

---

ICANN67 | Virtual Community Forum – Joint Meeting: ICANN Board and SSAC  
Tuesday, March 10, 2020 – 16:00 to 17:00 CUN

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This meeting is being recorded.

MERIKE KAEO: Hello, everyone. It is the top of the hour. And welcome to the SSAC constituency meeting with the Board at the virtual ICANN67 meeting. It is March 10th of 2020.

This is Merike Kaeo. I am the SSAC liaison to the Board and will be chairing this session. We will be starting with the SSAC's area of interest and then discuss the Board's.

And I would like to ask that when somebody is speaking, please do state your name and affiliation for the record.

So, Rod, are you on?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yep.

MERIKE KAEO: Please take it away, Rod.

---

**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.**

---

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Hello, everyone. This is Rod Rasmussen, SSAC chair. We have four topics that we wanted to touch on with the Board today. It's up on the slide there.

And then my plan was to have each of the folks in the SSAC who's been chairing the work parties that are behind these things give a quick overview of that, assuming they're on the call, muted on the call. I will cover if they did not.

And after each of the topics, we will be happy to take comments and questions from the Board members. And hopefully we'll have some time for further discussion. So we'll try and move through this with some alacrity.

Next slide, please.

So first one we're going to talk about is DNS abuse.

Next slide.

So this is a new work party that we have recently formed. And I'm going to turn that over to Jeff Bedser, if he made it onto the call, to run through what's going on with that.

Jeff, are you on the call?

I'm not hearing him. Let's see if I see him.

No, I will cover.

Nope, not seeing him so I will cover.

---

[ Laughter ]

Doing this on the fly here. Okay.

So we mentioned this before, that we were putting this work party together. We have done so. We have formed a work party, done some preliminary work. One of the first things we did was bring in a few people that are outside of the SSAC that have operational experience in dealing with abuse both from the perspective of registry, registrar, and ISP/hosting, and someone that is -- that has a law enforcement perspective as well to augment our own expertise with some of the folks that we have on the SSAC. It's important, we think, in this particular area since there's so much interest throughout the ICANN community in this topic space that we broaden out the participation of our own work because that should help inform our own work party of outside perspectives as well as allow us to do a good job hopefully of getting a lot of buy-in throughout the community to the work we come out with.

One of the -- some of the areas we're potentially going to be working on, we could actually take this out quite a bit depending on if we want to do various studies in looking at root causes and things like that. But up front what we want to do is provide a -- been calling it a framework, or listed as roadmap on the slide here, for the community to use without trying to get into formal definitions of different types of abuse, which takes you kind of down a rat hole.

So what we want to try and do, though, is provide a framework for the community to use in order to look at the various types of abuse that

---

are going on, how they're being perpetrated, how they interact with the DNS, where it's appropriate for various parties within the ICANN community to have some sort of role in dealing with those, whether that be direct or indirect, and providing hopefully some common -- at least common language and a common approach for the community to be able to use in its discussion in how to create policy here or various other work that needs to be done in order to deal with these issues.

And then we have some areas that we are very keen on taking a look at, taking a look at anti-abuse practices that are being employed by various parties, seeing how effective they are, and providing hopefully some input on best practices and standards that people could take a look at for implementing in their environments as appropriate and having some agreements as to what the -- try and drive to some agreements across the community as to what are the areas that need direct attention, immediate attention, and those that may still have some impact but may not be as critical to deal with and then areas that are outside the remit of folks within the ICANN sphere because there are a lot of abuse issues that cannot be directly addressed or even indirectly addressed very easily without causing collateral damage. So we want to be able to define those spaces, what's in them, what's not.

So that's the overview. I will open it up to the Board for questions.

MERIKE KAE0:

Thank you very much for that, Rod.

---

Maarten, do you have a question?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Just to say that obviously DNS abuse is a key issue for us and for the community. And for the Board perspective, it's very important to have SSAC's view on that exactly with the scoping that you said, what can we do, what can't we do from within our mission and also making sure that any efforts to do anything about it are also informed by its effect on the security, stability. So really appreciate that.

Goran?

GORAN MARBY: Thank you, Maarten. Hi, Rod. Hi, everybody. I can just echo what Maarten has been saying. I mean, to have -- not definition itself but actually talk about what the problem is and how to mitigate it, it's very important. And I'm personally very much -- I mean, if you look at some of the tools we're trying to develop, like DAAR and the health indicators, I would be also very interested to continue the discussion with SSAC about how we can make existing tools better and if there are any new tools that we can design to get a better understanding of how abuse works and what we can do to work with it.

So, yeah, that's what I want to say.

MERIKE KAE0: All right. Thank you. And I see that Leon's hand is up.

---

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Merike. This is Leon. Yes, just to highlight what Goran said, I think DNS abuse is on top of our minds. And in December, we received some advice from ALAC which had some very useful input. So I would definitely encourage the SSAC and the ALAC to work together to find these common grounds that could help us address these issues.

So if you can -- I think Julie Hammer is still the liaison to the ALAC. So it would be great if you could coordinate and reach that advice. Thanks.

MERIKE KAE0: Thank you, Leon.

Any other comments from any other Board members? Or any SSAC members who have added comments?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Just let me comment quickly that Julie is no longer the liaison to ALAC. It's now Andrey Kolesnikov. But he's doing a good job of coordinating as well.

So there's a lot of -- there's been a lot of papers, letters, et cetera, and the like that I know have been directed to the Board.

We've been included in a couple of those as a CC around DNS abuse and other abuse issues. And we're -- actually have been collecting

---

those as part of the corpus of input for this work party. So we have quite a -- already quite a list of those documents that we want to try or strive to address the questions and thoughts that were brought up in those and hopefully be able to provide some information that you guys can use in the Board as well by trying to address those issues.

And Becky had asked a question in the chat. I was typing in a response, but I can give that. She wondered if there were some parameters for what kind of abuse is in scope. And one of the things we're trying to do is actually try to do a good job of defining what those parameters should look like because I think that's one of the issues we've had in general in the ICANN community, is trying to agree on what -- where -- where the various levels of involvement would be for various parties within the ICANN community and dealing with different types of abuse.

So as a general rule, the DNS has to be used for one party to, you know, have an impact on another party that's considered a negative effect. It's a very general topic space, right? But you have to have involvement in the DNS in some form or fashion; and it has to be because of that, one party is negatively affecting another. That gives a fairly broad area to explore with them.

But I think if you start doing some kind of scientific examination of various boundaries within that, then you can start putting things into a proper perspective and where there may be a direct involvement with a contracted party that has to deal with a malicious registration of some point versus it's not really the job or remit when there's some

---

sort of platform problem or something like that. While the DNS was touched on, it wasn't really the primary vehicle.

So those are some of the things we're trying to look at with this framework and define exactly that. Hopefully that answers your question, Becky.

Cool. All right. So if there's no more there, then I think we'll go on to the next slide. And we're going to talk about the Name Collision Analysis Project, or NCAP for short, and give you a update there. I think Jim is on the -- Jim Galvin is on the call.

Jim, if you want to run through a couple of slides here, if you would.

MERIKE KAE0: (indiscernible).

JIM GALVIN: I'm sorry. Go ahead.

MERIKE KAE0: No. I was just going to say, Jim, I see your hand is up so, please, go ahead.

JIM GALVIN: Thanks, Merike and Rod. Thanks to the Board for this opportunity to speak.



---

We have -- just as a quick update, there are two slides. The first one up here is just a baseline, a reminder we consolidated after the first couple of reports to you.

Recall that the Board through two resolutions almost two years ago here had asked for some specific advice regarding .HOME, .CORP and .MAIL and general advice regarding name collisions in particular. There are essentially ten questions that were part of those resolutions that this Name Collision Analysis Project is looking at.

We do have an SSAC work party in this space, but we are conducting all of the work as part of a discussion group which is open to the community. We currently have 24 discussion group members, only 13 of which are from SSAC. The rest are from the community at-large. We do have a number of observers that do participate, and we get a handful of them at every meeting that we have, which is kind of nice, too.

And, of course, the mailing list that we have, although it's not very active, it is important to point out that public archive -- the archive is public. And anybody can subscribe to it to receive messages, although only actual discussion group members can post messages to the list.

And another important point here is that we now have our third co-chair. We've gone through a couple of co-chairs here within SSAC. But we have myself. Fortunately, I have been a little bit of continuity here. But we now have Patrik Falstrom who many remember was the SSAC chair, of course, prior to Rod Rasmussen.

---

But our goal was always to bring someone from the community to be one of the co-chairs and be part of the leadership of the discussion group. And we finally for public release were able to identify someone. That's Matt Thomas. He's actually from VeriSign. He's one of their researchers, and he's been an important part of even thinking about it, looking at the data we have, and the historical studies that actually have been done. That's a good thing, and we are very pleased to be able to welcome him to be part of our leadership team.

Next slide, please.

In terms of where we are specifically, study 1 has been launched, is quite active, and, in fact, is nearing the beginning of the end, if you will. There are two work products to come out of study 1. Its intent was to do a gap analysis. The first part of that was to characterize everything that we do know and that we have learned, catalog all that -- not characterize it, to catalog it all. Everything that we have gotten over the last seven, eight years that name collisions has become an important topic inside the ICANN community.

And so there was a contractor that was hired and there is a public comment that is currently in progress on all of that catalog. You know, that public comment period closes end of this month, and I suspect after that, that will progress (indiscernible) to be public. There is not a lot of tension there that would go on with that. It really is a catalog of what we know, a catalog of what we know.

We have also had a definition of name collision that we created, a nice technical definition, so that will be included there.

---

So that leaves us with one important question in study one, which is a statement as to the presence or absence of GAP that, you know, needs to be addressed and would require additional funding for studies two and three. And that discussion is one that is really just beginning. The work party itself will, you know, have some thoughts about that, which we'll get then to the consultant, the contractor who was hired to create the work-products. And all of that will be packaged up and delivered to the Board for its consideration. And, you know, regardless, obviously, of whether or not we get to do any additional analysis, I think we're moving in a direction where we believe in the work party that there is opportunity for additional analysis. SSAC, of course, will move forward with this discussion group and will do its best to continue with the (indiscernible) in studies two and three so that it can answer the questions that are in front of it.

But hopefully we will have an opportunity to go at some of the additional data that we know is out there and has been collected and is available over the last seven years. And in particular, resolver data is something which was not looked at way back when this was first studied. So it's useful to sort of collect that today and be able to look at those characterizations as we think about criteria, to provide to the Board in its consideration of whether or not to delegate collision strings, as the Board called them, in (indiscernible).

And that's open to any questions, and I believe that Patrik is there also, so he is welcome to join us if necessary here to answer questions.

Thanks.

---

MERIKE KAEO: Great. Thank you very much, Jim, for this update.

Akinori, do you have a comment?

AKINORI MAEMURA: Yeah, thank you very much, Merike. Thank you very much, Jim, and thank you very much, SSAC people, for involved in NCAP project.

And (indiscernible)I original was in Kobe (indiscernible). This now turning one year. And then I'm happy to see that now study one is now concluding with public comments. And then my understanding is we will -- after -- after the public comment period is over at the end of March, and then we will need to consider whether we should move ahead -- move it ahead to the study two. And then, yes, particularly we are still waiting for the situation. And then I'm looking forward to the consideration of that.

And then I think -- I think David has some details with (indiscernible) working on it with NCAP.

David.

DAVID CONRAD: Yeah, hi, Akinori. Yeah, as I'm sure you are all aware, Matt is pretty involved with the NCAP project. So, Matt, do you have any additional input you would like to provide on this?

---

MATT LARSON:

Not really. I think Jim did a good job with the overview. We're in the middle of the public comment right now on the first study. So far we have exactly zero comments, so it would be nice to get some. Speaking for myself, we are very pleased with Karen Scarfone, the contractor we chose via the RFP process to do the work. She's done just really a good job and very professional. I'm just very pleased with her.

So so far, we think it's going well, and the next steps, at least on study one, would be we revised the study based on, hopefully, some public comment feedback.

There is a little bit more that needs to be added to that before we can call it final and put it out for another public comment.

And our original schedule had us completing at the end of June. I'm now saying early July just to hedge a little bit because we've got a couple of weeks. So if things stay on track, I would hope to have a completed study one by early July.

MERIKE KAEAO:

Thank you for that update, Matt.

Does anybody else have any other comments regarding NCAP, either from the Board side or from SSAC?

I see Jim has his hand up. Jim.

---

JIM GALVIN:

Yeah, thanks, Merike.

I wanted to offer one additional (indiscernible).

As Matt was just pointing out, study one has its timeline and then there will be a process for whether or not to launch study two, and then we'll have to go through all of that. So there is some time with all of that. But I did want to say to the Board that what we will do in the discussion group is we will work in parallel with what we have access to and continue to move forward with the analysis part, which is the impact analysis and the root-cause analysis, working with what data that we have and what study one has been able to collect for us to look. So we're not -- we won't wait (indiscernible) for -- in a serial way for study two to be actually launched. We continue with progress, and we do as much as we can in awaiting the additional detail that we hope to get from a study two.

So just wanted to put that out there. Thank you.

MERIKE KAE0:

Okay. Thank you for that, Jim.

I don't see anybody else having their hand up, so thank you for this discussion. And I think we can go to topic number 3.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Okay. So I wanted to give you a quick snapshot on our response that we have been working on writing up to the SSR2 draft report.

---

Next slide, please.

So we do have a work party we put together. It's been a very quick turnaround. We appreciate the extra couple weeks that we got, extending the deadline. I know a couple of the other constituencies were -- were having the same issues we are, and it's just a very large report.

Geoff Huston, if you're available, would you like to just give an overview of what we've put together?

GEOFF HUSTON:

Yeah, thanks, Rod. Geoff Huston here.

Look, this is a one-page summary of SSAC's review of this SSR2 draft report. This is the shortest aspect of SSR2 in the entire exercise. The report itself is over a hundred pages in length. Our response is certainly not that long but certainly is relatively lengthy.

Why? Well, the report, I suppose, is surprising in many ways. And I think the best way to summarize where we've got to so far is to say that, in our view, it is some distance from a finished and useful product. In a detailed review of all of those recommendations, and there are a lot, there are 108 specific recommendations grouped up into 27 -- we call them high-level recommendations. So that's a huge amount of sort of proposals to do work. We found ourselves with issues with many of these draft recommendations. And equally of a concern, I think we have some issues with the overall approach to this review. Surprising in so far as it certainly deviates from conventional

---

expectation of what one would consider a review of assessment of security and resiliency and preparedness in this space.

We're not trying to rewrite this report. Absolutely not. But we are trying to sign post as well as we can how the review team might like to revise moving from this draft to a final report, revise it to make it actually useful to ICANN and the ICANN community, because the way it stands now, they certainly are critical of the implementation of the SSR1 recommendations, and we would hate to see an SSR3 being equally critical of SSR2 and treatment of that report. So we certainly would hope the situation can be improved.

But at the same time, in making a relatively critical judgment of this report, we have to also consider whether it was the review or the circumstances in which the review is made. We are asking a lot from volunteers, and I suppose the real question is are we asking way too much. This kind of high expertise, lengthy, detailed assessments, calls on an extraordinary amount of donated time and effort. And I suppose the question that we have in performing this review is is this really realistic? And are the products commensurate with our expectation?

And so we're also preparing a separate document commenting on this sort of more generic issue of is the review process actually managing to achieve its objectives in the framework in which they're currently being implemented, or are there some structural weaknesses that work hard to setting up these reviews to essentially fail, which is not what we want to see.



---

So we will get this review done -- our current timeline is to try to sign off at the end of this week, early next week and send it back to SSR2 as our comment. And we'll also be working on a separate document, which may well go through a more conventional SSAC advice path, about the carriage of this review process and its implications for ICANN.

So hopefully that was suitably brief (laughing). I'm certainly happy to take any questions. Thank you.

MERIKE KAEAO:

Yes.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

And this is Rod. Could I just add to that is well, just to add on that separate document point, is that we're also looking to incorporate comments around some of the other review processes that have been going on: ATRT3, CCT, all these other reviews, and cross-community working groups. We've had several public comments in the first part of this year that have taken a bunch of our time to try and provide some input on that are taking a look at process. And I know this is one of the things that we discussed with the other SO ACs leaders as needing to be addressed. And I'm going to try to take this and do some constructive work to give some thoughts to how we might want to approach this going forward.

So there's kind of two separate issues here. We're really trying to provide feedback to the SSR2 review team that will give -- that will

---

help -- because when they reached out with this, they said, "We know this isn't a finished product. What can we do? Where should we concentrate?" And we're trying to focus our answers on helping them put out a report that will be useful.

MERIKE KAEO:

Thank you for that, both Rod and Geoff. And as I'm, you know, the liaison, and I've been contributing to both the Board public comments and the SSAC comments, all I'm going to say at this point is that the Board is definitely very interested in SSAC's perspective on the SSR2 draft report.

Danko, you have your hand up.

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Thank you, Merike. First, I would like to say that the Board is very grateful to the SSAC on the public comment that is in the work. And we already had a bit of indication, but we think that this is very important way to help the review team.

And as you pointed out at the end, this is a process that has been troubled from a long time ago, and I have been here on the Board a bit more than a year so I jumped in late, but we can all see that it's been a challenging process. And we would really want and need this team to be successful and to renew it to succeed.

Having said that, I have a bit of a personal comment also. Kaveh and myself are the Board liaisons to the team, and in that role we are not

---

writing the report and influencing the content but trying to support and help the team do its work. We have been notified that some of the influences by the draft report that you are preparing is already there in the team. The draft was not itself separated in the mailing list but some of the feedbacks are there.

And then we see that a team is working with some good initiatives to try to rewrite some of the recommendations in a way we think would be better, like to identify first the problems and then to write recommendations, trying to solve them and to do that in a smart way.

And you also pointed out one very important aspect also, that review of the SSR1 recommendations and their implementation is also kind of challenged because it creates a lot of components of the recommendation, and this can be viewed in different terms. It's very difficult now to discuss what the original SSR1 team had in mind and how to (indiscernible) now.

So to make a conclusion, thank you for doing this. I think this is a good way SSR2 team is working. It's a bit of a challenge now because there is no face-to-face meeting, and in my experience, the team is much more effective in face-to-face meetings, but it's a small group and we hope in future some of that will be -- will be able to happen. But still, the team is working remotely and it's going through the recommendations. And they're already -- I believe the report is going in a better direction.

Thank you.

---

MERIKE KAE0: Great. Thank you very much for that from both the SSAC and the Board side.

Anybody else have a comment? I don't see any hands up.

So, Rod, we can continue with the Board's topic.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Move along to the next slide. We're going to be talking about DoH and DoT.

Next slide, please.

The ink on the PDF is still trying, but we do have SAC109 done. We were hoping to get it out last week, but we had some discussion in the final -- final-final review and we incorporated some new comments. And this is space that has a lot of interesting implications and the like. But we do have that.

Merike, I'm not sure if you have transmitted that over to the full Board or BTC yet. But you should have it soon regardless.

MERIKE KAE0: I have not. Just to -- yeah, I received it three hours ago and I've not yet had a chance to forward it. But it will be forwarded to the Board at the end of the day.

---

ROD RASMUSSEN: Just make sure the ink is dry.

[ Laughter ]

So that will be in your hands very soon. And I am going to turn it over to Barry, if Barry is on the call, to run through a couple of slides here.

BARRY LEIBA: Yeah, this is Barry Leiba. Hi.

Okay. So the angle we took on the report is to give a bit of a technical explanation at a very high level of what these protocols are, the short version of encrypting the communication for user privacy purposes. And then to spend most of the report talking about how this -- how you can look at this from different perspectives, the different kinds of stakeholders having different views, parents, enterprises, ISPs, governments versus dissidents, and this sort of thing, and look at the implications of doing this encryption in these different ways with different implementation choices and from different perspectives.

The report as a whole does not give advice to the Board. It gives advice to the reader in terms of an understanding of what the technology is doing and why it's doing it and what some of the effects of it are. And it tries to get people to understand the other perspectives they might not be coming from and why this is a difficult issue to discuss and why there are no yes and no answers and this is the right way to think of it and this is the wrong way to think of it.

---

So this is a little bit of a different report from what you will usually see from SSAC. But I think it will be useful for the community to read this and better understand what the complexities are, what the implications are and why different people are arguing different sides of the same point.

So that's -- I didn't actually go through the bullets on this slide. I don't think I need to go through them in detail more than what I've just said.

I'll go to the last bullet. One of the issues is the potential implications on the namespace, and we spend a bit of time on that. As different applications may use different recursive resolvers now, some of which may be behind enterprise firewalls, some of which may not, some of which may be filtered by government mandates, some of which may not, and so different applications may get -- now get different answers to their DNS queries. And so the report will talk a little bit about the implications about that.

Is there another slide?

Right. And I talked about this. We're not -- this report does not say things are right and wrong. It doesn't give the facile answers of, "well, it's always better to have more privacy, it's always better to have more encryption." Some of us think that; some of us don't. And what we have produced is something that balances it and shows where the different perspectives lie on these issues.

So I think that's all I have to say about this.

---

ROD RASMUSSEN:                    There are two more slides, Barry.

BARRY LEIBA:                      Oh, okay. Let's go for the other two slides.

Okay.

Conclusions, right. So the conclusion of this, evaluating these technologies, these protocols rely on the evaluator's perspective and how is DoH implemented in the browser you are using, in the application you are using, in the -- how is it dealt with in the enterprise that you are behind a firewall of and that sort of thing. So how are they deployed? What are the choices they're making for recursive resolvers? What do those resolvers do? What are the perspectives of the people who run them? What are the trust boundaries? Whom do you trust? What are the configuration settings and those sorts of things.

So, yes, bottom line here is that regardless of what your perspective is, deployment of these protocols is going to change things. And what we want people to understand is how the changes may or may not affect them depending on the perspective they come from.

Next slide.

The biggest issue that we had to decide how to handle was discussion of application-specific resolution, how having different applications make different choices will affect the end-user experience, how the applications work in concert with the operating system's resolvers and

---

what the operating system does, how the networks and endpoints work with respect to these, who has access to the data.

There are concerns about centralizing the knowledge of everybody's DNS queries and giving it -- there are concerns from ISPs and enterprises about giving that information out to some entity out on the broader Internet. So how does that affect things depending on your perspective?

And how are networks managed when this information isn't available, when caching is done outside of their boundaries and that sort of thing.

And is that it?

MERIKE KAE0: Yes. Thank you for that, Barry.

BARRY LEIBA: Happy to answer questions or comments.

MERIKE KAE0: I see Akinori has a comment.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Yes, thank you very much, Merike.

Thank you very much, Barry, for the explanation. It's a really good surprise to hear that SSAC has already come up with a SAC document



---

for this. And then I'm really looking forward to it -- forward to reading that.

Then, yes, that's -- as you explained, the DoH and the DoT program is - - yes, I concur with you that it is -- the specification itself is not really anything significant but how to implement it is really key.

And then we still have, you know, halfway to understand what is the implication.

As you should know, OCTO has already some -- released -- OCTO has released (indiscernible) for the DoH and DoT. And this SSAC document will add a lot of substance for this discussion. Again, thank you very much for this work.

BARRY LEIBA:

Thank you, Akinori. And, yes, just a note on that, that Paul Hoffman and I were both on a discussion with ALAC this afternoon about just that. So, yes, thank you.

AKINORI MAEMURA:

Very good to hear. Thanks.

MERIKE KAE0:

Great, thank you.

And I see that Suzanne has her hand up. Suzanne.

---

SUZANNE WOOLF:

Yes, thank you, Merike. Just to add to the comment on this paper, the ALAC session earlier today was actually very interesting, very lively. And I think part of what's going on, what happens with the OCTO paper and the SSAC one is that they're complementary. They emphasize different aspects of the challenges in front of us. So there's some overlap as far as basic description of the technologies, but there's also a very divergent point of view.

And, in fact, part of why this paper wasn't ready earlier is it turned out to be very challenging to get to consensus. But I think the challenge has been worth it. I think it's actually -- we tried hard to say things -- since there has been so much written, we tried very hard to be come up with -- to be able to say things that maybe people hadn't heard before, to provide a new contribution and a new voice. So we are looking forward reactions to the SSAC paper. Thanks.

MERIKE KAEO:

Thank you for that, comment, Suzanne.

Anybody else have a comment either from the SSAC side or from the Board on this topic? And I'm sure the Board will look forward to reading this paper once I send it out later today. I see Rod has his hand up.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Yeah. Just to give credit where credit is due, Suzanne was a co-chair on that work party as well. So I really appreciate the work that she

---

and Barry did as well as all the people on that work party. It's, I think, a very solid piece of work.

Hopefully it will add to the conversation and help clear up some of the -- some of the misconceptions. I know we had -- the ALAC call today was a really, really good session where I think a lot of people learned things and had some things that were cleared up for them that they may not have fully appreciated or understood, especially some of the implications of deployments of this technology. Thanks.

MERIKE KAE0: Thank you. Ram, I see you have your hand up.

RAM MOHAN: Thanks. Thanks, Merike.

I wondered whether the Board on the Risk Committee side or the risk side has a sense of what it considers the risk from these technologies and, you know, whether this is in the immediate horizon or very low on the horizon. Just a general sense.

MERIKE KAE0: Give me one second, here.

Lito, would you like to comment on this?

---

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, Merike. Yes, we have been following this also from the risk management point of view and have also looked into this type of risk and appreciate very much the work from SSAC and OCTO on these issues. So we've been looking at this, and we continue to do. Thank you.

MERIKE KAE0: Okay. Anybody else have a comment? Otherwise, we have 15 minutes left and we still have the Board's open discussion topics. So if we could move to that.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Merike?

MERIKE KAE0: Yes, Rod.

ROD RASMUSSEN: I just wanted to mention a couple of things just in passing here real quick that were outstanding items for us but that -- we have been continuing work on the environmental scan, risk scan. We didn't have any real update to provide you at this point, but we've had some major work done by the staff and the ICANN -- the fellow as well, and that's been coming along quite nicely. Don't have a delivery date yet. It's been progressed quite a bit. So I just wanted to let you know -- know that. But we have had quite a bit of work on all the public comments that all came due at once that needed our input on and

---

finishing up this DoH paper. So hoping to turn our attention to that a bit more and the abuse work party, et cetera. Thanks.

MERIKE KAE0: Thank you for that update, Rod.

Okay. If we can go to the Board's open discussion topics.

So the first topic was key priorities for action of ICANN constituencies in 2020; i.e., the prioritization of recommendations, streamlining of reviews, improve effective Nils of ICANN's multistakeholder model.

So anybody from SSAC have a comment on this? I'm not looking at any raised hands right now. I don't see any.

ROD RASMUSSEN: My hand is up, Merike.

MERIKE KAE0: There you are. Scrolling. Yes. Go ahead, Rod.

ROD RASMUSSEN: No worries. I'm surprised Julie didn't beat me to it.

Yes, and we discussed this in late January with the other SO/AC leaders as well. And I think we're largely on the same page when it comes to the prioritization for this year around a few things.

Obviously DNS abuse, which we already talked about today is a top priority throughout the community, and it sounds like everybody is

---

kind of diving in on that, as we are as well. And we look at the NCAP project that has been going on and the work we've been doing there for quite a while now but is an important part of the work being done with subsequent procedures and a potential new round, at some point, clearing up those questions and getting some thoughts on mitigation and answering the questions around .CORP, .HOME and .MAIL are all things that need to be done as part of that. And that's obviously a big part of the work we're doing. And there have been a series of things we have been doing already this year replying to reviews. And as we mentioned, we're providing some thoughts on streamlining reviews directly. We think that's actually a priority (laughing) is getting that, that reviews and cross-community working groups, all those things that require volunteer time that is not necessarily the focus of any particular constituency but is a concern of all. We need to be really careful with the use of our resources there, especially for some group like the SSAC where we have, you know, between 30 and 40 members depending on our current status of recruits. And a lot of those folks are double booked on volunteer things that they're doing for other constituencies as well. So it's a real important consideration for us as well as the community.

And there was one more I was going to mention, but I can't remember it off the top of my head.

But I wanted to at least give that feedback as I think we have some alignment on our prioritization, at least for the work we're doing in SSAC this year vis-a-vis the work that is going on across the entire ICANN community.

---

Oh, it was EPDP. We have been participating in that as well, which is obviously something that continues to be a big topic and area that needs to be buttoned up. And even beyond this summer when, in theory, we'll have, you know, a full spec, there's still a lot of implementation considerations and ongoing operational concerns that we'll be undoubtedly participating in as well. That was it.

MERIKE KAE0:

Thank you for that, Rod.

Anyone else have anything to chime in from SSAC?

Okay. I would just say also that what Geoff had mentioned in terms of --

JULIE HAMMER:

I think I raised my hand, Merike, but it didn't work. Sorry. It's Julie Hammer.

MERIKE KAE0:

Yes, go ahead.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thank you. I just wanted to add to Rod's comments and just reassure the discussion at the SO/AC chairs meeting in January where we had a very fruitful discussion on how do we, as an organization -- or as a community, go about prioritizing all of the recommendations that arise from these reviews and cross-community working groups and so

---

on. (Indiscernible) the Board doesn't necessarily see that they should be the only group along with the org having a role to play in that, and we came up with the agreement that, in fact, the SO/AC chairs should take a more significant role in that along with the Board and the org.

So I just want to emphasize that is an aspect of the overall community prioritization as opposed to our SSAC prioritization that Rod covered.

Thanks.

MERIKE KAE0:

That's an excellent comment to add, Julie, and thank you for that.

I don't see any other hands, and we have eight minutes left. So I guess I'll bring it over to the Board's discussion topic number two, which is specific developments coming up that ICANN constituencies feel need to be addressed when updating the ICANN strategic plan.

So Rod or Julie, do you have a comment on that? Or anybody else from SSAC?

ROD RASMUSSEN:

The -- This is Rod. So, you know, we have, I think, done a pretty good job of sharing with you some of the concerns and areas around the technology side. I think the DoH/DoT thing that we're coming out with today will hopefully help better inform the Board and the community around that emerging technology.



---

There have been -- We have not had any recent discussions of new -- new and radically different threat considerations to bring to the Board or the community's attention. The same old ones continue to plague us very well as it is, so to speak. And we continue to, amongst our members, you know, discuss anything that pops up on the radar that might be of potential threat to the SSR. That's a role we continue to focus on.

And as mentioned before, we'll be commenting on just overall process, which I think is -- we've got it covered in topic one but it's also in topic two, understanding how we're going to be able to address all the things we want to be able to do and do that within a reasonable amount of time and resources.

MERIKE KAEAO:

Great. Thank you for that, Rod.

I see that Ram has his hand up. Ram, please go ahead.

RAM MOHAN:

Thanks, Merike. This is Ram.

So I (indiscernible) the scale of the new threats or environmental scans. You have to do the environmental scans, but I hope that the Board did not intend to revise or update the strategic plan every year, and that mostly what you're looking to do is to get the scan done to see if there is anything new that merits the strategic plan to be updated, but that the default position is that you have a strategic plan

---

and each year your look at the strategic plan is really about an environmental scan, and all the rest of your work is on the operational side of making the strategic plan.

MERIKE KAE0: Thank you for that, Ram.

Matthew, I see your hand is up.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Yes, It's Matthew Shears. Yes, thanks.

Ram, you're absolutely right. We have a Board working group from strategic planning now, and the purpose of the annual review is not to review and change the strategic plan on an ongoing basis but, rather, to do an assessment of the threats and possibly opportunities that may arise, and to see if the impact and the timeline within which they may have that impact will materially impact -- will materially affect ICANN. And then to make a determination as to whether or not parts or particular elements of the strategic plan may need to be updated. But the threshold, the bar is going to have to be pretty high for us to do that.

Hope that helps. Thanks.

RAM MOHAN: Thanks, Matthew, for the clarification. Appreciate it.

---

MERIKE KAE0: Okay. I don't see any more hands.

Julie, I saw your hand go up and then down.

JULIE HAMMER: Sorry, Merike. We were just troubleshooting in the background.

[ Laughter ]

MERIKE KAE0: Okay. I did notice. All right.

Anybody else have a comment? We have four minutes left, but I see no hands.

Okay. Well, I'm sure it's been a very busy day for all of us, and, you know, a lot of sitting. So I want to thank both the Board and the SSAC for very fruitful discussion, and I guess I will close -- oh, I see Rod has a hand up and then Ram. So, Rod, please go ahead.

ROD RASMUSSEN: I was just going to thank the Board for their time and look forward to continuing our interaction, both what we've been talking about with the SO/AC leadership and with the particular SSR issues that we deal with here all the time. And we'll have plenty more to talk about vis-a-vis DNS abuse and next steps and NCAP. So thank you for your time.

MERIKE KAE0: Okay. And Ram?

---

RAM MOHAN: Thanks. I was going to suggest that if it wasn't already on the Board's plan, that after this meeting concludes, that perhaps there be an after action report on security and stability oriented observations about running a fully virtual meeting. I think that might be valuable to share both from ICANN's point of view but also it's a teachable moment for the community.

MERIKE KAE0: I totally agree, Ram.

So I don't see any other hands now.

GORAN MARBY: So, this is Goran. Sorry.

Thank you, Ram, yes, we are working on -- first we try -- just to give you -- First we're documenting the whole -- the whole experiment we're doing. And we are going to do what we call a lessons learned document out of this. And we will also go out to the community and ask for input as well, how this has been working or would need to go better. And running up to this meeting, security concerns, as behavior concerns a lot of our concerns was on the top of our agenda when we set this up.

So as always, Ram, you are totally right. This is what we're going to do in total. And I'm looking forward to SSAC's input and your input at this as well.

---

And by the way, thank you, Rod.

MERIKE KAE0:

Okay. Anybody else have any more comments to add?

I don't see any, so thank you very much, and this session is closed.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**