HYDERABAD – Joint Meeting: ICANN Board and Security and Stability Advisory Committee
Wednesday, November 09, 2016 – 11:00 to 12:00 IST
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

RAM MOHAN: Good morning. This is the planned session between the Security and Stability Advisory Committee and the ICANN board of directors. My name is Ram Mohan. I'm the liaison to the board from the SSAC. We have here a bunch of folks who are both from the board and from the SSAC. There are some new folks here as well, so I think it might make sense to quickly just very briefly -- you know, just do a roll call, say who you are, both from the board and from the SSAC. Cherine?

CHERINE CHALABY: Cherine Chalaby, board.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Akinori Maemura, board.

JONNE SOININEN: Jonne Soininen, the IETF liaison to the board.

LITO IBARRA: Lito Ibarra, board.

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.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Kaveh Ranjbar, RSSAC liaison to the board.

STEVE CROCKER: Steve Crocker, board.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Chris Disspain, ICANN board.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: George Sadowsky, board.

JIM GALVIN: Jim Galvin, vice chair of SSAC.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Patrik Faltstrom, chair of SSAC.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Jaap Akkerhuis, SSAC.

JULIE HAMMER: Julie Hammer, SSAC.

ROBERT GUERRA: Robert Guerra, SSAC.

JEFF BEDSER: Jeff Bedser, SSAC.

JOHN LEVINE: John Levine, SSAC.

RON DA SILVA: Ron da Silva. Hard to say "bored." That seems like I'm not interested. Board of directors.

                        [Laughter]

PATRIK FALTSTROM: There are two more SSAC members down there that you missed.

RAM MOHAN: I didn't miss. They just didn't show up.

DAVID CONRAD: David Conrad, ICANN organization.

PATRICK JONES: Patrick Jones, ICANN organization.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Adiel Akplogan, ICANN.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Yes. But the two first ones are members of SSAC.

RAM MOHAN: That's right. The first --

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Yeah.

RAM MOHAN: -- David and Patrick are members of SSAC, and I see Suzanne Woolf who is on the board and a member of SSAC, and Rinalia Abdul Rahim, who is on the board, joining us. So thank you. Could we go to the next slide?

We have a quick agenda.

There are -- I think from the SSAC, there are a couple of things that the SSAC wants to share with the board, and then the SSAC has some responses -- the board had sent two questions in to every SO and AC, and the SSAC has some thoughts on that.

My job here is in this session is to help moderate the session, and we have ICANN board operations folks who will take care of action items and notes and things like that.

The intent in this session is to be a dialogue, rather than just a, you know, one-way presentation set.

So with that, I'll turn it over to you, Patrik.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much.

So what we were thinking of presenting to you are two different -- two different topics that we want to go through.

The first one is related to SAC84. There were comments on the EPSRP. And after that, we are going -- we want to talk with you a little bit more about namespace management.

Next slide, please.

So one thing that we -- in SAC84, we are giving comments to the EPSRP as a whole. We understand that you in the board already discussed this. ccNSO brought this up to you. We've also been discussing this with the ccNSO. So we are currently -- to start by giving a status, is that we in SSAC, we sent a letter to ccNSO in Monday this week, and part of that is that we said that we will

respond to the issues that we got in writing from ccNSO, we'll respond to that within four weeks.

The -- our finding is that in the -- in the EPSRP, we believe that the conservation principle, the inclusion principle, and stability principle were not -- were not clearly enough spelled out, which from an SSAC perspective might have implications on security and stability of the DNS.

Part of the -- of the confusion here is that we have an overload regarding terminology where, for example, just to take one example, it seems to be the case that there is an impression that just because the evaluation of internationalized domain names consisted of multiple modules where one of them is called "security and stability" and the other one is called "confusion and similarity" -- "confusability and similarity" and it goes under that name, it seems to be the case that we in SSAC, we believe that confusability leads to security issues while other parties here in the ICANN community believe that just because the security and stability evaluation is one thing, and confusability another one, that the evaluation on confusability doesn't -- cannot lead to -- to stability -- security and stability issues.

That is something that SSAC in already the letter that we sent Monday, we explained that that is -- that is potentially one finding that -- where that -- where the conclusion from SSAC is

that we need to take that up as a separate work item and explain the different terminologies that we obviously use here in the ICANN community.

But that is just one example of why, from our perspective, there are -- seem to be some -- some miscommunications between -- and misunderstandings.

Another thing -- let's go on.

So ultimately, SAC84 recommends ICANN board to not accept the guidelines of EPSRP as they were written. That was the final recommendation.

Regarding the principles that are -- that is coming from IETF -- and it's not the case that SSAC has come up with them. These are IETF principles. We talk about conservatism, and that implies that we cannot add things to the DNS or similar without -- without -- we cannot deploy anything to the Internet and then if we -- if you see that that was the wrong move, it's very difficult to -- or impossible to undo, so we need to be very sure that what we are doing is not creating any issues.

And the other two principles, the inclusion principle is explicitly for a TLD label or code point, that a code point should not be added unless it is the case one is absolutely sure that it will not lead to any issues.

It's -- and specifically important for labels whose form normally presented to the user contained non-ASCII characters is something that is coming from the IETF.

And then we have the stability principle which talks about -- which is coming very much from -- you've seen that in the root scaling reports that it is not so much the number of changes that impacts security and stability; it is the rate of change.

So these are sort of the three principles.

So that was everything we were thinking about saying about SAC84.

Is there any questions? Should we have a discussion on that? Yes, please. Ram?

RAM MOHAN: Questions from the board.

Steve?

STEVE CROCKER: First of all, thank you very much, and in general, it's a very, very good thing that you guys exist. I think this is a very important part of ICANN. And it's quite evident from the other dynamics that if we didn't have you, things would be worse off.

And your point about not getting distracted by using terms like "confusability" as if that had nothing -- no relationship to security and stability I think is a fair point and one of the things that could be helpful, I think -- I'm just taking your point and echoing it -- is trying to bring some consistency and education across the community and across the organization with respect to terminology.

So all that's the good stuff.

One of the things that I've observed over time in a number of different settings, not just this one but including this one, is that there is, on occasion, a tendency toward group-think of getting an idea and saying, "Well, we've decided this idea and therefore everybody must follow it," and to be resistant in a very natural and human way of challenges as to whether or not the justification or rationale is sufficient. And I think that every part of ICANN needs to be -- to guard against that and to be open to some degree of challenge.

And I can cite multiple instances, including the confusability panels and including things that have nothing to do with the kind of things we're talking about.

When I look at the stability principle, I'm reminded of the root zone scaling that was done under extreme pressure, and I

harbor a certain amount of guilt about having agreed to that pressure and transmitted it.

I was never satisfied that the numbers that came out of that had much direct connection to anything measurable or meaningful. They were fundamentally a kind of a brokered "let's pick a number and we agree to that," and it's worked out okay because it could have been 10 times as much, it could have been smaller. I don't think it would have affected anything. The actual rate that we add things to the root is pretty -- pretty slow. But it -- it -- coming from a technical perspective, I found it unsatisfying that there was not better grounding in all of that.

So as a general principle, that's fine, but in terms of applying it, I think it's on relatively soft ground and hasn't caused us any problem one way or the other, but I would suggest that we think about things like that in, you know, greater depth.

RAM MOHAN: Patrik, a response to that and then I have a few other folks in the queue.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: So let me just comment on the stability principle.

In the discussions in SSAC that we had sort of after all the discussion with the -- with the -- about the root scaling, I think all of us agree with your conclusion that we need to have like solid data.

The important thing with the principle is that when coming up with a policy or any kind of evaluation, you should not forget to look at and evaluate the rate of change. Just looking at the number or at the end result is not enough. That's sort of what the principle is on -- is about.

Thank you.

RAM MOHAN: You want to respond, Steve?

STEVE CROCKER: Complete agreement.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you.

Bruce, did you want to say something?

BRUCE TONKIN: Just a general comment. It's really -- I've been -- I guess I'm now a former board director but I've been here for nine years or so,

but just the quality of the SSAC advice, particularly in the way it's communicated, you know, is -- is really a best practice in the organization, I think. You produce advice that's in a form that a board can actually sort of understand and think about, and you don't get -- you don't get too down into the sort of technical weeds in the documents that get produced, so I think -- I think, you know, well done, basically.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, Bruce.

Rinalia.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Ram. I have two questions, but I set the context for that. Your advice is clear to me, and the reason that it's clear is because I've had the benefit of being schooled through the root zone LGR project.

I'm thinking about how SSAC advice could be more effective in board adoption. And it has to do with timing. And I was wondering if you've had some time to think about whether or not this advice could have come much earlier.

And if I could also state my second question. I know there's been back and forth between SSAC and ccNSO. I was wondering

if there's also progress in terms of moving forward where the ccNSO also sees a way to move forward by somehow adopting this. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Regarding the first question, I think that -- I think that we have been able to move forward regarding discussions with -- let's start with the second one -- regarding forward movement. I do think we have forward movement.

We in SSAC, we know what kind of -- we think we believe that at least some of the six points that ccNSO brought up with us, that we understand their misunderstanding and we would like to clarify that to see whether ccNSO understand our point of view. So I think it's fair to say that the ball is currently on our -- sort of our side of the courtyard. We have been able to express a few of these issues.

Regarding timing of our advice, we do understand that some of -- the findings that we have are part of the EPSRP that was out for public comment earlier. And we literally did not catch them at that point in time. But the whole evaluation of our internal process and interaction with the ccNSO, that is part of what we are currently doing. And the goal is to come with a more solid response to, for example, your questions at the end of these four weeks.

It's also the case that I hope that both SO and ACs understand that communication is of utmost importance. And I think both our advice could have been shared in a better way with the ccNSO, without quantifying or qualifying that.

At the same time as the chair of SSAC, which has also spoken to ccNSO chair about, I was notified of the issues the ccNSO saw on Thursday last week when I understand that ccNSO, when they saw the advice come out, that they immediately reacted. It would also have been easier if they would have contacted us immediately, if you understand what I mean.

The ultimate issue, though, that unfortunately it's a little bit difficult to discuss at the moment because, of course, feelings are up in the air. And during an ICANN week, all of us are tired. And we try to sort of not make any quick statements here or conclusions, is that ultimately we have a problem in ICANN when multiple SO -- when different SOs and ACs obviously might disagree about something and they have very, very different PDPs. It is difficult to do the timing so that the statements that each one of the SO and ACs make actually matches the other one.

And this -- and my personal interpretation of the current situation is that there are a number of unfortunate things here, including timing, that is also sort of on top of all of this that have

made the conversation more heated than it is in reality. So I hope that after we have finished our work that everything will actually resolve itself. Thank you.

We have very constructive comments -- discussions with ccNSO, so everything is moving forward really -- in a really good way.

RAM MOHAN: Rinalia, did that address your questions?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Yes, it did very much. Thank you.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you very much.

Patrik, I thought it might be helpful for the board to also have you give a very quick preview of the other work that the SSAC is doing in the IDN area, just at a very high level, because, again, the work that -- the recommendations aren't done. But what may be coming there might have a significant impact on the organization. And, again, we might end up with recommendations to the board that might be significant.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: One thing that we have -- that we have been discussing in SSAC for a while is the fact -- and you have seen it, that we investigated, for example, the rules for trademark clearinghouse and internationalized domain names. We made some statements there. We have been working with ICANN the organization to ensure that things work as smooth as possible.

So what we have identified is that the various evaluations for internationalized domain names are slightly different in different processes. Trademark clearinghouse is one. IDN ccTLD fast track is one. The LGR panels is one, et cetera. So there are multiple processes. And we are nervous that there might not be enough harmonization between these processes. So that's the first thing.

The second thing is given -- if we find that there is not enough harmonization, the next question is, of course, can the non-harmonization itself have a negative impact on security and stability? That's the next thing we are looking at.

So what we are currently looking at is to try to not do -- really do -- the current status is that we will probably -- we will not do that evaluation ourselves. Instead, we are looking into coming up with a methodology that the various processes can use to inform each other how they handle things like comparison of characters. That is where we are. Thank you.

RAM MOHAN: Thanks. Any commentary from the board?

Okay. Then in that case, let's -- let's go -- advance these slides. Let's go to the next topic.

JIM GALVIN: Domain namespace. As SSAC has reported to the board at the last couple of ICANN meetings, so this will be the third time that we're reporting on this, we have been studying the issue of domain namespace. And collisions, in particular, is the closest actual event that occurs here. That's the problem that we're looking to, to see if we can say something about how to address those concerns.

Next slide, please.

So the first step in all of this was to clearly articulate what we thought the problem space was, and this has been a long discussion. We have spent a good deal of time trying to define exactly what the problem space is that we should look at and we should address. And the space that -- to define this in a way that matters to ICANN, define it in a way that allows us to make suggestions that would be actionable to ICANN, that would be helpful.

So the first thing that we come up with is using the phrase "domain namespace," and the definition of that would be all possible names that can be in a tree-structured hierarchy.

What's important here is that the global DNS is a subset of that, okay? So the domain namespace encompasses a much larger space than just what would go into the root zone and the global DNS space that we're ordinarily familiar with, okay?

RAM MOHAN: Jim, may I quickly interrupt?

Ron, did you want to have a brief intervention before Jim continues?

RON da SILVA: Yeah, I was going to say, I know we covered some of this in the tech yesterday. I wonder if you can -- there were a few board members that couldn't make it -- maybe do a short version for their attention. But a lot of us were there. Do you want to alter it accordingly?

JIM GALVIN: Okay, thank you. Certainly.

So we created a definition of the problem space. And we make the observation that as the Internet has expanded, what's

interesting here is that the DNS as the root zone, as a tree-structured hierarchy itself, and, of course, the resolution protocol that comes with it, has found itself being used in many places other than just what we ordinarily see as the industry that ICANN is the facilitator and manager of in keeping track of the Internet identifiers. And that's important. And that's a feature, if you will, of the Internet, that you can have that kind of innovation and protocols can be used in that way.

So the next slide, please

In here what we've come to is to address specifically the findings that we had given that definition of the problem space of what we're working with. The observation to be made is that uncoordinated use of that namespace creates collisions. And the sort of obvious example of that is the corp, home, and mail situation in the current round. And, obviously, there are some other things. If you look at the root statistics in the root zone, there are some other names that were popular along the way. This is in many ways sort of to be expected. I mean, you know, we sort of saw that coming. But it has now become an issue because with collisions, you get ambiguity and that ambiguity is what creates instability in the domain namespace.

Next slide. There's one more. Yes.

So what can you do to address this? It is this lack of coordination between the uses of the namespace which clearly sets up collisions and creates this ambiguity. It's fairly obvious to suggest that there are at least two organizations that have a role in using domain namespace as we defined it on the first slide. Again, the domain namespace being larger than what goes into the root zone. ICANN, of course, as its coordinator of the allocation and assignment of names in the root zone. And the IETF also maintains a list of names that it reserves and that it considers special for technical purposes. The two obvious examples at the moment are .LOCAL and .ONION, which you have probably heard yourselves in discussions.

And then you have the situation which has arisen from things like corp, home, and mail. Those are not the only ones, just the ones that are currently before the board to consider what to do about. But individuals and others can uniformly just decide to use other names in their own -- for their own context and in local environments. They are commonly called private use names. Others have called them names that they squat on. But, you know, the fact is they exist.

So what's important from an SSAC point of view, is looking at this from the point of view of what ICANN can do and what could be actionable for ICANN. So that's the way that we are approaching this definition of the problem space.

And our goal at the moment is to try and have a set of recommendations that we can present to the board and to the community by the end of this year which will suggest how to deal with this coordination problem and what ICANN can do specifically in its role as the coordinator of the root zone focusing on that particular area because that is something that ICANN controls and is well within its remit. Thank you.

RAM MOHAN: Thanks. So I have in the queue Cherine, Steve.

And, Khaled, did you want to be in the queue as well?

Okay. So Cherine first.

CHERINE CHALABY: Jim, thank you.

For point of clarification, you said that you will set some actual recommendation of things that ICANN can do in its coordination role. What about gaming? Will your recommendation go as far as making a recommendation to prevent gaming? Or how will that be addressed?

JIM GALVIN: We won't make a specific recommendation about gaming. But the question of how to deal with the statistics that one can get

from the root zone and the queries that go there is something that we are thinking about. And we will make a suggestion about how the community, you know, should look at that issue and consider how it wants those kinds of things handled. So gaming as a specific phrase won't be addressed. But the issue of how to handle the statistics that exist will be. So that should address that concern.

RAM MOHAN: Does that answer your question, Cherine?

CHERINE CHALABY: I think so. I think we'll see when the recommendation comes out. But it's a difficult issue to actually prevent completely, right?

RAM MOHAN: Yes. Thank you.

                        Steve?

STEVE CROCKER: The gaming question is a very alert and sophisticated question, and it's good.

Corp, home, and mail were mentioned. As you are aware and you made mention of, those items, those names are before us in a certain sense in that there are applicants pushing to have them delegated or have them allocated and then delegated. And they posture -- I haven't delved into this in great detail. But in broad terms, their general posture is, yeah, there's background traffic, they're in use and so forth but there's mitigation and we can deal with that.

On the other hand, if I take just based on what you've just said in this session about conservation -- it's not conservation, it's conservatism principle and the inclusion principle, that would lead one to suggest that in an abundance of caution those names should just be ruled out because they're already contaminated and so forth.

You're going to give us some advice. We're eagerly looking forward to it.

I guess the natural thing is how far will that advice take us and what happens after that?

RAM MOHAN: Patrik or Jim? Who -- Patrik?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Let me -- let me answer the SSAC current status on specifically home, corp, and mail, and then I'll give back to Jim to talk about the actual work party itself, because we don't talk about corp, home, and mail in -- as part -- in the work party.

Our view is that it is a good thing to review recommendations and all those kinds of things and conclusions now and then. When we have been talking about corp, home, and mail we have already made statements in earlier SSAC reports about the conservatism principle applied to those applications.

We are aware of the fact that there are new studies ongoing by ICANN organization that is looking at -- that is looking at collecting data, and at the time when there is no data on the table, it might very well be the case that SSAC is reviewing, again, what we have said earlier, but at the -- at this point in time we don't see any reason to revisit our earlier findings.

RAM MOHAN: Steve?

STEVE CROCKER: I'm not sure the best sequence here, but I'll just -- you just triggered a memory.

ICANN|57
HYDERABAD
3-9 November 2016

The so-called mitigation studies, I haven't looked at them but it does remind me of what happened in 2003 when VeriSign brought out the Site Finder service and there was an extremely sharp reaction from the community and we held various meetings. Some of us were there.

And they responded with a lot of studies that said, "Oh, this isn't very bad," but the studies were basically of a marketing orientation, as opposed to a technical orientation, and I suspect that we are going to get back into that kind of cycle.

So I would counsel two things. One is to provide the basis for the people who are not of the same skill level and experience that you are to be able to make those differentiations, and the other is, repetition is sometimes helpful, as opposed to, "We did it and it's on the shelf and everybody should know that." You know, we all know that it's harder than that.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Absolutely. We agree with what connected saying. We did -- as an example, we did revisit our -- and referenced again our view on dotless domains and we're following the discussion on home, corp, and mail in great detail, and it might very well be the case that we are going to repeat our statement, but we don't have an ongoing work party at the moment but we are discussing it at every meeting we have.

RAM MOHAN: Patrik, would you consider taking Steve's two suggestions on to create an action item that takes Steve's two suggestions and put that into consideration for disposition inside of the SSAC? So could I ask that those two items be put in the queue for SSAC to consider?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Absolutely. Thank you. And thank you for -- for making sure that we are -- that we agree on both sides.

So while the action points are going out of this meeting, I also believe that there were some action points based on the discussion we had with Rinalia, because what I saw was clear in -- in the clear interest from the board to also get information about the communication between SSAC and ccNSO, so I think another action is that we should also keep the board informed of the ongoing progress in that discussion.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you. And I'm -- I don't know who from our -- from our staff side is keeping track of the actions. I don't know if Vinciane is here, but -- oh, okay. So okay. We have that -- okay. Great. I see Vinciane there.

So my normal style here is at the end of the meeting, we'll have Vinciane come up and walk us through all the actions.

In the queue now are Khaled, Bruce, and Suzanne.

Khaled?

JIM GALVIN: I'm sorry. May I respond to a little bit of some of what Steve said first?

RAM MOHAN: Sure.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. I'm just feeling a bit compelled just to be careful to set expectations on the SSAC recommendations that will come from the domain namespace.

You know, SSAC in general does not want to put itself in a place of making a decision on behalf of the community, you know, or the board or anything like that, so the expectation -- the recommendations that we are providing are for criteria, for questions that we believe the board and the community would need to consider in making its decision.

I mean, we try to position ourselves very carefully to not be the ones to make a decision, but we want to facilitate the others who have to make that decision. So I just want to make sure that folks understand that and set that expectation. Thank you.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, Jim. Khaled?

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you.

So I like the structure of the principles and I understood that the -- it applies to the domain name environment depending -- DNS and others.

I think the board will be interested to understand if there is any work to assess the impact of other environments in regard to the DNS and if any kind of situation that any of the -- those environments will not follow those principles.

RAM MOHAN: Jim? Patrik?

JIM GALVIN: So SSAC is not a research organization in that way, so I mean we would not ordinarily take on that kind of question ourselves. I mean, if the board had a particular question or concern about that space, I mean, we would always take a request to look at something and then, you know, put together a response.

But there's no -- no work at this time to speak to that.

STEVE CROCKER: Would you -- would you take note of Khaled's question? We may want to be able to explore it in other ways than simply asking SSAC. It's a -- it's an interesting kind of question and there are other kinds of avenues that we might explore.

RAM MOHAN: Julie, just a quick heads-up. Kaveh has -- has a slide that he may want to put up, so -- so you have to -- can you just work off line on if there's -- it's even possible to do?

Next in the queue is Bruce.

BRUCE TONKIN: Thanks, Ram. This might be a similar question, but I mean the fact -- I would think there was coordination between ICANN and IETF in that we have liaisons and a lot of common membership in the communities. The last one is an interesting one, though, and I was just wondering -- I realize perhaps SSAC hasn't done any extensive research here, but what do you think the trends are? Like is this mostly a legacy problem or are we ongoing seeing more, you know, domain names being used in devices and software outside of the sort of ICANN environment?

RAM MOHAN: Jim, did you want to respond?

Are there others who want to respond to Bruce on this? Jonne or others?

Okay. Jim, to you first.

JIM GALVIN: So thank you, Bruce. The -- the approach that we're taking in our namespace work party is to assume that the DNS and the namespace that is -- the domain namespace is going to continue to be used on the Internet in an independent way; that there will be a lot of players. And that's where the industry is right now.

So rather than predicting what's going to come in the future, we're taking at face value where we are today. And so we are going to make recommendations about how to handle collaboration because you have to expect that other entities, other parties may step up, you know, want to have a list of names that they're using in their environments, so we're considering what ICANN can do in order to manage the fact that that's the state that we're in today, that's the way the environment exists. Thank you.

RAM MOHAN: Did you have a response to that, a reply to that, Bruce?

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah. I'm just trying to understand how much of this is a legacy issue because there's a lot of legacy -- like Belkin is a classical example that's used. I know wherever we get reports from root server traffic you see that come up. But I'm still getting a sense of in an environment where people now know that there's more -- you know, the namespace is expanding, are they still doing this? I'm just trying to get a sense of trend?

RAM MOHAN: So I think Kaveh --

[Multiple speakers]

BRUCE TONKIN: -- whether it's possible or not possible.

RAM MOHAN: Thanks, Bruce. I think Kaveh should be able to help on that, but Jonne, let's get you first and then we'll get Kaveh to come in on this.

JONNE SOININEN: Yeah. I just wanted to respond a little bit about the coordination with IETF.

So of course we have an IETF liaison and there are -- there are also many other ways that there's cooperation between the individuals in different -- in these two communities.

However, I do agree that most probably on this topic, we need to do some -- something more, but I'm not sure -- or improve the dialogue between the ICANN community and the IETF community.

For people who might not know, there is -- there is work ongoing in IETF looking at the special namespace, what is the responsibility of the IETF. Suzanne is very involved in that. And actually, IETF did send the ICANN board and GNSO a liaison, which is, I think, already two years old, most probably, saying that they would be starting to look at the policies to -- to allocate these special names.

So there is a -- this is the time to collaborate on that.

But of course I don't know yet what is -- if there is something more behind this notion there that there should be more coordination and collaboration, but I'm of course interested to see that -- what comes as an end result of this advice.

RAM MOHAN: Jonne, a quick follow-up from me.

Is -- does that translate into -- I mean, that's a status update that you're providing, but is there -- does it translate into an action for either the board or for SSAC based on what you just said?

JONNE SOININEN: Not really for the board, I think, but SSAC should be aware of this dialogue in IETF -- and I know that SSAC is aware of this dialogue -- and also, participate not -- you never participate as an organization, of course, in the IETF, but the individuals should participate in that work.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you. Kaveh, before I come to you, let me -- I think Suzanne has been in the queue so let me get to Suzanne and then over to you.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Sure. I think most of what I was going to say Jonne has largely covered, but to point out -- and maybe David was also about to point out -- that there's ICANN staff that have been heavily involved in the discussions in the DNS operations working group in the IETF, so there is an ICANN presence organizationally, and there are SSAC members, as well, who are -- who are participating in that discussion.

The working group has just adopted a problem statement document which anybody who's really interested in the topic should look at because that's sort of the blueprint for what problem the working group thinks it's trying to solve, if it's going to come up with recommendations on the IETF side of how the registry should be maintained differently or how the procedures should be updated.

But it's worth -- the other thing that's worth noting is that there are sort of -- that there are sort of two different kinds of special use names being discussed here, and they have slightly different constraints, at least from the protocol perspective.

There was an attempt to have -- to get to IETF consensus that the home, corp, and mail should be added to the special use names registry that ultimately didn't get consensus to proceed because the technical reasoning was very hard to construct beyond a desire to constrain ICANN's policy, and that didn't strike people as a particularly good way -- a particularly good use of the standards process. There's also the case of things like .ONION and .LOCAL and at least one other -- one working group in the IETF where they're doing protocol development that they strongly feel requires the allocation of a special use name, and that's actually a slightly different case and people are thinking very hard about how to accommodate innovation and useful

extensions of the namespace that don't -- that also don't have policy implications that cause harm to ICANN.

So I want support Jonne's point. I think it's -- it's good that people continue to participate in multiple processes, and also, I note Jonne's the guy now because he's the -- he's the formal bridge between ICANN organizationally and the IETF.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, Suzanne.

Kaveh?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yeah. So this is just to clarify and maybe give some more background to answer some of the questions. This graph is from five of main K root servers for November 8. As you see, UTC midnight to 7:00 a.m. almost.

And so the color differentiation doesn't matter. That's the query types. But this is all the queries that we receive at K in that time period. And you see for .COM, we receive about 7,000 queries per second, so the next one is .NET, .LOCAL, and then this clear shows HOME comes as fifth and then down there, you have that strange thing on top of CN, which I don't know what it is. You have Z, you have LAN, you have DHCP, LOCAL DOMAIN,

BELKIN, DLINK and things like that, which you receive huge amount of queries for. If you look at like the numbers are ranging from 200 to 1,000 queries per second, which for -- for one letter, it's too much. If you sum it up between all 13 letters and all the nodes, this is basically tens of thousands or maybe hundreds of thousands of queries for, for example, .BELKIN or .DLINK coming to the root zone.

The question -- so all this discussion, this is just to show the reality of this discussion and how this is happening, so if there's anything else I can add...

RAM MOHAN: Any questions? Jim, you have your hand up.

JIM GALVIN: I do. What I want to do is say a little bit about collaboration because we've been having this discussion in the namespace work party and what it means.

Going back to a point that I made earlier, our -- the way in which we are look at this problem space is to think about what ICANN can do that's within its own control.

So it's sort of natural to suggest that ICANN and whoever else is taking advantage of the domain namespace should collaborate

in some way. And you have to create some definition of what that means.

In fact, that gets kind of challenging very quickly because you may not know everyone who might have a name who would want to be part of that collaboration party and be at the table, especially when you think about all of the private uses or independent uses. So it's possible not everyone will be present.

Our preference in looking at this is thinking about this in terms of root zone management. That is specifically in ICANN's remit. You know, it essentially decides what goes into the root zone and what does not. And so we're thinking in terms of making specific suggestions about creating certain additional policies or procedures that help ICANN to manage that and have it make decisions about what it does within its control. So how it handles root zone management given that you have this domain name space being used in a much larger context than just what ICANN does. Thank you.

RAM MOHAN: Thanks.

David in the queue.

Kaveh, do you want to respond to Jim?

EN

KAVEH RANJBAR: I just want to -- yes, just to clarify because I know some of the IDNs might not see the root of that problem because, for example, .BELKIN, you see that .BELKIN receives a lot of queries. But if .BELKIN is assigned by policy or they come up in the new gTLD round and buy that, they will receive so right now root servers mostly just want a non-existing name to these queries, which is fine.

But, actually, if someone gets ownership of that name, then they will receive these millions of queries or tens of millions per day and -- which means they will, first of all, they will collect a lot of data. They can collect a lot of data. And, second, it might have huge security implications. So for the ones who might not be clear about that, that's why this is very critical.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you.

David?

DAVID CONRAD: Just in response to Bruce asking whether or not the opening of the namespace as a part of the new gTLD program had an impact on the continued use, in two ways the -- as Kaveh points out, this is an ongoing issue. The leakage of unused names to

EN

the root servers probably has not changed significantly because typically it's not really intentional.

But there are, I believe, nine -- nine or ten -- and Suz may actually know the real number -- parties interested in obtaining names in the special use name registry, like Tor did for .ONION. They want to obtain these names outside of the ICANN context because they argue they're not being used within the DNS. They're still -- they look like domain names; they're just not DNS-implemented domain names.

I have in my various Web surfing exploits noticed a -- at least a dozen more software packages that make use of top-level strings that are not delegated but are just -- they think it's a cute name to use and they provide instruction on how to make browsers be aware of those names.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, David.

Suzanne is in the queue, and then we'll close this topic and we'll get to the final part of this meeting.

Suzanne?

SUZANNE WOOLF: Sure. Thank you, Ram.

Just to follow up David's point, it's important to note when you're looking at traffic to the root servers that the problem isn't that there's a lot of queries to the root servers. There's supposed to be lots of queries to the root servers; and root server bandwidth and operational capacity are provisioned for attacks, not for even a lot of silly, normal traffic. So the issue there isn't the load.

The issue, as David pointed out, has to do with leakage of information that people might not want to have getting out and the general uncertainty of how you resolve names or how they fail to resolve as the environment gets more complicated.

One of the advantages to having a process for the special use names registry the IETF has tried to do is that in order to get such an allocation -- in order to get a name in the registry, you have to be able to describe a bunch of attributes of how the names are supposed to be used, including what you want resolver operators to do to prevent leakage of those names into the larger Internet and into the root.

So there's actually an encouragement built into having that structure that says, you know, you should be thinking about how you're going to use these names and how you're going to prevent them from causing this kind of problem of leaking into the public DNS which suggests that an enormous part of the real

problem is people who are ignoring not only ICANN but also the IETF and just saying, Hey, what harm could it possibly do to just start using names? And so part of what we -- the challenge we all face as SSAC, as ICANN, as IETF is to suggest to people that that's not good practice.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, Suzanne.

Patrik, were you going to have the human rights thing come up as well?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Robert -- I hand to Robert to explain where we are there.

ROBERT GUERRA: Sure. I'm searching because I think the SSAC has been developing -- Sorry. Yes, it's been developing -- it's Robert Guerra for the record. Excuse me -- developing an advisory that it will send as a comment to the board. And also wanted to -- Ram also earlier today shared with us some of the conversations that had been taking place both in the community as well and discussions that we've had in the SSAC.

We're probably going to be building into the comment to the board that given that it's an issue that has many different

meanings from corporate social responsibility to human rights, that it might be of interest for the board to seek outside expertise to do a human rights impact assessment to identify exactly what are the human rights issues in regards to ICANN as an organization, what aspects pertain to it, what aspects in regards to corporate social responsibility so it could better identify and move on those issues.

I'm not sure if that's been done before. But having a sense of what the issues are and not let -- that could complement the efforts from the community, could be particularly helpful and guide the board.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, Robert.

Any response from board members? You have kind of a suggestion, I guess, from -- or a direction -- could I call it a direction, Robert?

ROBERT GUERRA: Sorry. Just a little note here. So I think it's just -- sorry, because I just was caught on the spot answering this.

Work Stream 2, you know, does have a work that they're doing in regards to human rights. And they're working very closely in

regards to that in trying to define a framework for implementation. However, this is slightly different to help advise the board and perhaps the community having outside expertise, perhaps a white paper, something else, could, I believe, help the board and others get a sense from outside experts what exactly are the issues. What is corporate social responsibility aspects, openness and transparency the board could do? And then what are the aspects? What's the right terminology? I'm not sure that's been done. And that's something we discussed earlier today.

RAM MOHAN: Thanks. So that's kind of a concrete suggestion.

Any responses from board members on that suggestion?

Cherine. I can't hear you.

CHERINE CHALABY: Very positive. Thank you.

RAM MOHAN: Okay. Does that mean that the board will take that suggestion on its list of actions to consider and to dispose of? Because that was a suggestion to create or to commission an impact report of some sort, right?

ROBERT GUERRA: It's Robert Guerra again.

I believe the term that's done is undertaking a human rights impact assessment, finding outside expertise, like KPMG or something like that -- there are organizations that do this, academic centers -- and others to help guide the board and the community and then that could help guide the conversations as well.

RAM MOHAN: I'm looking to you, Cherine, because you were the person with the first response. Doesn't mean you must respond here, too.

CHERINE CHALABY: I mean, when it comes, we'll look at it definitely and consider it, no?

RAM MOHAN: It's actually the other way around. It's not -- nothing is coming. This was from Robert as a suggestion that the board commission a -- what's it called?

ROBERT GUERRA: A human rights impact assessment, which is done in the corporate sector by banks and others to help identify what human rights or corporate social responsibility issues pertain to

the organization in the space that it's active. And it could help guide both the board and the community center the conversations a bit more and focus them.

CHERINE CHALABY: Sorry, Ram.

I took the tail end of that. I misinterpreted it. Yes.

So I don't know if we can make that suggestion now outside the WS2 work. So I think it's something we need to consider seriously from not going on a separate tangent. That's all. I don't know.

We haven't had this discussion amongst us so it's difficult for me to give a view.

But the WS2 work takes primacy, no? There has to be some coordination rather than us going on separate trend lines.

RAM MOHAN: I think that's precisely -- that's precisely where this is going. The recommendation -- or not recommendation, the idea is a little different.

Patrik?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: I feel that we have a little bit of misunderstanding on process here at the meeting between SSAC and the board. We as one of the chartering organizations for the CCWG accountability, we participate in Work Stream 2. Robert is our -- is the participant in the Work Stream 2 specifically regarding the human rights and current CSR issues related to human rights.

We are to support Robert. We are in SSAC discussing these issues to draw conclusion of what the SSAC view actually is.

What Robert did convey to you is the current view of SSAC that we are -- that we are -- that we are conveying in this work -- in this working group of accountability Work Stream 2.

Now, that is something he conveyed. That is something different from SSAC drawing a conclusion and giving a recommendation to the board to actually start that work. That has not happened. It might be the case that SSAC will be that explicit.

So I would say no. It seems to be the case that you sort of understood or interpreted what he said as that kind of recommendation from SSAC. We are not at that point. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: You're using this forum to tell us -- to give us an alert or an attention that that's what your interactions are with Work Stream 2.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's right.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you.

RAM MOHAN: Okay. Let's -- let's shift to the final -- very final piece.

Patrik, there were a couple of questions from the board to us, and there were two questions that the board raised.

Would you be ready and willing to provide a quick response to the board on the two questions that they raised to the SSAC?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Yes.

So the first question was what do we, board and ICANN organization have to do to make the transition work for us? And the answer is that we in SSAC, we found our role during the transition and as such we think that we at the moment have things under control. That's easy.

What is important to remember, though, is always that we have both SOs and ACs with and without PDPs and both groups -- and both the groups that do participate and the ones that do not participate and all the various subgroups after the transition, for example, the CCWG.

So what we are trying to say -- That was a little bit quick, Ram. Thank you for pressing the button so quickly.

What we are trying to answer in the first question is that, one, we are comfortable where we are after the transition. We do not need any help as such.

Two, SSAC do not participate in all the various groups that are created after the transition and neither are, for example, RSSAC. And I think it's really important to remember from board's perspective and ICANN organization that that is the case. Just because GNSO, I think, is participating in all the various groups that they had an ability to participate in does not imply that all groups are. That was the first question.

The second one, what do we board, ICANN organization, and community need to do to advance trust and confidence in what we do? And the answer to that is that the overall response is that we believe that the path that the organization, the board, and we in the SOs and ACs have started to take to be more clear and not only say ICANN but actually say "ICANN board," "ICANN

organization," "ICANN community" is really, really, really important. We are trying to do that ourselves, and we encourage everyone to continue to do that and be more clear.

And when you listen someone claiming "ICANN should," then maybe you should start the discussion ourselves and ask what do you really mean here to make sure that people are really thinking before they make an advice.

So what we are talking about is in the continuation of that ensure role clarity between the various groups to quickly deescalate situations when misunderstanding or miscommunication occur and not continuing to put fuel on the fire.

Clearly establish rationale for disagreements from adopting community's advice.

Collaborate with community on implementation of policies so as to reduce surprises to the community.

And ensure non-technical board members pay attention to important technical matters, even if these matters are complex.

And the last point is something we have been discussing. And as we have said, we are happy to try help. If we knew exactly how to reach that, we would tell you how to do; but we need to continue to work together. Thank you.

RAM MOHAN: Any responses from the board? Rinalia?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Just a question, actually, Patrik. I think you have it written down. Would you mind sending it to us as well? Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: And yes, the first sentence that I read was actually my poor English and it will look as weird in writing as when I said it, but I hope you can interpret what actually -- what we actually mean.

RAM MOHAN: Ron and then Chris.

                     Yes, Ron.

RON DA SILVA: Thanks. I was just going to add onto the comment about having a common lexicon on what we're describing when we're talking about ICANN. I know this has been an issue that's been raised and unfortunately there isn't consensus in the ICANN community on what ICANN or ICANN org or ICANN community actually means, so I think to the extent that, you know, we're probably not going to get everybody to agree but we need to at least define what we mean when we say one of those three things so that somebody hearing it knows what we're talking

about. Whether or not they want to use a different label is probably a debate that will never end.

RAM MOHAN: Okay. Any other questions? Anything else that you would like to --

Oh, I have Steve. Go ahead, Steve.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you.

So you've responded to the sort of two big transition-oriented questions that we've shared with each of the groups that we've been interacting with. I'd like to ask one that is more specific but along the same lines with respect to SSAC.

I have, as you know, a deep bias in favor of SSAC, having been involved from the very beginning and still honored to be a member.

But having disclosed my potential conflict, is there anything more that we can do for you? What would you need? How are things going for you?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: I think one of the things that I, as chair of SSAC, really, really, really like and makes my life easier as the chair of SSAC is, number one, that we have these meetings and that we have this conversation between the ICANN board and SSAC. Those board members and SSAC members who have been around for a while know that up until maybe two years ago, we did not even have these meetings, and the first meeting we had like maybe one or two SSAC members and one or two board members. Nowadays we see not only, I think, every board member that could come and every SSAC member that could come, but also a large audience and people following our discussion. That is progress, and for me as the chair, I must say thank you very much, and I think we need to continue the dialogue because that also makes us understand how we should word our documents so that when they are received, they are easy to understand, which was one of the points that you made earlier.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you. Any other comments?

Okay. We are four minutes over the scheduled time. Apologies. And we are adjourned. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]