
SAN JUAN – Joint Meeting: ICANN Board & SSAC
Thursday, March 16, 2018 – 08:30 to 09:30 AST
ICANN61 | San Juan, Puerto Rico

RAM MOHAN: Good morning, everyone. This is Ram Mohan. I'm the liaison to the Board from the SSAC. This is the meeting of the SSAC with the Board. We'll get started in just about a minute's time.

All right. Good morning. This is Ram Mohan. This is the Board with the SSAC. Let's get started.

The first thing that might be useful, I think, especially for board members who don't know all of the SSAC members, might be for us to just go around very quickly. And if you could please state your name and your affiliation. And we'll just move on.

Start with you, Patrik.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Patrik Faltstrom, Netnode, member of SSAC.

ONDREJ FILIP: Ondrej Filip, CZ.NIC, member 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.

JOHN LEVINE: John Levine, MAAWG liaison and SSAC.

RUSS MUNDY: Russ Mundy, SSAC and also SSAC liaison to RSSAC.

JIM GALVIN: Jim Galvin, Afilias.

JACQUES LATOUR: Jacques Latour, Cira

CRISTIAN HESSELMAN: Cristian Hesselman, SIDN.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And SSAC.

TARA WHALEN: Tara Whalen, Google and SSAC.

GREG AARON: Greg Aaron, SSAC, iThreat Cyber Group.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Sarah Deutsch, ICANN board.

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

CHERINE CHALABY: Cherine Chalaby, ICANN board.

RAM MOHAN: Ram Mohan.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Rod Rasmussen, SSAC chair.

JULIE HAMMER: Julie Hammer, SSAC vice chair.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Maarten Botterman, ICANN board.

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: Lousewies Van Der Laan, ICANN board.

BARRY LEIBA: Barry Leiba, Huawei, SSAC.

CHRIS ROOSENRAAD: Chris Roosenraad, NeuStar, SSAC.

ROBERT GUERRA: Robert Guerra, Privaterterra, SSAC.

JEFF BEDSER: Jeff Bedser, SSAC, iThreat Cyber Group.

BEN BUTLER: Ben Butler, SSAC, GoDaddy.

MERIKE KAE0: Merike Kaeo, SSAC, Farsight Security.

ANDREY KOLESNIKOV: Andrey Kolesnikov, IETF association, SSAC, and ALAC liaison to SSAC.

JAY DALEY: Jay Daley, independent contractor, SSAC.

LYMAN CHAPIN: Lyman Chapin, Interisle Consulting Group and SSAC.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Jaap Akkerhuis, NLnet Labs. Apologies. I have to leave early.

RON DA SILVA: Ron da Silva, board.

RAM MOHAN: George, if you could just quickly introduce yourself.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: George Sadowsky.

RAM MOHAN: Matthew?

MATTHEW SHEARS: Matthew Shears.

RAM MOHAN: Rod, do you want to introduce the other two people?

ROD RASMUSSEN: I believe we have Geoff Huston, SSAC member, and David Conrad. Everybody knows who David is.

RAM MOHAN:

Okay. Great.

The format of this meeting I'll moderate the meeting, run the queue. But this is really intended to be a dialogue, an interaction between the Board and the SSAC.

If you could go to the next slide.

These are questions from the ICANN board to the SSAC. So I'll pass this to you, Rod, to provide some responses and then initiate the dialogue.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Thank you, Ram.

Okay. So I think we all know what one of the primary goals of 2018 is between -- for SSAC given the recent request from the Board and the work we've done and put out to public comment. That is the Name Collisions Analysis Project or NCAP as we're calling it because we like acronyms in ICANN. That is really long anyways.

So we assume we're going to be talking about that fairly extensively here.

We also are looking at a couple of different things to release in the near term. A paper. WHOIS rate limiting. We figure that's going to come out sometime maybe in Q3 or perhaps sooner,

depending on the work, how soon the work party wraps up. And then also a paper looking at some issues around Internet of things.

And that, again, would probably be sometime in Q3 but maybe brought forward or backwards. That's the way SSAC works. Depends on how much we get information and research and availability of our members.

So those are the three areas of work that we have already on the docket. There are many more that we may take up as well, depending on various requests and interests from the membership.

Ram, should we talk about -- have questions from the Board on those three?

RAM MOHAN:

Why don't we do that? Questions from the Board? I see a couple of other board members have also joined us.

So there's Lito. Just raise your hand. And then Leon and Kaveh. And Leon. And there's Goran in the back as well. And Khaled. Where is Khaled? There you are. Okay.

Rod, do you want to -- sorry, there were questions -- do board members have any responses?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Basically, we've got those as our key goals. And one of them is one I know we want to talk about today.

So I guess the point would be, before we talk about the NCAP project, are there any questions about some of the other initiatives we have going so we can get those out of the way?

RAM MOHAN: Any questions from board members? Three key goals -- name collision analysis, WHOIS rate limiting, and Internet of things targeted for this year. Questions?

Jonne.

JONNE SOININEN: Yeah. Just out of curiosity, what is your focus on Internet of things? What is the -- what do you see as the SSAC's role in that? Because "Internet of things," of course, is a huge area and very overly used term. So what is -- what do you think is important for SSAC?

RAM MOHAN: Ask the chair of the work party.

CRISTIAN HESSELMAN: That's really a painful question. Because, as you said, it's a really big topic. So -- we have -- sorry. I'm Cristian. Cristian Hesselman.

So we're currently looking into what our focus could be in this area. So we know that the Internet of things might have an impact on users, the DNS, and the Internet at large with all these insecure IoT devices out there.

So, for instance, users could be impacted in terms of their privacy could be hurt or their -- maybe even their physical safety. And, as we've all seen, these IoT devices can also be used to launch DDoS attacks on the Internet. And that includes, of course, the DNS.

So we're currently kind of making an inventory of the topics that we could look into. And we have identified a few. So the potential topics could be that we look into open source protocol stacks and potential vulnerabilities in those, so perhaps by setting up a test lab or an IoT lab to investigate -- to continually investigate if there are vulnerabilities in open source software and then perhaps recommend projects that would, let's say, improve that quality.

So we need to, basically, map out in that case which are the most used open source stacks out there being used by IoT devices. Other topics include that we look into the potentially

changing DNS usage patterns so we look at how IoT devices use the DNS. That might be one. Another one related to the key rollover, the KSK key rollover is that we investigate how many IoT devices have an on-board validating resolver. That might be an issue because, as you know, IoT devices do not always get updated. So that might be an issue. And there might also be things like there are DDoS for hire services that also make use of IoT devices. So there are probably sites within certain TLDs that can be used for hiring these DDoS attacks.

So those are a number of topics that we currently have on our radar, but we still need to decide on which topic we're going to pick.

RAM MOHAN: Any other questions?

Jonne, did that satisfy your curiosity?

JONNE SOININEN: It does. Can I ask some more, or do we have time?

RAM MOHAN: We have time.

JONNE SOININEN: Okay. Because this is a very interesting area. But, still, when you say IoT devices, we have -- if we look at the IoT devices, we can have a very broad range there of a very small center that is connected to Internet, maybe not even, over IP or through a gateway or something like that. Or even in a car can be an IoT device as well. And those have -- use varying different softwares and very different protocols and so on.

Do you have -- and also that, when we look at this kind of like IoT software that you can find, for instance, in open source, that is wide range of software that can be used in this, depending what kind of device that is.

How -- do you have any vision already how are you going to kind of like focus that? Or are you going to take samples of different devices? Or what is the approach?

CRISTIAN HESSELMAN: We haven't selected out that far, to be honest. One potential focus area could be home networks, because these are traditionally poorly secured. So, if you look at where these DDoS attacks, for example, come from, that is usually from home networks and not so much from cars or industrial networks. So that's potentially an area to focus on.

But the -- let's say the other question you asked, that remains to be worked out.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you. Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thanks. I hear you on the vulnerability. So we'll have to focus on the IoT.

Are you also considering what the DNS can do to make the IoT environment safer? The other way around. Not only how IoT can affect the vulnerability of the DNS but also the other way around.

CRISTIAN HESSELMAN: That's a good question. We had some thought on that. So it could be if you really -- if you look at -- there are various models for the IoT. And one of them is, when you have -- there is a back-end service associated with a device and, of course, there is kind of a binding or an association between the back-end service and the front-end device, do you want to make that secure?

So one thing you could do there is actually use DNSSEC to go to the service.

So that becomes more difficult to hijack the association between the device and the back-end service. You cannot be rerouted as easily to a malicious service somewhere without the user of the device actually knowing that. So that could be potentially something.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you very much.

I also wanted to acknowledge Becky from the Board who has also joined us in this meeting. Becky, if you could just raise your hand so people know who you are. Okay.

Rod, let's go to the second question.

ROD RASMUSSEN: I wanted to talk about NCAPs?

RAM MOHAN: I thought we'd finish this and then -- I thought NCAP was sort of deserving of its own segment.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay.

RAM MOHAN: So what are your most relevant longer term goals?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thanks, Ram. Okay. So we have two main things we want to talk about with the Board on that.

And they're both kind of very long-term thinking about the nature of SSAC, relationship with SSAC and the community and the Board. In the new ICANN post-transition world, one of the -- with the requests we got for NCAP and other requests we know are probably coming down the pike, things like the KSK roll, looking at -- potentially looking and reviewing the DAAR. We heard that as a potential item. We've had a couple requests for specific technology issues around IDNs.

We're getting a lot more requests than we ever had before.

And we're also hearing from other SOs and ACs about potential requests. We had several people come up to the mic yesterday in our open session and were requesting things around RDS registration, directory services, replacement for WHOIS type of things where they were asking about accreditation models and authentication and things like that.

And we had -- to be fair, we'd actually said we were kind of interested in talking about these. And that set off a flurry of people wanting to say, yes, please talk about them.

So there's a lot of things coming to us.

But we're constrained as a volunteer organization. We have -- we're all volunteers. And we have a fairly limited staff. We're actually down a little bit because of some internal movement. So our staff has been doing a great job of keeping up with things, but it actually limits the amount of work we can do. And we're going to talk about the NCAP project where -- that's a really huge project where there may be a management layer. We're still trying to figure that out. But we'll get into those details later.

But there's just a lot of things coming down at us.

So we wanted to have a dialogue around where the Board and the community, et cetera, and this is just a start of a dialogue about how we're going to do this. Because one of the things we're concerned about is having a lot of items thrown at us, especially given the nature of the way we've worked in the past where we would come up with items. And occasionally items would come to us. And we'd deliberate whether we'd even work on them or not because sometimes we didn't have anything to say.

And then at our own pace come out with a paper or a comment or things like that.

Where we're getting more now is we need to know an answer to this question by this date. And that's just not the way we're set up to operate. Instead of saying, no, we're not going to do that, we want to have a dialogue about how we can accommodate the needs of the community and our ability to provide sage advice and make this work for everyone.

So that's kind of -- and that's a big meta issue, right? But it's being driven by what we're seeing and, you know, I'm also trying to raise a flag saying hey, there's a lot going on here and I don't want to start seeing volunteers going, I don't think I'm going to volunteer anymore, I've been conscripted to the ICANN staff, or something like that, right? So that's the first meta issue. Why don't we see what people think about that.

RAM MOHAN:

Yeah, what do board members think about that? Cherine.

CHERINE CHALABY:

So thank you, Rod. I think this is -- this is a fundamental question because it goes to the heart that we discuss in various other areas about contention of resources. And I mean, you could -- I can hear what you just said. You said in the past we had fewer topics we chose and at our own pace we come up with advice. Now you have a lot of things coming down your

pipe and with requests by certain day to achieve things and you don't have -- you're a volunteer organization who's not enough people, right, to do everything. I mean, it's a --

ROD RASMUSSEN: To do everything and the stuff that people actually were keen to do.

CHERINE CHALABY: So it is definitely a prioritization issue and we have to -- I mean, I think we said it everywhere because you're not the only stakeholder who's complaining about this. Everybody is saying we have a lot to do and there's contention for limited resources. So we do have -- we are missing a central mechanism to resolve prioritization and contention for resources. And I think we've said it before. We said that the -- the demand, this is a supply-and-demand issue. The demand comes from the stakeholders. The supply is provided by Goran and his team. So unless we put the supply and demand together, we won't be able to achieve everything we can do.

But going back to SSAC, I mean, your -- your mission is definitely, right, is the security and stability. So I think you have to prioritize this. Anything that comes your way that is not security and stability, core is security and stability, is going to go down in

the pecking order, there's no doubt about that, right? So I don't think we have an answer, but I'm glad you've started a dialogue because we have to find a solution for that.

RAM MOHAN: Okay. I have David Conrad and then Khaled and then Jay in the queue. David?

DAVID CONRAD: Hi. Yeah, I'm in sort of an odd position as I'm both staff and in SSAC. And my suspicion is that there probably needs to be some sort of load sharing between SSAC and OCTO in this space. There are a lot of things that, you know, since OCTO is staff and we are able to be directed and have tight time constraints placed upon us we're probably better for some of the tasks that may be associated with OCTO -- sorry, with SSAC. However, there are other areas in which SSAC, being an independent body, may have better, you know, characteristics, depending on the particular request. So it's probably something that one of the things the board may want to consider is trying to figure out which direction requests that would normally or historically gone to SSAC may be applicable to go into OCTO and vice versa.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, David.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone).

RAM MOHAN: Please.

CHERINE CHALABY: Sorry. I don't want to occupy the space, but that is a very good suggestion, David. And what is stopping us from doing that, huh? I mean, if -- I like your point about the independence and at the same time you say there are things that are applicable to OCTO that can take some of the load off of RSSAC.

RAM MOHAN: SSAC.

CHERINE CHALABY: SSAC, I mean, sorry. So what is the -- is there something stopping us from doing that?

RAM MOHAN: Back to you, David.

DAVID CONRAD: My suspicion is it's mostly just historical. Yeah. OCTO is relatively new. SSAC has existed for quite some time so

traditionally people would throw sort of security and stability stuff towards SSAC, but now OCTO's ramped up somewhat. I'm always in need of additional resources so I don't want to -- I'm a bit nervous of throwing too much into the pot here, but, you know, I think any of the -- the combination of OCTO and SSAC may be able to address some of the load.

RAM MOHAN: Okay. On this one, Rod, did you want to respond?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah. I think some coordination is a good idea, David, so that's something we should probably set up some sort of offline -- you know, subsequent discussion, probably amongst the admin committee and OCTO.

RAM MOHAN: Okay. From the board side, if you could tag that as an action item for a follow-through, that would be helpful. Thank you, Vinciane. Khaled.

KHALED KOUBAA: I have question out of curiosity. I attended yesterday your session. I believe you said there is 37 member in the SSAC, which is great. I mean, looking at the skill sets that you have,

guys, it's very important to have very core people that work on the security and stability issues. But when I hear you now talking about the volunteer need and the resources need probably is there any thinking about doing more outreach to include other either membership or new kind of volunteer or using other people? I mean, I noted, for example, the room was full of people and you were asking questions. I personally saw a lot of NewGen people and fellows that are interested in the security issues. So probably this is one of the kind of resources that you may look at it.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thanks. Julie Hammer speaking. This is an issue that we've debated in admin committee and amongst ourselves in individual conversations, not necessarily in recent times SSAC as a whole and there's two sides to that equation. The SSAC is set up as a community of identified experts who actually have a high degree of trust in each other and one of the reasons why progress can be made on many issues is because of that trust that we know each other well and are willing to share information that would not necessarily be shared in a broader group. So one of the balances that we have to find is having sufficient people to do the work that we want to do but maintaining that relationship within the group and the level of trust so that we actually can do the work and get the

information that we need to do the work. So it really is a balancing act. If the group gets too big, it may actually impede the way we're able to undertake work. So I think it's a -- an issue that we really do need to debate more and maybe think about it with some lateral thinking to see what -- what we can come up with. But expanding the group isn't necessarily going to be the best answer.

RAM MOHAN:

Rod, did you want to say something on this topic? No. Okay. Jay?

JAY DALEY:

Thank you, this has been a great -- Jay Daley speaking -- a great conversation so far and as Julie and Rod have said, it mirrors a lot of what we've been talking about in SSAC.

Just a reminder that our biggest piece of work to come up by far is NCAP which has been originated by the ICANN board, not the ICANN community, and it is a qualitatively very different piece of work in scale and various other things. Now, I know we'll get on to discuss that. But it's a -- we need to consider that as well when we talk about pushing things into the pipe. You know, that the source of these type of things. And I will also make it clear I think in that conversation how much we've talked about the

integration with OCTO and how much we offload into OCTO as well because we're very -- I'm aware of that.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, Jay. Sarah is in the queue and then I'm going to come back, Greg, for a brief intervention, then back to Rod. I want to keep us moving on on our schedule. Sarah.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Yeah, just a very quick question. I saw that JAR (phonetic) was mentioned as one of the items, and I just wondered what discussion there's been in the SSAC about GDPR.

RAM MOHAN: Rod, that word has been mentioned.

ROD RASMUSSEN: She said the word.

[Laughter]

So we have discussed -- well, actually, let me just take a step back. The issues surrounding WHOIS and RDS, et cetera, have been talked about in this body and we've offered many different recommendations around them over -- you know, over a decade. SAC 55 was a fairly seminal piece that was the blind

man and the elephant piece as we called it which talked a lot about a lot of the big issues. We also commented on the EWG report and we've talked in general about models and things like needing to deploy RDAP. So all of these kinds of things have been talked about that related to the current topic. Given the current topic, obviously our members are involved in various ways with, you know, trying to deal with this issue, whether they're -- work for a contracted party or have interest for data access, what have you. So there -- there are definitely those conversations going on.

We identified three areas that SSAC may do some work in that would be applicable but would not necessarily be something we would put out, you know, in the very, very, very short term which is we're -- where we bear -- the deadline that we're bearing down on. The three areas are law enforcement access to data, access for various levels of security practitioners, whether that's investigations or automated systems for reputation, things like that, how to continue doing that because it helps protect so much of the infrastructure itself, so it becomes a necessary issue itself, and then a technical perspective, looking at gated access models and all the things that go into that as far as authentication and credentialing and all that kind of thing which would be in our SSR remit. We're not looking at things like legal policies and trying to deconflict, you know, various national

laws. That's outside of what we feel is our scope. Is that -- does that answer the question?

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, Sarah. Greg?

GREG AARON: Greg Aaron. That topic actually is an example of what we've been talking about. It's something that the SSAC has to track and understand because there are a lot of security implications to what's going on and we've published a lot about that topic over the years. So it requires the time of people in this group such as myself to see what's going on and bring that information back to SSAC.

The question I have is, every project within the SOs and ACs has some sort of a sponsor, and I think one of the questions for the board is, how are the -- the groups in the community choosing their projects and are they running them in an acceptably efficient fashion? The RDS working group, for example, in GNSO has been going on two years now. It has no output whatsoever. So is that fair to volunteers? You know, at what point do things need to be revisited or put back on track? Because that is an enormous time sync for people like us who are trying to do the right thing.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you. Let's go to the -- back to you, Rod, for the next piece of -- on the long-term goals.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah, and I did want to have one -- one finish-out item on that first one.

RAM MOHAN: Okay.

ROD RASMUSSEN: And that is, one of the areas that we need to be thinking about as we're getting requests from the board or other SOs and ACs is that some of those things we couldn't hand off to OCTO because we're being asked to review some of the work they've done, for example, the KSK roll would be in that realm. By the way, one of the points I've written down here is that we actually think that ICANN's been doing a good job on this. I just want to make sure that's -- that's understood. On the way they've handled this process and all that. I think we've said it before, but I want to say it again.

So there are -- but there are some of these things which are coming out which may -- the inclination may be to say hey, let's

ask SSAC about that as an independent body but when you stop and think about it might be better to at that point do what any other company -- kind of corporation or organization does is find an expert that comes in as an independent auditor or some sort of thing like that, depending on the -- or examiner or consultant and actually give you an answer because you get a specific question. I'm not saying don't -- you know, we're -- we're saying deflect all that work there, but this is, depending on the nature of the question, may be more appropriate. And so if we're thinking about the divvying up work between us, OCTO, we also need to think about divvying up work with others that might be more appropriate, given the nature of the question being asked. And again, this is part of a dialogue that we need to -- we need to have that conversation.

RAM MOHAN: Keep going.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay. So the other meta issue is around the organization of ICANN itself, I mean, the ICANN community and the empowered community, et cetera. As a newly minted SO/AC chair, I have been thrust into some interesting areas already, the SSR2 review team being one of the most obvious, where we have found that

there really isn't a mechanism for handling things that get spun up and then have some sort of issues.

There's also a question of accountability and how things are guided, et cetera, along the way. And we've all had hallway conversations about that. But it's quite clear that we need to be doing something about that. And we're just raising this as one of the ACs -- and hopefully, you have heard this from some of the others. I know as chairs we have been talking about this issue extensively, having to deal with and make up on the fly process to try to deal with the SSR2 issue and some other things we have concerns about. So any thoughts that the Board has on that particular area.

And, again, this is, I think, a bigger community dialogue; but SSAC wanted to make sure to raise that and make sure that was on your radar, if it wasn't already, which I'm probably pretty sure it was.

RAM MOHAN: Cherine.

CHERINE CHALABY: So, yes we -- I think we agree with you there is a process missing. And I'm sure that the other process is missing. I mean, the bylaws have gone from 50 pages to 250 pages in one go, frankly.

And, I mean, they are really comprehensive. But I think we probably now as we are implementing parts of it, we find that there are missing processes. And so we'll have to take stock of that and make sure that we learn every time and put a process in place.

So on the SOs -- on the SSR2, it is true. I mean, I can sense that the SOs and AC chairs are looking for something there to guide them through it, rather than -- as you said, making it on the fly, which is tricky.

But wasn't there -- just an aside, wasn't there a discussion about finding a facilitator to --

ROD RASMUSSEN: Khaled was going to address that.

CHERINE CHALABY: Khaled, do you want to address that?

KHALED KOUBAA: I don't know exactly what point you are referring, Cherine. But I wanted to address another thing.

CHERINE CHALABY:

No. The point we were talking about was that when the SSR2 was paused, the responsibility then was with the SO and AC chairs to -- or the SOs and ACs to restart it when they've analyzed. And now they are saying this is all well and good, but we don't have a mechanism for us to get together and make that restart happen.

And we are just inventing it on the fly. Is there something that can be done? And I said, well, I understand the difficulty. But there was a suggestion of having a facilitator, an independent facilitator, to help the group get together and put the pieces together and restart it. So could you comment on that?

KHALED KOUBAA:

So I understand Rod's point. And this what I already discussed, myself and Rod and other SO/AC chairs about the -- there is, in fact, a lot of things that have been introduced in the bylaws that gives responsibility to the SO/AC chairs to be acting on behalf of the community in few things, including for this case the SSR2. I mean, the responsibility on behalf of the community to impose the SSR2 is on your hand as SO/AC chairs.

But we are facing few challenges in terms of accountability, in terms of -- I mean, in the case of the facilitator, we are moving with the facilitator. But one of the questions are related to whom this facilitator, for example, will report. Is it for the SO/AC

chairs? And if yes, how will it be the mechanism? Is this, like, a meeting with them and what kind of information that needs to be chaired with them? A lot of questions. We are learning a lot from that.

I think the good thing is that we -- with the SSR2, we have learned so much, we incorporated few of the things in the guidelines about the specific reviews. But we are also proposing few things. So expect that there will be few things that would come from the OEC AC. And we will be discussing as well for the facilitator.

RAM MOHAN:

Thank you, Khaled.

I have Cherine and then Geoff on this topic, and then we will move to NCAP.

CHERINE CHALABY:

Thank you, Khaled. This is an area where the Board can help the community, frankly, right? And I think we need to take some leadership there and help with that missing mechanism and propose it to the community and get a dialogue going and, really, try and resolve this impasse by us taking some leadership and making proposition to the community. So I'm glad you said that.

KHALED KOUBAA: If I may, I can share that 7:30 today the OEC had an informal chat about how we can move with the reactions that we have seen. In this meeting especially and every single meeting we have unsatisfaction and feedback from every single community members about the reviews and how we are conducting them. So we are taking the lead on that. Thank you so much.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you.
Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: Thanks, Ram. Geoff Huston. As a former and continuing member of SSR2, I would like to be frank with you. It was a train wreck. And part of the reason why the train wreck happened was that it is extremely challenging to do a difficult and complex piece of work relying solely on volunteers drawn from across the globe with the attendant issues of time zones, languages, et cetera.

And so the outcome was in some ways predictable given the scope and the aspirations of the work and the ability of volunteers to do this.

The facilitator, as I understand it, is to restart the process. If that's all this is, it will restart the train wreck and you're going to be back there again in another 12 months wondering why it's gone off the rails. This is no way to do such an important role. The volunteers need dedicated help to do their job, not just facilitate the meetings but to address this substance of the work. And I think that kind of assistance is the only assistance that is going to, if you will, create an outcome that differs from another repeat of the train wreck.

And so in some ways, what I am saying is, if you make the volunteers manage some kind of contracted study and be responsible for reviewing and ensuring that those studies are undertaken with timeliness and effectiveness, you might get a better outcome. But any other process where you simply say to the volunteers do all the work, you're not going to get an outcome you're happy with. I am sorry.

So I apologize for my frankness. But it has been a difficult for me last year watching this. And I do not and would not like to see ICANN repeat that. That would be dangerous.

RAM MOHAN:

Thanks.

Cherine briefly and then we'll move to name collision.

CHERINE CHALABY:

So there are two points here. One is what you just said. When you start one of these reviews, you have to structure it, right? Otherwise, it will become a train wreck. Agree with you.

And the other one is if the Board wants to fulfill its fiduciary responsibility, something is not going in the right direction, ask for a pause. There is also a missing mechanism for how to restart.

And that brings us all to the point that Goran has been saying all along, is that maybe we're doing too many reviews in one particular year. And next year there are nine reviews lined up. How would we manage all this?

So I think if we are able to collectively as a community get together and agree that we can stagger those, so do less but do it well, right, rather than do everything in one go just because our bylaws said you have to do it, you have to do it, you have to do it, and we end up doing none of them doing it well.

And as we go around, take, for example, the organizational reviews. As we go around, many constituents -- make stakeholders are saying they are not effective. They are receiving recommendations and they say we're rejecting most of them.

So there is an issue here. We have to take a holistic view and sort this problem once and for all and in the right way. And I fully agree with your comments. So thank you for raising it.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, Cherine. Khaled, briefly, and then we're going to move --

KHALED KOUBAA: Very quickly. I just would like to really thank you about making this comment because it's -- we need to be frank to each and every one of us. We are part of the same family, the same community.

And just, I would like to make sure that the OEC and the Board are keen to make sure that if there is any need for you to conduct your review, we will not say no at all.

And my understanding is that there is also already budget for contracting external contractors. So we may use what we have in hand already. Thank you.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you very much.

Rod, just go to you for an update to the Board on what the SSAC is doing on name collision. And then really the rest of it is a dialogue on name collision with the Board.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thanks, Ram.

Yes. Just very quickly, we have put out for public comment preliminary proposed plan. I really want to emphasize "preliminary." We don't even have full consensus within SSAC about how that's even put together. But we wanted to get this out for public feedback and feedback from the Board, which we'll get some of that today and hopefully over time.

That plan envisions breaking this up into various studies, basically understanding what is out there, what is actually happening and trying to figure out what data we could use to analyze everything that is there and what potential other -- potentially filling the other studies we're doing.

The second kind of big part of it is looking at root cause analysis, what's causing strings that may be considered collisions. Part of what we're going to do as well is better define "collisions" as part of the Board request. And, finally, look at mitigation methods, for ways to deal with things that we do find and understand the nature of where they're coming from.

We put together a proposed way of going after that. We are -- and then, of course, I'm sure -- I've heard there may be some questions about how we put costs together, et cetera. Let me head that off right off the bat by just saying we put -- we took a look at the studies we're talking about, having public workshops and public -- doing the thing that the Board asked us to do which is to be inclusive, which is a change for SSAC on that and bringing in members of the community. That adds a fairly significant cost component to that, I might point out, because there would be separate meetings and they may be tied to ICANN meetings to save costs. But again -- which we assumed at least in a couple of those, but you have to have them.

And then there's the ongoing kind of project management overhead, right? We assume that we're going to have a project manager because we are a bunch of volunteers. We don't do project management. Some of us may have done it in our careers, but it's not something we're doing. So there's a fair -- there's, like, technical writers and there's things in there that actually build -- build that out. So that's how it was put together and based it on kind of what rates of those kind of typical things are in the marketplace that we had information for and put that together. So that's where those came from. But there's all those questions about that.

This is just a preliminary proposal so we could get feedback on it. This is not the end all, be all of what it would be.

And then there are also fundamental questions about how this thing gets run. Because we've been debating this even since we've put this out for public comment internally. What is the proper role for us to have in this process versus being part of the process where there may be other resources we could tap into either with an external party or OCTO or some other way, mechanism, of dealing with the management of stuff and assigning of tasks, et cetera. I would point out that SSAC has no capability to sign a contract or to do anything because we are not an official -- we don't have that signatory authority, right?

So all those things would have to be worked out, and we would like to have a dialogue around that -- or get input around that.

That's out for public comment. And then we're going to take that back and what we get from our dialogue with the Board and then produce a final proposal with all that after the public comment period and all that. So that's where we are there.

Jim, did I leave anything out? No? Okay, good.

So I'd like to open it up for questions, comments and feedback from the Board.

RAM MOHAN: Great. From the Board, Jonne is the lead for the name collision discussion.

So over to you, Jonne.

JONNE SOININEN: Yeah, thank you, Ram. So I'm Jonne Soininen again.

Trying to see how to address this or how to start the dialogue because I'm like you. Basically you brought a lot of points up and I'm trying to parse them in my mind partially and also take into account what we have done already before. So what we've done actually until now is when we saw your proposal, we discussed this briefly in the Board Technical Committee. Not the whole Board has discussed this. But we took the first look, and we had some kind of like first reactions to that.

I brought something up already in the public session, so basically we were asking are you looking at also second-level collisions, is that part of the plan, and stuff like that. So I don't want to basically spend too much time on that anymore.

But what I would like to start first is to say that thank you for this work because this is clearly -- it is visible that you have put a lot of attention to it and you have put a lot of work to this.

I also understand that this is not something that SSAC normally does. So this has basically -- has challenged you with a task that is not necessarily the most usual task for you guys.

And, yet, you have brought it up and that's very good.

Also, I would like to thank how you took what we asked in the proposal. You thought very much about the openness. You have thought how to do that and stuff like that. So nice piece of work. Thank you very much.

There were some -- so, first of all, I have to kind of like -- I'm completely open. First, the thing that basically at least shocked me or kind of like surprised me was that the -- what is the dollar figure at the end of it.

Now after discussions with some of you, it seems like kind of like the question there is a little bit on the -- really on the kind of like assumptions that you built your proposal on.

I think that you've already hinted towards them a little bit. What you are saying -- and if I understand it correctly, and please fix what goes wrong here, just to start, and I want to ask you more about this later, but basically what you're saying, this is not work that SSAC would do normally. So you are not volunteering to do this. You are -- basically, you are looking like this like any project plan, what it cost to do this, whether you

hire somebody to actually do the work and run the project and do it completely in a pay-for-hire way and you have found what I assume is the maximum for that.

Is this correct?

ROD RASMUSSEN:

More or less. I mean, we -- we looked at what role we should play, because part of the analysis, et cetera, that goes into this and the design and asking questions would be done by members in their volunteer capacity. So we didn't basically -- we didn't cost out every single minute that would be spent in it; right? But we did take and say we're looking at three studies that would be -- at least three studies. it might -- depending on how you divvy things up, it might be more; right? Because when you start breaking projects down you end up with different things. But three main studies, and kind of the hours and people, types of people that would be involved, and we were thinking you need a senior level person for this. We actually broke it down to that level.

We actually have a detailed spreadsheet that has all of these costing assumptions in it, which obviously we can share with the Board. For sensitivity reasons, we didn't put it out for general public because there's cost assumption there, and then if you would be bidding this out, that would be putting ICANN at a

huge disadvantage on that. So we know how to keep that kind of close held.

One of the things we've been talking about potentially doing in reviewing that would be to put together a small team from the -- from the Board and from our side to just walk -- probably of the NCAP admin committee, and just walk through that with them so we can have direct oversight slash analysis by the Board to kind of satisfy those questions that have come up, those natural questions. We're talking about a pretty substantial sum that we've put out there.

And we were -- To answer your other question, we were conservative on your estimates on cost because we don't like surprises the wrong way.

Yeah.

RAM MOHAN: So Julie, and then back to you, Jonne.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks, Julie Hammer. Just to at one point on the costing and that is there's actually an element of the cost, not insignificant, that comes with meeting the Board's requirement for us to be

inclusive and get input from the community and even beyond ICANN.

So we thought about mechanisms by which that could happen. But that come with a cost as well.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you.

Jonne.

JONNE SOININEN: Yeah, excellent. And thank you very much for this. Like, this is really helpful.

And first of all, Rod, on your proposal that we should meet with perhaps more group from the Board and go through this, that was -- I will take you on that offer, because that was actually what we thought that we would want to do anyway. So sounds good.

Then the kind of like an underlying feel that I feel that I have discussed with some of you individually, and now here as well, is that you keep on repeating that this is -- you're not usually doing this, a normal project like this. This is a different way than SSAC works usually. And just sort of kind of like, personally, for me is

that do you feel uneasy that we did give you this question and do you feel that SSAC is the right place to do this work?

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Yes, thank you, that reflects some of our own internal debate. I mentioned earlier we did not have full consensus on this, and that would be one of the areas that we have open -- open questions amongst ourselves on this.

And, you know, stepping back to the meta issue around name collisions and understanding and examining it, I think we've spoken extensively about it in the past, and it's a natural question to come to us to get more thoughts on.

This is a -- So the question here becomes is what is our role in doing -- We have a role. I would definitely say we have a role. Absolutely. Then the question becomes what's the proper role for us to be at? And we put this together initially thinking, well, we're going to be pretty deeply involved in managing this thing, but as we've been -- as I said, we've actually been talking about this further since we put this proposal out there. And maybe we have a lighter role where we're more designing asking the questions and then others are taking those and designing things to study those questions and bring those kinds of -- that kind of data together in consultation with us. And as we get things back, then we can take and, you know, do our thing to analyze

that to some extent. There again, you may have others helping with that analysis.

At the end of the day, you want to get recommendations from us as the independent body. The question is the process of getting the answers and getting the data that we need to do that. And I think there are a lot of different -- there's a spectrum of ways that we can approach this. And now that we've kind of dug into it, we see that.

And this also reflects back to that meta issue we talked about before. Where there's this change in ICANN and we're getting more questions, are we going to have to evolve a bit, too, ourselves and be, you know -- be more accepting of this? And if we are, what is the right level of support you get, we get to do that. Just some resourcing things, too. But we need to figure out where we can do our best and be most efficient, give you the best advice while still answering the questions that the community is asking.

I hate to take it back to that high level since we're dealing with this project but it really does reflect back to that.

RAM MOHAN:

Jonne.

And just to let you know, we have about five minutes left on this topic before we should wrap. So I don't want to have you talk only about the cost because I think there were a couple of other topics you wanted to bring up also.

JONNE SOININEN:

Yeah. I think the couple of other topics I brought up already in the public session, which -- and the -- and I think that what I'm hearing is that -- and I know we're not going to finish this topic here today. And really, the kind of like getting into a smaller group and talking about hashing this out, this most probably is the right way to go. So as a conclusion that, I would like to put that there as an offer and you seem to like that.

And the -- kind of like on the structure of this thing, first of all, now we have something that we can look at. We have a good starting point. So this is -- you've already done a very important step for this name collision thing, is actually having a project plan proposal that we can start work on and look at what is the right place to do that. And it's good to hear or it's interesting to hear that you basically have had the discussions internally about what is -- what should be SSAC's role. And I hope that you come to some sort of conclusion internally as with that. And we can also have a back-and-forth between the Board.

But that's kind of like a proposal to move forward, I think that a smaller group of the ICANN Board and a smaller group from the SSAC should sit together and start looking at this.

RAM MOHAN:

Okay. I hear both from the Board and from the SSAC the same proposal, so I'd say that there is more than just rough consensus on doing that. So Vinciane, that will be another action item that arises out of this discussion.

In the queue is Cherine and then Patrik, and then we'll most likely run -- Patrik first.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Thank you very much. If I look a little bit from the outside, which I'm able to do now, both in SSR2 and some other things and the CENTR project, I think to some degree we see an evolution in how ICANN is operating where earlier diverging views in the community was something that ICANN org take on -- took on a very explicit and operative role to try to resolve what the actual consensus was and interpret the view of the community. And then the community and specifically the advisory committees are designed to review whatever was produced and come back with feedback, and you had to repeat a loop there.

What is happening now in the modern version of ICANN I find is -
- which, by the way, I completely support and I've been advocating this for, like, forever -- is that there is much higher pressure on ICANN, the community, to actually reach the consensus, which means including taking the last -- the last couple of steps to actually come up with some kind of solution.

So from that perspective, ICANN, the community, is now trying to do all the different kinds of things that earlier the community was doing and, because of that, is not really designed for.

In the case of the NCAP project, I do understand that the Board would like to have SSAC much more closely participating in the project and not just communicating back. Like you can jump higher and higher and higher instead actually participating. So we, actually, in the community come to some consensus. But on the other hand, as was pointed out, we in SSAC are not used to do that. We evaluate the result of what others have produced. And now we're asked to run the project, which means being a little bit closer. So we actually -- so we don't like -- so we actually see some convergence here. And we simply -- as Rod pointed out, we simply do not know how to do this.

So I think -- I completely fully support we have this consensus of having this smaller group of discussing how to move this forward, but I think there's a meta issue in there as well, and we

see that with SSR2 project as well. There's certain things volunteers cannot do. And regardless how much we would like to have run the community around something which look like project, the question is whether we really have to do that -- can we do that in the community. And if we can, what kind of support do we need? What should the division of labor be in the normal project sort of setup? What are volunteers doing? What is staff doing? Et cetera.

I think there are some meta issues in there as well that need to be discussed.

Thank you.

RAM MOHAN:

Thank you.

Jonne, there's Cherine in the queue. Do you want to respond to Patrik? Okay.

JONNE SOININEN:

If I could just respond to Patrik very quickly.

Yeah, I think this is one of the things that we also in the Board looked at, is really what is the -- what is the responsibility on -- on running a project. And that is something where we have questions as well; is it most probably would be -- would be --

could be better that if the org would run the project rather than the volunteers would run the project. And I think this is something that -- or some sort of mix of that. And this is something that we have to actually discuss as well, is that what is the appropriate mechanism to run these kind of projects if we choose to run it in this way.

RAM MOHAN:

Thank you.

Cherine.

CHERINE CHALABY:

So just a quick word, which is I understand the cost and the process issue, but let's not let this get into the way of talking about the substance; right? I mean, we spend half an hour on this project and it was all process and cost, whereas the substance is there's an underlying problem which the Board needs advice and needs closure on. And this problem has been going on for quite a long time; right? And we would not have come to SSAC if we did not need your advice and want your advice to get closure on this.

And because -- So that was an issue in the last round of new gTLDs. And if there is another subsequent round to come, it would be good to have that issue sorted out so that we don't fall

into the same position again of people requesting to delegate certain strings and we feel we can't delegate it and we haven't got really a clear policy of why. Like with .HOME, .CORP, .MAIL which we hang around for a number of years and at the end we said we will not delegate those for the moment and take your money back. I think we need to provide -- we owe everyone to provide more clarity on this issue.

So -- so again, there is a need for this work to be done, and let's find a way and not let sub- -- process and cost get in our way.

Thank you.

RAM MOHAN:

Thanks.

Rod, back to you on this one.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Yeah, and thank you, Cherine. That hits the nail on the head for us. We would -- We would much rather be talking about the cool stuff, the fun stuff for us; right? The geeky stuff. And we have -- the good news is while we've been doing this, we actually have had substantive conversations around this, what kind of data and would that data help illuminate this issue or not.

So we have had those discussions. And I'd much rather be having those discussions than this one. So totally agree with that.

RAM MOHAN: Okay. I'm going to -- Jay, if you want to get in, you'll have, like, 10 seconds or 20 seconds because we're almost out of time here.

JAY DALEY: I think we need to be very careful about having a dependency on round two with this project. The outcome of this project may not be something that can be a yes, no, or a red/green or anything like that in the future. And so even if we make that dependency, we employee regret it later depending on the outcome of this. So I strongly recommend that we look at the "act of God" clause, or whatever else it is, required for round two so if this ends up having a bad outcome for some people, that kind of clause can be invoked rather than having a dependency between the two.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, Jay.

I'm going to hand it back to you, Rod, and then to you, Cherine, to wrap the session up.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay. Well, I see that we're already past time so I'm going to say thank you to the Board for coming and spending time for us, and thank you for the SSAC members for participating as well.

CHERINE CHALABY: I would say thank you. This is very important dialogue because our mission is the security and stability of the identifier system, and it couldn't be a more important meeting to talk about this. This is at the heart of our mission so thank you for the dialogue. I appreciate it.

RON DA SILVA: Real quick, there's a pair of glasses over here? Does this belong to anybody before I put it in the lost and found? No? Okay. Thanks.

RAM MOHAN: That adjourns this meeting of the Board and SSAC. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]