
HYDERABAD – SSAC Public Meeting
Tuesday, November 08, 2016 – 15:15 to 16:15 IST
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: It's quarter past three and I hereby greet all of you welcome to the SSAC Open Session at ICANN57 in Hyderabad. My name is Patrik Fältström, I am Chair of SSAC. Normally, we have this session in the morning, 8:00 a.m. I recognize some faces that normally come to the 8:00 a.m. meeting, but clearly having the meeting later in the day improves the ability, interest or whatever for people actually come to our meeting. So I think we have to go back and thank the scheduling team, too, for actually finding a better time for us. So welcome, everyone.

I have the SSAC numbers that are here in Hyderabad or here with me and let me ask for a roll call.

ROBERT GUERRA: Good afternoon, everyone. It's Robert Guerra, SSAC member.

JAMES GALVIN: Jim Galvin, Vice-Chair of SSAC.

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.*

RAM MOHAN: Ram Mohan.

WARREN KUMARI: Warren Kumari, Google.

JEFF BEDSER: Jeff Bedser.

JULIE HAMMER: Julie Hammer.

JOHN LEVINE: John Levine.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Thank you very much. So what we want to go through is to explain a little bit about SSAC, talk a little bit about the work in progress and then go through the publications since the previous ICANN meeting. Then as normal get some feedback on how we are operating and also request some input from you on the action and direction that we have with you and the community.

We are today 31 members, we are appointed by the ICANN Board and members are appointed on three-year terms. We do have expertise – and we tried to have expertise together in a

multitude of different areas that you see down to the left. What we do is bound by the Charter of SSAC which says that, “We advise the ICANN Community and Board on matters relating to the security and integrity of the internet’s naming and address allocation systems.” We have had 87 publications since we started in 2002. The publications are both reports, advisories and comments. We see those as part of the outreach that we do.

Next slide please.

Our charter is tied to what ICANN is doing by matching what’s in ICANN’s mission and core values. The publication process itself starts by having us or anyone else discover something that SSAC as an Advisory Committee should investigate. We do that by forming a work party. We do some research and write report if it is the case if we find that there’s something to do. Then if it is the case that we find that we actually have recommendations to give to someone, in that case we review, approve the report and then publish it.

In the specific case that we are giving a recommendation to the ICANN Board, in that case the process continues in a few more steps. We submit advice to ICANN Board, they acknowledge and study the advice and then they take form and action. That could be one of four different things. It might be that the Board initiates some Policy Development Process, that the Board asks

the staff to implement something or do something with a public consultation, or it might be the case that the Board passes the advice on to other parties, or it might be the case that the Board choose other solutions to the issue that we bring up with them including, of course, that they could say, “No, we don’t see any risks. We don’t share the concern. Or we try to take care of the issue in different ways,” which means that they are not following our recommendation.

So the important thing here is that as an Advisory Committee, we in SSAC also had a very strong view that it’s part of taking our advice into account by basically, in plain English, ignoring the recommendation and do something else, as long as that is explained.

We have yet another SSAC member coming to the table, Jaap Akkerhuis.

Next slide please.

So the current work parties we have. First of all, work parties looking at the issues with the global name space that we use for, among other things, the DNS harmonization issues, potential harmonization issues. What kind of impact that have or might have between the different processes within ICANN Community that deal with internationalized domain names. We have one

work party that is following the work related to auction proceeds here in ICANN.

Then we have three ongoing groups that are working on long-term projects. One, is the DNSSEC workshops that we are hosting at the ICANN meetings. We have an ongoing work party that is keeping track of all of these advice and the flowcharts and the state diagrams that I demonstrated on the previous slides, specifically the Board advice. Then we have the Membership Committee that the Vice-Chair of SSAC at the moment Jim Galvin is the Chair of that is managing the appointment and review process of SSAC members.

We are going to go through the recent publications, so let's move immediately to those.

So here, once again, the current work in progress, if we look at the milestones we match the milestones that we had for third quarter, we published SAC084 and 83 and then in Q4 we released 85, 86 and 87. We will go through them shortly so I am not going to talk more about them than now. We had DNSSEC Workshops here at ICANN57. And we are continuing the work on name space and internationalized domain names. We do hope that the work on name space issues would conclude this quarter.

Then 2017, in the first quarter we hoped that we will have an advisory ready on harmonization for internationalized domain

names and we will have workshops regarding DNSSEC at ICANN58 in Copenhagen.

So if we dive into the publications since ICANN56, the first three are 85, 86, 87, those are responses to interaction that we have had with the working group in the PDPs that are related to the gTLD processes, to the GNSO Policy Development Processes. Their responses are pretty generic and they point to the SSAC reports and advisories. They invite a working group to look at these and recommend the working group when needed reach out to us to issue more specific questions related to each one of these activities. The first questions from the working groups were pretty generic and that meant that it was pretty difficult for us to know exactly what kind of advice they wanted to know that we have been looking at before. So we envision that there will be more interaction between SSAC and these working groups.

If we go into a little bit more interesting advice, we have SACo84 that contains comments and guidelines for the Extended Process Similarity Review Panel for the IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process. We reiterate in this publication that the three that we find that the EPSRP do not mention the three core principles that elsewhere in the IDN review process it's talked about the conservation principle, the inclusion principle and the stability principle. Because these three principles are missing, including the fact that because of some wording issues in some of these

documents that belong to the Fast Track Process, there is some confusion regarding whether confusability between strings might have security implication or not. Because of all of that together, we in SSAC recommend in SAC084 that the EPSRP should not be approved by the Board.

Since this was published, there have been interaction between us and ccNSO and within that interaction SSAC understands that we reviewed much larger group of material than what was actually requested in the public comment period and that created quite a lot of confusion. That's the first thing. And the second thing is that we also understand this confusion that exists regarding overloading of terms regarding confusability, stability, similarity and those kinds of terminology.

So what we in SSAC did was that we, Monday this week, we sent or Sunday or whatever day it is— I don't even know what day it is anymore. Anyways, after we had the meeting with ccNSO here we sent a letter to the ccNSO explaining or at least we tried to explain, but there is still some confusion, that we understand that there have been misunderstandings and that we requested four more weeks to write an explanation of the SAC084 and respond to some issues that ccNSO raised with us.

And as far as we and SSAC understand any information we have there was a conclusion within the ccNSO that they receive that

message from us with that gave us a little more time to respond. So we envision that the next couple of weeks, we'll work a little bit more into the situation and explain SAC084. That said, these principles – the conservation principle, inclusion principle, stability principle – are important for us in SSAC. And we believe that confusability might lead to security implications, but now we are risking falling into the trap of overload in terminology again and we, together with the ccNSO is now working hard on trying to resolve these issues. Because if nothing else, if we disagree, we should agree on what we disagree on and we are not there yet.

Next slide, SAC083

SAC083, those are SSAC comments on the proposed amendments to the new gTLD Registry Agreement. What we found was that Section 1.2 of Exhibit A introduces new text related to the potential provision on non-delegated records in the TLD apex. Something that's normally in plain English have been called in this context dotless domains. We saw that with the new text, even though that was not the intention, the new text could potentially lead to something that could be interpreted as if the SSAC view or the ICANN view on dotless domain has changed. What we did to resolve that issue we proposed a slight change in this wording and as far as we understand, that has been accepted.

So to be able to give that advice, of course, SSAC went back and we revised all that we looked through, what they've done, our findings and saw where the things had changed. Because, of course, every time something like this happens, even though it's unintentional, we in SSAC do choose to take things seriously and take it as an opportunity to maybe to change what we have said earlier, but we didn't find any reason for doing that. We, instead, reinforced and restated our view regarding dotless domains.

So, next slide. Okay. We can actually stop there, sorry. Sorry for going too far. Let's stop there and try to use as much of this time as possible which is now about half an hour for questions. So let's open up the floor for questions from you guys and, hopefully, other SSAC people than myself.

MARK:

Mark [Inaudible]. Yesterday during the RDAP Session, it seems that there was a good consensus that RDAP was the right vehicle for registration data and replacing WHOIS. However, there seemed to be some concerns from some registries to delay the deployment and I'm kind of concerned that this may delay forever and then RDAP will die. Does SSAC have anything to do about this given that actually SSAC was the one pushing the RDAP a while ago?

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Well, as I pointed out when I was on that panel yesterday and I heard basically the same thing as you, I think we in SSAC we have been very specific in our advice, both that they are everything from the fact that we see that certain features are needed... oh, sorry. Let me try to start from the beginning and then I let Jim try to uncombed this. We see that there is some interest that certain features should exist in the WHOIS service that today doesn't exist. That's sort of one group of findings.

The second group of findings is that the WHOIS protocol itself on Port 43 cannot implement those features. Another one is that we believe that the IETF is the right body that actually can develop some protocol that can be used to make sure that those features are implemented.

Then we detected that the IETF has developed a number of these protocols and not WHOIS++ that was mentioned yesterday, but rather first the [Chris] working group and then the RDAP protocol. Our conclusion is that the RDAP protocol do include the features that are needed for the services that are needed, specifically the differentiated access.

And all of those findings with follow-up recommendations are things that we have included. We don't have any other ability than to repeat our advice and trying to participate in the

discussions in the community just like everyone else. That is one of the strengths and, of course, some of these.

So in this case maybe you would like us to be a little bit more and stronger than an Advisory Committee. But we cannot do much more than being an Advisory Committee and, for example, try to separate what I saw yesterday personally. This is not an SSAC conclusion, but my personal conclusion is that it was even yesterday after all of these years, there was a mix up between use of the RDAP protocol itself and definition of the profiles and all the things that you do when using it. And maybe that is something that needs to be ironed out. Jim?

JIM GALVIN:

Thank you, Patrik. And thank you, Mark, for the question. I think the only thing that I would add is it's important to separate policy discussions and policy positions from technical ones and technical discussions. I don't think there was any change to SSAC's advice in that session yesterday. SSAC stands firm on the advice that it wants to give with respect to the role that RDAP can play in this ecosystem of needing to provide a directory service to the community. Yesterday, what you saw is some discussion about what it means from a policy point of view to implement and take advantage of what RDAP has to offer. It's

important to keep those two things separate. So does that answer your question? I hope that that's helpful.

MARK: Thank you.

PETER KOCH: Peter Koch, DNIC. So I work for ccTLD, therefore, I have the ccNSO label. But this is completely to satisfy my own curiosity. In that and since we're naming this community interaction, I'm not asking about specific security topics but about the outreach and interaction in the community actually. So on some occasions SSAC is accepting liaison roles to other bodies within ICANN. With the EPSRP, there was some confusion about how the input would be given and it was received in an interesting way that no we can only advise the ICANN Board which is probably not completely true because the mandate also says you interact with the community.

I looked up other previously published documents including some communication with some other group that requested contributions and input from SSAC and that was responded to in a slightly different way. So just out of curiosity, how would SSAC decide how far to engage or by what means to engage in other party's work?

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Thank you very much. As Peter point out, this is also something that is also part of this miscommunication which I would like to call it between ccNSO and SSAC, and there are two parts to that question. The first one is that when SSAC has a view or to be able to have a view SSAC needs to reach consensus as a group on the specific piece of text or something that we compile. And when we have finished and have that view then we release that as a document or communication or something that we put a number on. So that is what is an SSAC review. Apart from that, we are all SSAC members and we as individuals can participate in various different processes in the community just like everyone else here when that is possible.

So what has happened a few times though is that unfortunately is that when SSAC members have been appointed by SSAC to participate in other groups and those individuals have said things, it has happened unfortunately in too many cases that when SSAC later do express a view on that work that we have been told that that is not valid input as an SSAC member has participated in the work. And because of that misunderstanding, SSAC has been very careful by not appointing individuals to other groups to sort of resolve that kind of misunderstanding.

That said, we are still hoping that SSAC members have the ability to participate. And our internal process is like this, that we get the request like we did in this case, by the way, and do we have any SSAC members which are interested in participating and then we are looking inside SSAC and asking SSAC, is there any person that have an interest, time and the commitment to be able to participate, including to explain this process issue which is kind of important in this specific case and unfortunately too many other cases, this is not the only one. If there's no SSAC member that do have the cycles because there are too many things going on in the community, then in that case we cannot even from SSAC appoint someone. So that is sort of the process to have someone participating that still speaks on their own behalf.

We do have another kind of outreach as well and also both incoming and outgoing and those are former liaisons. But when we have former liaison we are the groups that, for example, we have Julie Hammer from ALAC and then we have Ross Mundy from SSAC to RSAC, and in those cases, for example, the incoming liaison like Julie Hammer. Those incoming liaisons like Julie, they are reviewed just like anyone that applies for membership in SSAC. So from our perspective, she is just an SSAC member. There is nothing special just because she is also a member of ALAC at the same time. We feel that that is a very

fortunate situation that individuals formerly can participate in multiple groups. But we have to separate these two sort of formal assignment and then the ability to participate in work parties.

By having this awkward situation that SSAC advice is so specific and we are extremely careful of stating what is actually an SSAC statement and just because we have expressed this quite clearly at the last couple of meetings and also because of the discussions that we now, for example, have with ccNSO the more people understand our own process, the easier it will be for us to participate. That's the positive thing. So that is basically how our processes work.

Anyone else from SSAC that would like to add anything? Was that an answer to your question, Peter, for clarification?

PETER KOCH:

Oh, absolutely. There was no intent to bring you in a situation that you respond to this particular [case] because I have no mandate and there was no [inaudible]. So you avoided that very carefully, and thanks for the elaborate response.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM:

And this is also something that we hope from SSAC is that the more people understand that our advice, even if people

misunderstand them or think that we have written the wrong thing which we sometimes maybe do or we'll come to the wrong conclusions or different conclusion at least than others in our documents, the more people like you do not treat what we are saying as individuals. Not even me as a Chair, as if SSAC is saying it, the easier it is for us to have more relaxed communication with each other because we in SSAC are really black and white. What's in our documents and resolutions that is what we're saying and the rest are discussions.

We have also from SSAC tried to really, really hard get as many people as possible from SSAC to participate at the ICANN Meetings, even though many of them, at least historically wanted to go to, for example, the IETF. To be able to participate in other group's work and that has actually worked pretty well. So we are very happy with that. So over time we hope that we'll get better interaction. And every time we have sort of— I don't want to use incidence, it has too much negative connotation. But let me call it just interaction with other SO and ACs. I always see something positive and the ability to learn from each other's processes because if I express take my privilege as the Chair, you don't have to respond to this.

But as the Chair of SSAC, let me just say that this is a typical example where two groups within ICANN that have two extremely different processes when they are communicating

and they disagree about certain things. And, the point in time when they're issuing their point of view is a mismatch between the processes. There is so much misunderstanding and feeling some blood pressure. And let me just say that I'm really happy that both SSAC members and ccNSO members after the and during the interaction we have had this week see that it moved forward constructively and together. Let me just have that said. Thank you.

More questions? Okay. Is there any SSAC member that would like to bring anything up interesting for the audience? Robert?

ROBERT GUERRA:

So good afternoon again. One of the things that I wanted to mention as well that the SSAC is involved in as well is we have a work party that annually tries to submit a proposal to the Internet Governance Forum. And if that proposal is accepted then the SSAC works together with trying to take an advisory that SSAC has developed and proposed that for discussion in the broader community. So that's something that takes place as well, too. I ask all of you, if you're interested in that, just to let us know and we'll be organizing a workshop session at the IGF in Mexico in early December.

So in regards to the title and I will paraphrase it because I don't remember off the top of my head – it's regarding advisory that

SSAC had on IPv4, space exhaustion and the workshop will focus on whether there are challenges for law enforcement and the shift from IPv4 to IPv6. And we're going to have a session that will include members of RARs, law enforcement community, and others to see what challenges, how detection of fraud takes place, what's the issue in regards to IP addresses and the challenges are not being faced as we shift from IPv4 to IPv6.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Yeah. We're all reading the question in Adobe Connect, so you can read it as well.

JULIE HEDLUND: This is Julie Hedlund from staff. No, I do need to read it so that it also gets into the transcript in the recording. There's a question in the chat from Paul F. Question begins, "Given the tendency for browsers now to combine search text box with the address line, does SAC083 include any language instructing browser developers on the interpretation of "dotless domains?" End of question.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: So SAC083, first of all, SAC083 do not include any language for that. SAC083 actually is the only document that points to our regional research regarding dotless domains. Let's see, is there

any SSAC member that remember the details of that? So the real SSAC document about dotless domains is SAC053. I don't remember on the top of my head that 53 include any such language. So, unfortunately, I think the answer is no. But SAC053 you can go back and read that.

There are a few other things that have happened lately, of course, regarding how browsers are dealing with things, for example, looking up domain names while people are typing and other kind of things. There are a couple of those discussions that are going on. The only thing else I've been looking at so far is explicitly dotless domains somewhat is happening in specifically the combination or search path that is in the normal DHCP configuration. Warren?

WARREN KUMARI:

So yeah, I just wanted to mention SAC053 describes kind of what where browsers currently do or what some said of where browsers did.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM:

So Paul F. is currently typing in the chat room. But in the meantime, anyone else that would like to bring anything up? Okay. Let's just wait and see until Paul has typed. We can go to the next slide here and –

So questions that we get is part from how do you participate in the work that Peter just asked. Another question we get is, for example, how to prioritize new work? We always questions from ICANN Board highest because we need to respond. But it's also the case that we are trying to participate questions that we get from other groups in the community higher than work items that we come up with ourselves. We do though think that we could get more questions from other communities and other SO and ACs. So whenever you have an issue or when you have a PDP or a work group or whatever that end up dealing with something or discussing something that is related to SSR issues, do not hesitate sending us the question. We are happy to receive more questions from the community.

Regarding checking the Board's response to SSAC advice, we have been working together with ICANN, ICANN staff and Board to develop, first of all a process for the state diagram to a state machine for how to take care of advice that we give to the Board and keep track of their responses. That is now ready and implemented, but what is not implemented yet is sort of the user interface, reports and such things. We are currently working together with the Board and ICANN staff to try to figure out what kind of reports are needed? What kind of reaction to people need, both people like you and people like us? And it seems to be the case that the need is different depending on, of course,

[inaudible] so we're trying to at the moment build a couple of used cases and try to be able to design and implement the reports needed. As it is today, we ask for reports at uneven intervals and we, together with the Board and staff and make sure that the state of the world is what all of us think.

Regarding how to inform the community on its work, what we're doing there is that we're issuing a report and then we now and then we reach out, for example, Internet Governance Forum that we just heard from Robert. But, it's also the case that we are trying to do small short videos where we explain our reports. This time we did a video on SAC084, it ended up being Jim and me again. We are trying to get other SSAC members to also do that. We also encourage SSAC members to present our work at other meetings, which is also something [inaudible] SSAC members are participating in various conferences and groups and they try to talk about our work as much as possible. So if it is the case that you, for example, see that you have SSAC members that participated at your meetings or whatever and you would like them to say something, don't hesitate reaching out to them, they don't bite. So, next.

JULIE HEDLUND:

There is again a question in the chat. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. Question again from Paul F. "Thanks, but with so much

traffic to sites coming through search engines, how does SSAC expect to discourage the public’s adoption of dotless domains without any sort of browser control?”

RAM MOHAN: Thanks. We don’t control it anyway. We actually have no control over pretty much anything. We provide advice and as far as dotless domains are concerned, if the marketplace evolves and there are dotless domains out there, then what we’ve already said in our advisory still remains something that we stand behind.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: John, please.

JOHN LEVINE: The question’s a little confusing. I mean, I believe that he’s asking that in most browsers, you can type the address and search terms in the same place. Yeah, you know, it’s like you type in the word “pickle” and it’s sort of up to the browser, as a matter of fact, whether it will do a search through its index for pickles or whether it will look for dot pickle.

Historically, there actually are quite a lot of dotless ccTLDs, but none of them are very interesting. In fact, it’s actually fairly

difficult to get a browser to look up a dotless domain even if you have one defined in your local network. So beyond the fact that no browser maker would be so foolish as to take instructions from us, I certainly appreciate that the public is confused. I've written popular books like "Internet for Dummies." I try to explain like in the browser bar, "Well, this is an address and this is a search term." But for the most part people type in words and stuff comes up. And the overall awareness by individual users of what is a domain name as opposed to a search term or anything else is sort of vague. So I think our advice goes to ICANN and to some extent to people directly related to ICANN. But although I appreciate the question's concern about confusion in the world, I think this is a swamp that we could not begin to drain.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM:

Thank you very much. Let me explain a bit further what we've done. So the follow-up question is, of course, okay, if that swamp had contained so much water, what is that SSAC ever looking at? We are specifically looking at, for example, the search path that is used in the resolvers that act different depending on whether there's a dot in the domain name or not which, of course, is not only tied to web browsing, but also other protocols that are in use and those kind of things. And how that behaves when you are inside your enterprise or organization where the search path makes sense and when you come to

conference like here when you have a different search path. What is the implication when a resolver is moving in the network topology. So we have been looking much more of those kind of issues have come up because of that.

So the question that we then ask the community and that we always would like to have feedback on are things like, for example, whether you think the reports are accessible. Do they explain things in the way so that it's understandable? We have got this week good feedback regarding translation because we're translating some of our reports, not all of them because of time and budget constraints. Feedback on how SSAC can do things differently, which is sort of part of the discussion with ccNSO and how we can work better together. And then we always, even though you don't have any question directly that you want us to answer, just getting information about what kind of topic you think SSAC should look into is something that is welcome.

And that's all. Last chance to ask a question. Yes, there is a question there.

JULIE HEDLUND:

And I'll just note that Paul F. also has a question, another question.

JAY DALEY:

Thanks, Patrik. This is not so much a question as sort of a suggestion. I think that there are a class of SSAC advisories that are evidenced-based where a data set has been collected and is used for determining the advice. I think it would be useful to start thinking about a repository for open data for those cases so that a data set can be published at the same time to be made available to allow other people to verify or challenge or whatever through that type of thing. And I can see this is partly probably heard me in a public forum this is part of a general trend of things where ICANN could be doing this and it would be nice if SSAC took a little bit of leadership on it.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM:

Let me thank you very much for everything that you are doing, yourself personally. I am following what you are doing and no other SSAC members are doing itself. And we are talking about it not only that we both should encourage people to use that kind of system. Use those kind of systems ourselves and then also, of course, create those kind mechanism ourselves. So, yes, that is – we actually do have all SSAC members which are very vocal and believe very much in that. For example, we have SSAC members that also work at, for example, with CAIDA and all of their work. So KC Claffy – that could not be here unfortunately, it is one of

those that worked very much as you know with those kind of data sources.

And also from the academic background. That is also one thing that we're looking at very closely regarding SSAC, the competency of SSAC as a whole, us individuals. We believe that it is important that that competence and experience from academic sort of evidenced-based how do you draw conclusion from the data set is something that we value very much that we have [in turn in] SSAC. So that is one of those checkmarks that we... But all of us can do better. And, yes, we should also come up with, we don't have a methodology ready on how to be able to do that and how to do that. But, yes, we follow your work and personally I agree with you.

And now we'll have the question from Paul.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Yes, this is Julie Hedlund from staff from Paul F. in the chat room. Thanks. "But shouldn't ICANN and SSAC stop trying to prevent dotless domains and start preparing for the inevitability that they are/will become the new registry of choice?"

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM:

Ram?

RAM MOHAN: As we'd mentioned before, I don't think SSAC has the power to prevent any of these things. We provided advice and as John said, there's a user experience issue. He pointed out some of the downsides. As far as what ICANN should be doing, that's something that really it's up to the policy development organizations as well as the Board to make those final calls. But, from an SSAC point of view, I think our position is pretty clear and speaking personally I don't see a reason to revisit this particular issue and change the position that we've taken.

JAY DALEY: Ram, this is Jay Daley again. Just to slightly disagree with you. SSAC053 does state a advice to contractually ban a [inaudible] records. That's a very strong recommendation and that has the practical effect of SSAC seeming responsible for preventing dotless domains. So it may not be, SSAC is not the deciding body clearly. And it is only setting advice in that way. But when the advice is that specific at that level, I think that's why other people interpret it.

RAM MOHAN: So, Jay, just quickly responding. You're right. SSAC made a clear recommendation in that area and as Patrik said, database

decisions are a good thing. We can look for and continue to look for data that might make the opportunity available to change that recommendation. But barring that I think the, at least from my point of view, I don't see a reason to change the decision based on anecdotal evidence. I see a reason to go look for data and see if there is a reason to revisit what the SSAC has said.

JAY DALEY:

I agree with you. I'm not saying you should change your decision at all, just point that out. The other thing to point out is that I'm taking a bit of a guess here, but I believe there's been a degree of unintended consequence as well as a result of that that there was some scare about what records should appear at the top level. And as we know only a very limited set were allowed. And so SRV records were not allowed and that caused a number of us users at the top level for redirected to WHOIS. I don't know this is now a [moot] point because we're moving now toward that. But that could be potentially have been an unintended consequence of such strong advice there that they would be potential other issues from other records that hadn't yet been thought through.

PETER KOCH:

Peter Koch, DNIC again. Maybe in addition to that, while I understand that SSAC documents not necessarily undergo

public comment period before being published and I also understand that the urgency of the matter might sometimes prohibit that and also the committee is like we're 31 members today are large enough and hopefully serve some diversity in skills and experience. In this particular case, while I have no interest in a particular outcome, but in this particular case a couple of community members have submitted comments not so much to SAC053, but through the following process that specifically criticized certain findings in that document. And it might have been a good idea to revisit them and address them in some way. And that that did not happen is to a certain extent... I know disappointing is a hard word [inaudible] speak, but I'm an engineer so if that could be reconsidered or responded to that would be great. Thank you.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM:

Thank you very much. I think that's very good feedback and one of the things that I claim, you actually asked for two things there. One is that we are taking them into account and two, that we're addressing them and responding to them. We are much better on the first one than the second. Let me just say that this is also one of the reasons why we actually did talk before we released this document on related to dotless domains.

That's why we really revisited and that was also my point. We revisited our previous work. We investigated whether and discussed whether given all the input that we got is there any reason for us to reopen, to revisit the work that we did. That was also, of course, had a time bound as this had to be able to respond to this specific thing when we found it. But we draw the conclusion given all of those constraints to say what we want. But the addressing part has to do with SSAC. It's tied to this issue regarding SSAC interacting with the community like you asked your first question, that's right on the spot. And there are two things that we are waiting for at the moment. We are very tied to our operation procedures, but there are two things that are happening at the moment, the SSR2 review is now starting and we were among the first SO and ACs which are reviewed. And our new review of SSAC is starting pretty soon in ICANN speed. A little bit faster than last years' time, but not much maybe.

But anyways myself as Chair I have actually decided or suggested to SSAC that we have those two reviews, the external reviews and I think it's real important that we implement whatever those reviews come back and I hope and take for granted that they will look into, for example, these kinds of things, whether interaction between SSAC and the community can work in the different ways. And then we have to implement

those just like we implemented the result from SSAC previous review and the SSR previous review.

Okay. There's another question.

JULIE HEDLUND

This is Julie Hedlund from staff reading the question from the chat room from Paul F. "But truly when SSAC/ICANN sees the potential for consumer confusion it has an obligation to act to mitigate that confusion, especially since there are many potential TLD registrants who currently see as a TLD as a registry rather than the new preferred domain of respected businesses?"

RAM MOHAN:

Yeah, thank you for that comment. I think SSAC in general does care about consumer confusion, especially the co-relation of confusion when it comes to stability and security. So I think your comment is valid. It's something that actually permeates the conversations inside of SSAC when we look at various topics. So thank you for that comment.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM:

Okay. In that case, let me thank everyone for coming. It was a new record participation. Woohoo. Good. And thank you, Paul for being so active and asking us questions remotely as well.

Obviously, the remote participation worked. So thank you very much and I hereby close this session.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]