I think, before the registry introduced it. And the registrar has all said, please go ahead, but we don't want to do it. And I would expect that to be similar in different TLDs. Yeah, so that was in a nutshell.

If you have any other questions about it, we can talk about it at any time.

CATHERINE PALETTA: That sounds great. We'll watch. I'll get my people to watch that document because let's be clear, I won't understand it. I've got people though, like Ram.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: And also, thank you, Catherine, for jumping in and saving me on that because it doesn't look good to face plant in front of everybody on a live mic in a recorded session. Roger.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, John. This is Roger. And maybe from the SSAC, is there initiatives larger than this? I know over the past couple of years, there's been on and off discussion of when and where DNSSEC is appropriate to use it. It's come to light that as great as this fundamental security thing is, it's not necessarily needed for everyone. And in years past, it was everyone should use it. And I think that's changed. But I want to hear from SSAC on that topic a little bit. Thanks.

RAM MOHAN: Thanks, Roger. I'll send that Amazon gift card to you later because it's precisely one of the topics that's coming up on the SSAC piece.

OWEN SMIGELSKI Sorry, I should pay attention here. Reg, you got a hand up?

REG LEVY Thanks. Thank you for that, Peter. And I'm looking forward to lunch to pick your brain about this a little bit more. Because it seems, I think, I put this on the agenda. So I appreciate Catherine jumping in there. I'm confused about the utility of it beyond SSAC, not SSAC, DNSSEC for DNSSEC's sake. Because when the keys are given to a third party, then security is decreased, right?

So if I have a cryptocurrency wallet, and I forget my passkey, then I'm hosed, right? I lose it. But if I give that key to a different type of application or wallet, that keeps all of my keys together, I just have to remember a short password. But then they have access to my wallet. And so I don't understand how security is actually being increased, just that the uptake of DNSSEC is being increased. And I don't see that those are actually the same in the context where you're outsourcing your own security to a third party. And if you want to save your answer to this for lunch, I'm happy to take that offline. But that's where I'm coming from and kind of why I put it on.

RAM MOHAN I think that makes sense. And perhaps you do that offline.

PETER THOMASSEN I'd save the long answer for lunch. The very short answer is, if you have a password application, like one password, they don't necessarily have access to the clear text. And the other thing is, let's talk about lunch.

RAM MOHAN Okay, great. Beth, should we move to the SSAC topics?

BETH BACON I think first we need to schedule our lunch. Are we all going to lunch? That's what I found. That's what I heard. Yes.

RAM MOHAN Okay. The next slide. We want to give you just a quick update on a few things that we're working on, not just current work parties, but what's coming up. And we bring this to you, not just to inform, but because we want to consult with you. And we want to invite you into that process. So again, it's kind of a new thing. It's new learning, but we're trying to build some collaborative muscles here. Next slide, please.

The first work party that we want to share is what we're calling RIDE. And Rick Wilhelm is the chair of that work party. And the intent here is to focus on clear guidelines to enable identifiers that are being created in other namespaces. Blockchain is one example. There are a couple of things that are happening. There are identifiers created in other namespaces.

In some cases, they use the same nomenclature, they use the same syntax, they use the same kind of words. And that has the potential to have confusion, that has the potential to have some trust issues if there is a problem in that space, but it uses the same names that is in the space that you're all in, we're all in, and that has regulation, etc., associated with it. So we want to focus on how to integrate responsibly.

And the key areas of study are the ones that are there on the right-hand side, managing synchronization when domains expire in the domain name system. If they're linked to identifiers in other name systems, what happens? And what is the user expectation? How do you get predictability? How do you get stability of that system? So that's the first thing.

The second thing is what do you do about fraud when similar names exist in multiple systems and there are claims or they have been sold with a certain set of claims associated with them? So what are the issues there? And finally, potential risks that could be introduced to the DNS system itself. That's our remit, that's our focus.

So we want to be clear that it's not intended to kind of be a knock against innovation in new systems, but it's about making sure that the system that we do work with and that we do have responsibility for, that there is clarity, there is security and stability and user trust in that area. I'll pause for any questions on this before I go to the next one. None. Okay. Let's go to the next slide.

This is the question that Roger was looking to what DNSSEC is doing. So we have started up a work party on DNSSEC operational considerations. And in this, what we're looking to do is to provide a practical guide that demystifies DNSSEC. And if there are operators who want to implement and adopt DNSSEC, how do you do it in a safe way, in a way that is predictable and reliable? And what we're doing is to analyze adoption trends and analyze barriers to the adoption of DNSSEC and to look at what are the tools that are out there. Are there enough tools? Is there a paucity of tools? What are the best practices in use? And acknowledge that so many outages have been linked to DNSSEC changes and that there is a, maybe not just a perception, but there may be some level of this idea that if you implement DNSSEC, you are at some point of time, you're likely to have an outage, right?

So we want to see, is there truth to that? What are the benefits of deploying DNSSEC? What are the practical trade-offs, the pros and cons of deploying DNSSEC? And really, what can we learn from those who have gone down that path of choosing to implement DNSSEC or gone down the path of saying, we're not going to implement DNSSEC, right? I mean, we know, for instance, that if you look at the top 100 most trafficked websites in the world, only a small percentage of them have implemented DNSSEC. And there are assumptions being made there, right? That the others don't know about it. But in reality, it may be that there's somebody there who made a conscious choice and said the cost of it or the complexity of it.

So we want to kind of tease those pieces apart and eventually get to a step-by-step guide that says, we're not here to kind of blanket say, you must implement DNSSEC. It is the best thing since sliced bread. But we want to say, when you make a choice or when you start to make a determination about deploying DNSSEC or considering deploying DNSSEC, what are the things you want to look at? And what kind of resources should you set yourself up for, right? It's a complex thing. We recognize it's a complex thing. So that's kind of the focus of what we're doing.

And in that area, we have a specific ask for you in the Contracted Parties House. We've done some interviews with ccTLD operators, ccTLD registries and registrars, asking them some of these questions. Did you decide to do DNSSEC? What kind of challenges did you have? What did you find from it? And we're not looking for just the rah-rah cases. We're looking for what happened.

So we would like to invite you in the Contracted Parties House to come and chat with us in the work party. We'll send you the questions ahead of time. We have them crafted. And it's an informal session, but we want to learn from your experience and your practice. Reg was talking about how there were decisions that have been made. We want to learn that, and then we want to make that available to the next generation of people who want to deploy DNSSEC.

So that's an ask. We'll send the request to you. And if you could both help disseminate it, but also please come and talk to us,

because we actually don't know. You know. And we'd like to learn from what you've done and what you've not done, and then share that as part of the report. So I'll stop here for any questions or feedback.

BETH BACON

Well, I put my hand up, so I'm going to call on myself, because I'm drunk with power. First of all, thank you for thinking of us proactively and in advance so we can contribute in a hopefully meaningful way. Very happy to help spread that out. And it may be that registries send questions along. Not everyone may participate, but they may be able to email you some answers or do those sorts of things. So different ways for us to do that, but happy to also participate. Besides this being practical for operators, I think it might be a really good contribution, or at least parts of it, where it's the pros and cons, demystifying some of the outcomes of DNSSEC deployment and explaining why you would or would not, would be really helpful for our friends in the GAC.

We've been hearing a lot about DNSSEC, and I think we heard DNSSEC for DNSSEC's sake from Reg. There's a lot of, I think, misunderstanding that A, that it's blanket the right thing to do, when in fact, sometimes there may be choices that are made. And I think that would be a super contribution to that, to their capacity building and just something as a resource for them. So you may not be thinking about that now, but as you go through, that's something that that's the first thing I thought of.

RAM MOHAN Fantastic. That's great. And this is an area where I think it's not only collaboration at the stage of building the report, but when it's actually done, I think it's again, useful to find ways to disseminate it, to share that and to kind of maybe find some semi-permanent way to build some kind of a landing spot so that when people start to think about DNSSEC, here is a reliable resource that is updated from time to time.

BETH BACON Anybody else from registries or registrars?

RAM MOHAN Okay, then let's go to the last slide that presentation-wise that we have. These are, there are two new work parties that we're kicking off, and they're both, the first one is just being chartered. And the second one, we have a charter that we're starting to discuss. So the first one is on what we're calling right now, DNS abuse and artificial intelligence. Laurin, he is here and he is one of the co-chairs of that work party. Laurin, do you want to speak just briefly to what you're trying to do in this work party?

LAURIN WEISSINGER Absolutely. So this is Laurin. We are really in the early stages with this one. I think that's the important thing to say. So we're kind of just started discussions about what are the relevant definitions, what's the relevant scope, and what we really want to do. You can

already kind of see it in the slides, right? What is the role of kind of artificial intelligence when it comes to like the things that SSAC cares about? And as I've been saying, this is not something that's really easy to scope. You really have to do this very well. And that's what we're currently kind of trying to figure out how to do and stay tuned for more on the actual content and our actual focus once we've done that.

RAM MOHAN Thanks. And I think today's chartering session was a public session. So if you go back and look at the recording of that, you'll be able to see what we were discussing if you have the time for it. But otherwise come chat with any one of us and we'll be happy to take your feedback, pass it in to Laurin and make sure that-- I mean, as Laurin was saying, the biggest thing that we're trying to make sure is that it's scoped appropriately, that it it's not going to attach the magic AI label to everything and then you get lots of clicks, right? So that's kind of one of the things that we're focused on. Roger, you have your hand up.

ROGER CARNEY Thanks, Ram. And this isn't specifically to this, but since you brought AI up, I thought I would throw in, is SSAC looking at the efforts around agent naming services that's going on at IETF and other places? And again, I'm not sure that it fits exactly here, but it's something I'm wondering if SSAC is looking at.

LAURIN WEISSINGER So there's something that I'm aware of personally that I think is interesting. The question is if it would fit within the scope we're talking about and if so, at what point it would make sense, but definitely an interesting topic.

RAM MOHAN Jody?

JODY KOLKER Thanks, Ram. I'm curious about the DNS transparency, what you've mentioned there. A while ago, Registry used to have a live feed when every new domain name was registered. Is that kind of what SSAC is determining, if Registry should have a live feed of newly registered domain names being pumped out onto an API somewhere?

RAM MOHAN Thanks, Jody. So again, this is in early stages where we just have a charter out and it comes from a lightning talk from one of our members in some analysis that they've been doing. And there's a category of names that they've termed transient domains. These are names that get created or used for potentially abusive purposes, and then they get removed from the zone file. But the duration of time to live, if you will, for that domain name in the zone file is smaller than the current published zone file update times.

And effectively, that means that from an observability point of view and looking at whether there is damage caused by those domain names, it becomes invisible from the public eye, right? So that's a problem area, if you will, that we're looking at. Whether there is a solution for it, should it be a live feed? Should there be other mechanisms? We're not at that point yet, Jody, but we're recognizing that there is what appears to be a clever hack that exploits the public zone file update time intervals. Catherine?

CATHERINE PALETTA Thanks. I also wanted to talk about this because I noticed this when I was reviewing the public comments for the PDP thing. You guys know what I'm talking about. The DNS PDPs. And this was the first I had heard of it, and I thought it was really interesting. And based on what you just said, because when I read that, I hear, oh, this is great. Registries are taking action on abuse so fast that no one-- we're mitigating so fast, no one even knows the domain was registered. But then your last statement there made it sound like maybe this is something the baddies are doing to exploit that. And that's not what first came to my mind. I'm interested in how that works and what that looks like.

So I guess this is very early, but I think it's an interesting topic. I don't think this was one of the gaps identified when the GNSO Council was looking for gaps. And I'd be interested to see as we look past these two, three PDP topics that were the focus of this issues report, if this can be something that is looked at by the wider

community. And I don't know. This was the first I'm hearing about. I thought it was very interesting.

RAM MOHAN

Yeah. Inside of the SSAC, in the lightning talk, what I recall, and there may be others here who have an even clearer recollection of it than I do. But what I recall, Catherine, was that one part of it was the fast mitigation, but I think the bigger focus and concern was how it was being exploited. And you couldn't actually see that piece of use at all, because from the security researcher point of view, you couldn't see the name in the zone and then out of the zone. Okay. Sorry? Oh, Greg.

GREG AARON

Greg Aaron. So one of the things that might be happening is the zone files are only distributed once every 24 hours. And what some people have seen is criminals will wait until the zone file gets distributed, then they register some names and immediately do something with them. And so people who are looking for that kind of bad activity don't see it until 23 hours later. But there are probably other things going on as well. And we need to figure out and identify what all those things are.

RAM MOHAN

Which brings us, Beth and Owen, to the last slide. And this is where when we've had informal conversations, we've talked about, hey, we have a whole bunch of content. And we recognize that much of

it is technically dense, but we're actually working on getting some summaries that are more repurposable for a regular audience, people who are not necessarily operators, technical people, etc.

So we wanted to just open the door to you and ask if there are things that matter to you that also matter to us and where we have content and where you have distribution, kind of dissemination ability. And it may not be something that we necessarily identify here in this session, but I want to open that door. Just as an example, with the ALAC, we began a process about 12, 13 months ago, and it's labeled Safer Cyber. And what we've done there is we've provided guidelines and things about credential management and phishing and how to protect end users against phishing as an example.

And that content, we've been able to collaborate with the ALAC. They've taken that content, repurposed it, made it into something that is usable for their audiences, and then they go on and disseminate it. We're not a part of that process, but we are very much a part of making sure that the material has authoritativeness to it and accuracy to it. So that's one worked example. It doesn't have to be that same model. But we want to open that door to you and have you start thinking about, are there community educational needs? And you were talking about the GAC and educating the GAC.

Maybe it's useful for us to do something together where you have an implementer's point of view from the CPH and you have the

researcher's point of view from the SSAC coming together on DNSSEC as an example and educating. That's one thought that comes to mind, but there are probably many others.

BETH BACON

Well, you don't need me here because you stole my idea. This is Beth for the record. So I think absolutely the joining forces is a really great idea. That's the first thing I thought of. Obviously, the work that you're doing on DNSSEC is right in the wheelhouse. That's very helpful. So I'm happy to take this back as something for us to noodle on as registries and registrars and then think about ways, not only topics and things that might be helpful, and take a look and take a more thorough look at the things that you have already kind of on the boil and see if there's ways that we can contribute, ways that we can collaborate.

I do think we have been talking a lot about trying to get not just capacity building sessions with the GAC. And we say capacity building, it's not because they don't or can't understand what we're talking about, it's because there's such aggressive turnover there. And it's folks that are often from they're handling 30, everything that's IT or technology in their government, and they come here for a week and they're like, what the hell? So they try and figure out what this is going on.

I've, in my like dream world, there's a little book, a little resource, a whole webpage that we can just say, hey, GAC, do you want to link to these documents? It might be really helpful as a primer or as an

introductory packet, things that we can provide to folks. So I think I would really enjoy noodling on that with you. So I'll take that back by seat. Beth, oh, Beth, you put your hand down. It was up. Go for it.

BETH MARTY This is Beth Marty with name.com. The other Beth. You kind of just said what I was going to say anyways, if you already have materials, if you can just make a, say, this is what we already have in stock as the first cut at suggestions and say, this is what might, we might be able to distill really easily and share with the broader group. That would be great.

BETH BACON We're actually just one Beth.

RAM MOHAN So, perhaps it's something that we do in intercessionally because it with better noodle asynchronously than here.

BETH BACON I guess we are at time. So any, any other business close last call for comments, questions, concerns? All right. Well, we really appreciate that we're getting this on the schedule. Sue and Zoe and Nikki have this on the list of every meeting now, so I think we're going to see a lot of each other, which is great.

RAM MOHAN	That's terrific. Thank you so much for having us and look forward to more.
OWEN SMIGELSKI	And I'd also like to plus one what Beth said.
SUE SCHULER	Thank you. We can end the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]