EN

KOBE – SSAC Private Meet (1 of 5) [C]
Tuesday, March 12, 2019 – 09:00 to 10:15 JST
ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is the problem. We all have to have the same frame of reference, you know? And if you don't have it all ready, you need to learn it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah. If you know what it means when I say they'll never understand each other, they're just from different comic book universities.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Alright. Let's kick off our NCAP Work Party meeting. I'm actually not logged into the Zoom room. I assume we have one, right?

KATHY SCHNITT: There's no one logged in.

JAMES GALVIN: There is no one? You're watching it, though, Kathy? Excellent. Thank you.

So, let me just say hello and welcome Matt Larson over here, for anybody who hasn't noticed that he is here with us in the room representing OCTO for this project, so he will be … I don't know if it will be you or if you [inaudible]. Actually, I haven't had a chance to talk to you. It's going to always be you or you'll have someone else who's going to be doing this.

MATT LARSON: There is no escape for me.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: There's no escape from him?

MATT LARSON: For.

JAMES GALVIN: Alright. So, we have Jay Daley and myself up here, the NCAP Work Party. Thanks to everyone for coming, even though we really didn't tell you anything about this meeting except that it appeared on the SSAC schedule. So glad that people paid attention to the calendar and took note of that and didn't tell you anything explicitly about what was going on here.   So, let me just jump right in. Just go to the next slide.

MATT LARSON: Actually, Jim, I should probably give a more serious and [inaudible] if I may.

JAMES GALVIN: Absolutely.

MATT LARSON: So, yes, while we're making this up as we go along to a certain extent, I think that the main people on OCTO who will be working on this will be the people whom you've already had contact with. It would be Roy, Paul Hoffman, and me. So, some combination of the three of us will provide technical oversight, of course in conjunction with the NCAP Working Party.

JAMES GALVIN: A quick administrative question that comes to my mind is I'm assuming that you'll be the guy who will be subscribed to the NCAP admin list and not those other guys, but all of you will be subscribed to the discussion list. Maybe we can deal with that offline if you don't have an immediate answer, but …

MATT LARSON: I think the answer depends on what each of those groups end up doing, how everyone interacts, which I think we probably don't know … I mean, certainly there's no pressure from my

perspective to have more people on the NCAP admin list – I'm already on it – than necessary. I think Roy must already be on the NCAP work party mailing list. I don't know if I am or not, to be honest. So, off the top of my head, I think it would probably make sense if [inaudible] is willing to keep me on the NCAP admin list and it would probably make sense to have Roy, [Paul], and me on the NCAP Working Party list if you were amenable. But again, that's speaking now without knowing quite how all the touch points are going to work.

JAMES GALVIN: Okay. That sounds right to me, too. I don't know if Jay wants to add anything, but we'll sort it out anyway as we go along here, so that's fine. We'll figure it all out.

The important news here in all of this is when Jay and I got to figuring out what to do with this particular meeting is really this meeting is about level-setting, so just bringing us all back up to date on where we are and what we have and where we're going to go. So, we have a few slides here just to walk through to remind people about what has happened. Some things have been happening in the background over the last couple of months especially. Probably the big news of the day – it's somewhere actually on one of these slides, but I'm going to offer it up right up front here now anyway. The BTC … The board has

a pending resolution to approve that we'll launch study one. We'll get some slides here that go through some of this and we'll say more about that when we get there. So, we are actually essentially working up to being officially operational here. So, we'll just walk through some things here about where we are.

Folks should remember all of this stuff which is really on here. The last two bullets are new information, I suppose. A big part of this was working through with the board the relationship with OCTO and moving in a direction that made OCTO really the project manager for all of this. Sure, Jay, go ahead.

JAY DALEY: So, the more that we looked at this particular project, the more that there were a number of characteristics with it that made it very different from a previous SSAC working party. We had a very detailed board resolution, far more detailed than we've ever had before. We had a relatively fixed time table and we had a fixed budget and it was … This was a project. This is very, very different from a work party, which is sort of an exploratory type process. It was clear to us that we could not manage this in the same way that we managed other work parties because of those characteristics.

So, we asked the BTC and asked OCTO whether or not this could be treated as an ICANN project with OCTO managing it, and us

ICANN 64
COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

supporting and working with that project. That was agreed and there are implications for OCTO on that which are potentially quite big and Matt can speak to those if necessary to help us understand what that means for OCTO and how they'll be able to do this. But really it was the only way forward.

I think there's potentially a lesson learned here about the nature of that resolution and just how detailed it was and just what it set out and the implications that come from doing something like that, but for now, I think we're comfortable with the way forward of OCTO managing this.

So, just to finish off, to give you a practical example, that means that the whole process of selecting contractors will be entirely managed by OCTO. We will have nothing to do with that. Previously, we were talking about us having to create some firewall internally within SSAC and some people involved in it and some people not involved in it, but that will now not be something that we're doing. Any questions on this particular thing?

WARREN KUMARI: So, I think that this is a great outcome. I don't really see how SSAC could possibly have done this as a work party. But possible I fell off a mailing list or something? It feels a little as though, "Here, we did all this stuff. Here's the result." Not, "Hey, we're

planning on doing this." It feels like this happened and it was a great outcome, but was the work party people involved in this and I just missed the thread or was it people made a decision? Transparency questions here.

JAMES GALVIN: The short answer is no, not directly. Just being honest, from my point of view. We had talked about this a little bit. The project … We had the work that we want to do and that hasn't really changed. This really is all just about structure and management, so in a sense, maybe I'll throw Rod under the bus and say it's all his fault.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, no, no. I'm good.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm going to disagree slightly. We did do that. The main discussion was at an NCAP work party meeting where the only two members that turned up were Chris and Barry. So yeah, we did discuss there about that, that that was our concerns about that. Okay.

ICANN 64
COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just let me add that a lot of this was negotiating and went back and forth, BTC and OCTO and all that and that was stuff that was not really work party type things. Especially since there was money things being thrown around and part of the discussion and all that which we said up front was the admin committee so that members weren't going to be compromised by that. So, trying to maximize transparency while still getting things done on that political stuff, so to speak.

JAMES GALVIN: Yeah. It wasn't intended to hide anything. Just a little extra tidbit to add to all of that. Some of it was driven in … Another underlying piece to this was to separate all the financial discussions out from the work party and we did have discussions about that early on in mid last year or so and then we just started having all of those discussions internal on the NCAP Admin Committee.

Just to be clear to folks, the NCAP Admin Committee is just myself and Jay with Rod and Julie, and now Merike as the SSAC liaison and someone from OCTO which presumably will be Matt but we'll sort out exactly who that's going to be, just as an ordinary thing to make sure that our team are all involved in that. I was about to say next slide, but that's the next slide.

So, the status of the proposal. Yes. We went through a couple of iterations. I think actually I probably should have called that out here on this previous slide. No, we didn't actually … Somewhere we lost some of that detail. The timeline here. We went through a couple of iterations in evaluating the proposal because SSAC had submitted its proposal. Bernie had done a review and that resulted in a lot of the restructuring effort and another review and exercise on the budget and financials. Then as part of the discussions about OCTO being more directly involved in the management, they did a review and we had a couple of iterations on what the project should really look like and what some of the details were with OCTO.

What this slide gives you is an explicit look at a change that was made to the proposal, not in terms of the overall work that's to be done but we did move some things around here in particular and probably the most important thing is to understand that … Two things to understand.

One is that there will be explicit check points along the way here as this project moves forward and that's really an ordinary project management kind of responsibility. For something this large and this long in length, ICANN as a body would ordinarily do this especially with the amount of money that's involved here. So, just calling it out so that we're all aware of that and no one loses sight of that. So, that's one point here.

ICANN 64
COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

EN

The other thing was moving the development of the data to repository into study two and not doing that as part of study one. We had originally thought that we would try to get the data repository development work done as part of one in preparation for doing two but now we'll just do that in parallel with our ability to collect data when we get to study two.

Then there's the sentence at the bottom there. The board does have a pending resolution to authorize the OCTO proposed study one. So, any questions or comments about that? If you haven't looked at the proposal in a while … Oh, Geoff. Go ahead, Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: So, the reason that we moved the building of the data repository into study one, because it wasn't in our very first version of the proposal, was that we were under some pressure to reduce the overall timing of the project, so we looked at parallelizing.

So, OCTO have taken a few, which I'm perfectly comfortable with, to take it back out again so as to avoid doing any work that may not be necessary and that will have an impact on the timing, but that's I'm sure something that's been understood and we're not worried about that. So, this is a relatively innocuous change as far as we're all concerned about this.

ICANN 64 COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And Merike isn't here yet but we do not anticipate that the board will say no.

JAMES GALVIN: Are you talking about … Yeah. The vote that's supposed to happen in the short term. All indications are we'll go through this. Unless something pops up that says don't continue, even the check points that are supposed to happen I think we should work with the assumption that, for the most part, this is going to go forward unless something really interesting happens along the way that results in us not wanting to move forward.

This is just a quick look at tactics I suppose, where we are and what we actually have. So, we do have a proposal and there is a link there for that. We do have a statement of interest document. We're going to come back and talk about that a bit more in a moment as we get into next steps here. And we do have a definition of name collision. We've actually done a fair amount of work on that effort, so we have some words there for all of that. So, we have a pretty decent starting point as far as that's concerned.

And some of the details about division of labor is OCTO will be the project owner and manager for all the external parties as

ICANN 64
COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

well as the project overall. This says SSAC will prepare statements of work for contractors. It's a little bit of an overstatement. To a large extent, the proposal itself already has those statements of work, but we'll do a brief iteration with the work party to give people an opportunity to add a little more detail to what might be there and then it essentially becomes OCTO's document and they'll work that through their ordinary process to go look for contactors and make all of that happen.

We expect a relatively friendly relationship with OCTO.

GEOFF HUSTON: Very friendly.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Jim, I completely disagree. No, I would remove relatively and replace with the positive adjective of your choice.

JAMES GALVIN: Alright. Jay is beating me up over here in my ear, too. He's like, "What do you mean relatively? We're going to have a great, friendly relationship." So, we're hopeful that we'll—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

JAMES GALVIN:	That's right. I'm only halfway through this little cup of coffee. We'll be able to have some discussion with them about contractors when they're all selecting those, too. We'll be able to offer some opinions, but ultimately the decision will be theirs but we'll get some discussion with them about the technical merits of different contractors.

The important thing is for SSAC ultimately to focus on what it does best, which is actually the analysis of the data and of course producing the recommendations that we want. And we do expect to be able to work closely with the contractor so that we can iterate on some of the research and data analysis that's going on. There's a large amount of data there, and to some extent, as we start to ask questions of it, new questions will come up. So, we'll manage all of that. So, that will be our focus for the most part is doing the analysis part of all of this work and that's important.

Folks, I was just realizing that I did not send these slides out, so if you're looking for those links to expand them into something, we'll get those slides out shortly and then you'll be able to go look at this and come up to date. But, go ahead, Jay.

ICANN 64 COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

JAY DALEY:	Matt, if this is putting on a spot, then no need to answer, but is it possible of you to give us an indication of the resource implication of OCTO taking on this project and what it means for your end of thigs?
MATT LARSON:	So, it is early, but certainly a great deal of the work is going to be done by contractors, if not all of it. So, I think knowing how the team is loaded right now, there's just not a lot of spare cycles. So, I guess my assumption going in, it would be wonderful to have a contractor with sufficient skills that we can outsource basically the entirety of the work to them and that the OCTO role can be technical oversight and project management and that we won't have to get involved in day-to-day activities.
	But that's said even before the board resolution has been passed, so I think … I was telling Steve and I think I maybe even said this earlier. We're sort of making this up as we go along, to a certain extent. So, that's my answer now.
JAMES GALVIN:	Yes. It's good to have a great relationship with OCTO because we can sort out details as we go. It's going to be great. We don't have to make it great, either. It's already great.

So, where do we go from here? What do we actually have to do? Let's talk about some administrative things. And unfortunately, these are kind of important.

There's something which we kind of dropped, if you will, and let go of early on in this process. We spent an awful lot of time developing our statement of interest and this project will have an additional statement of interest, its own statement of interest.

Now, SSAC is not really used to this whole idea but this is an ordinary ICANN thing. If you've been involved in any other ICANN working group project, it's completely ordinary for a project to require a statement of interest of all the people who participate and they're all published and put up on the website, on the project site.

We at NCAP took a fair amount of time putting together … There's a standard template for the SOI that is used in ICANN working group and then each group gets to add its own set of additional questions that thinks are useful and important.

You'll want to go look a this and we will now be setting up some time here. We will make an announcement about it. But everybody who is going to participate in the group will be required to fill out and complete this SOI and it will get posted on the community Wiki page for this project and we'll be going

through the process of making all of that happen. So, that's one important thing. Let me pause there before we go any further and see if anybody has any questions or additional comments about that or concerns.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Is this just for the work party or for the whole SSAC?

JAMES GALVIN: So, it's just for the work party at the moment but I guess that's an interesting detail. It probably has to be everyone, doesn't it, in the end?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I've done these before. They're trivial. But …

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I guess they're trivial if you don't have a large corporation breathing down your neck, so okay.

JULIE HAMMER: Jim, we did discuss this way, way back in the process. What we were saying was we were going to stick as much as possible to our normal SSAC processes for providing comment and processing document and that means sharing with the whole

SSAC. And on that basis, I'd say everyone in SSAC needs to put in an SOI.

JAMES GALVIN:

Yeah. The document ultimately has to be reviewed by the full SSAC, so ultimately everyone will have to put one in. I would guess unless they withdraw. Then you wouldn't have to do it.

Let me get ahead of one issue here. Warren, I'm sorry, I have a suspicion you're going to ask this question because I think I remember you being one who was asking this issue. When we've gone through the review of the SOI, there are an additional seven questions I think. I think we're down to seven questions. We had quite a few more at one point early on and we actually did do a legal review with ICANN on some of these questions and they actually softened – ICANN Legal softened these questions for us on our behalf.

Everyone, of course, has to make your own decision about how you have to do these things, but the ordinary process that's expected is just that you just make your best effort to document what you think is relevant. No one is actually going to do any deep dive background check analysis of these things. That's not what the process is about. I know that there was a great deal of sensitivity about some of the questions and that's why even ICANN Legal softens some of the questions for us and they

emphasize to us that everyone should just do your own best effort and that will fine and everyone is going to be okay with that. Did you still have a question? Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Actually, my original question was how do we actually say, yes, I want to be part of the work party?

JAMES GALVIN: Now, the next thing. I'll just jump to the next [inaudible]. Need to announce the discussion group. So, a reminder about how we're going to work. We have the SSAC NCAP work party which will only have SSAC members on it. So, that will be, for our purposes, to have our own private discussions if there are issues that we want to have. But as this really is a relatively inclusive group from an NCAP point of view – remember, one of our requirements from the board is to be inclusive of other technical parties. We have a discussion group list that has actually been created and we are expected to ordinarily carry on the work of this group on this discussion group, so we will all have to subscribe to that discussion group.

In the same way, the community will subscribe to it and anyone will be allowed to subscribe if they complete an SOI. So, even for SSAC members who want to be part of the work party, we'll have

ICANN 64
COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

our internal SSAC list, but to be on the discussion group, you will need to complete an SOI, just like the community does. It also means that the discussion group is a list that anyone can subscribe to and listen to. But the only people who can post are those who have sent in an SOI. And that's an ordinary way in which ICANN does do groups. You can always have observers who can't post to the list but they can always receive them and read them. And this list will work that way, too.

So, let me just make sure I've answered your question, Warren. Yes? More or less? Okay, Julie?

JULIE HAMMER: We had also envisioned the need to have invited experts on the SSAC work party who would need to be added to that list after filling out an SOI and we haven't yet got to the stage of seeing who they might be, but that was also part of the inclusiveness.

JAMES GALVIN: Just to make an important distinction there, I want to color that a little bit and let me just check and make sure that you remember this the same way I do. So, the SSAC work party list will follow ordinary SSAC procedures. So, there's nothing special about the invited guest on that side of things, so that's just an ordinary thing that we get to do.

The reason for doing this discussion group and the SOI was, remember, there was a lot of discussion about how to have a process, if you will, for evaluating people to bring on the inside who are part of the community and instead of doing all of that, we went to this ordinary model here, where as long as you fill out an SOI you can join the discussion group. If the discussion group becomes a place where it's difficult for us to get work done, we may actually move some of our discussions to the work party list. And in that case, we're going to have to be careful. We may want to pick and choose a few people out of the discussion group who are actually helping us and contributing in a relatively – in a good way – and make them invited guests and put them into the work party so that we can use that for having discussions if the discussion group gets out of control. I hope I haven't blurred all of that and made that difficult. But we're just trying to find a way to manage this within ICANN's ordinary processes for facilitating developments of community work products and that's our proposal where we had gotten to, actually, towards the end of last year and all the discussions we had about this. I'll give people a chance to take that in and see if we have any questions or comments about it.

One other detail that's … Did you want to talk about it? Oh, okay. There's one other detail that we actually did not put a sub-bullet for. Jay will jump into that.

JAY DALEY: Just to remind you that we originally decided that there would be a third co-chair for this and we would be aiming for a non-SSAC person to be that third co-chair. We will put a call out for that when the various lists and stuff are up and running. We think we've identified a very likely candidate to put his name up for that. But if there's anyone else out there you think might be appropriate, then please just let us know. I think the particular skills we're looking for is someone who's going to be good at helping with reading the reports and things that come through from the contractors and stuff and somebody potentially who's going to have a little bit more time than Jim and I to do that sort of work.

JAMES GALVIN: Okay. That takes care of the administrative things. Oh, establish a regular meeting time is the last bullet that's up there. We're going to keep the same meeting time that we had before which is to anchor it at 4:00 PM Eastern on Wednesdays. That means it's right after the SSAC Admin Committee meeting. Steve?

STEVE SHENG: So, weekly, biweekly, monthly?

ICANN 64 COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

JAMES GALVIN: I expect it will be weekly, as long as we have an agenda, things to talk about. We are going to have a few things to get through here in the immediate term and then it's just going to depend on what's happening with the contractors and the study, so there will be probably a little bit of a break while we wait for OCTO to get the first contractor in study one going, but we'll see. Julie?

JULIE HAMMER: So, is that going to be locked to UTC time when …?

JAMES GALVIN: No, no. Locked to 4:00 PM Eastern. It's going to follow the Admin Committee meeting which is logged at 3:00 PM Eastern. So, we'll just have to watch that. Matt, you look thoughtful. Did you want to say something? No? Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Matt often looks thoughtful.

JAMES GALVIN: That's a good thing.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Relatively thoughtful. Sorry.

ICANN 64
COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

JAMES GALVIN: Alright. So, what are the substantive things to get to? And this is just to remind folks that the first bullet under there is a reminder that the board actually had two resolutions that it produced that caused us to create the NCAP Work Party. One was specific to corp, home, and mail and then there was the more general name collision problem space that they wanted us to look at. So, that's one work item that we can get to. We want to talk a little bit about when can we respond. And there's some later bullets and slides there on what that is, so we'll come back to have that discussion.

Then, of course, there's a preparation of the statement of work for study one, what we're going to do for that. I forget whether we added that to the last slide. We'll wait until the last slide anyway to get to that, too, and say what we're going to do there. But those are the two things in the short term that we need to get to and move on.

Then, that last big bullet down there is really just a reminder to us, again. We really need to complete our administrative work here. We've got to get those SOIs done and people subscribed to the list, so there's a little bit of process here on the backend that has to happen. We have to coordinate with ICANN to get some kind of announcement out about the discussion group so that people know to join and have the opportunity, give ourselves a couple of weeks to get started for that list and SOI to get

populated as well as a couple of weeks for SSAC to do their SOIs. So, we have a little bit of a timing thing here. We won't really get started on any of the substantive work until mid third week of April, probably. Let me just pause there. Any thoughts or comments? Matt?

MATT LARSON: Jim, did you say you were going to talk more about the statement of work on a subsequent slide?

JAMES GALVIN: Yeah. I think it's there. What we wanted to do there, I forget whether the words are there or not, but if they're not, we'll get to them here in the next slide which is … Yeah, we don't actually say on the [previous slide]. So maybe we'll stay here and talk about the statement of work, what we wanted to do. Do you want to say what you and I just talked about before when we were [inaudible] here? I'll start it off here.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, you start off.

JAMES GALVIN: Okay. So, what we really want to do with the statement of work is the project proposal itself really should be what we want the statement of work to be. Oh, you want to do it? Jay?

JAY DALEY: So, the statement of work, [this 31], is relatively straightforward. It is looking at previous research and finding useful things that have come from that and gaps in that that we should then work forward with into study two.

Having said that, though, I think we all interpret that slightly differently. So, one different interpretation I've seen is that some people think that means getting the original data that was used by [inaudible] or JAS in looking at again. Others think it just means looking at those reports to see what they have to say.

There are other interpretations as well as to whether or not data that was, say, used four or five years ago is still relevant today or whether we have to look at things again because things may have changed.

So, what we're going to do is effectively just have a round table of work party members to ask them what they think study one means, get from them all of those opinions and those views about that, write that up in some coherent fashion and send that to OCTO so that when OCTO then does its what does it think

ICANN 64
COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

study one means, it has our input of what we think it means and we can then get some sort of plan from that, that either addresses most of that or deliberately doesn't address other things because it's got specific reasoning not to do that. We think that would be the most helpful thing for OCTO if we try to give some detail then about what we think study one means.

JAMES GALVIN: That sounds fantastic because one thing I was waiting to say and now seems like a good time is we intend to follow the standard ICANN RFP process to select a contractor which Jay has been involved with for selecting the open data provider last year. There's a fair bit of documentation that goes with that, and obviously no matter what process we used we need a clear, detailed, crisp statement of work so that people who are bidding know what they're bidding and we can judge them on have they done the work? So to the extent that SSAC can help us create that, that's absolutely vital.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: For me, the concerning part is just the timing of how all that comes together. I'm looking at this and I'm thinking it's going to be May before we really have – and probably even mid-May – before we've had a chance to really work through all this and get

our input to you that you can then turn around however you want before you issue the RFP.

I don't know how to speed that up in any way given that we have to do this whole discussion group and get it off the ground and we need a few weeks to do that and I figure we have to have at least probably two or three meetings even on the mailing list to get through the statement of work for study one. Maybe we can speed some of that up. I'm just trying to put that timing stuff out there and see if you have any thoughts about that or concerns.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Well, then, the other issue is the ICANN RFP process only goes so fast. I don't know the fastest it can go, but I don't think it's much quicker than about two months. Jay, do you recall the timetable? I can look in my e-mail [inaudible] records.

JAY DALEY: I think that is the fastest it can go, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The process is what it is. We can't change it. That's the whole value-add of doing the standard RFP process.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It does, as I think about the calendar of doing all of that, it calls into question whether NCAP needs to meet at the next ICANN meeting. I guess it just sort of depends on where we are, but just calling that out. So we're not really going to get started for a little while yet because the contractors will need some time to start doing what they're doing and we have to see how fast work comes back to us. I'm just thinking out loud about whether NCAP is really going to be meeting weekly. We will hear for a little while, while we get all of this going and then there will be another lull while we wait for stuff to come out of study one for us to look at.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: May I? One question is if we can parallelize the RFP and SSAC's creating statement of works, if we can go forward with an RFP that won't have the ultimate level of detail that would be in a contract with whomever we engage. I don't know the answer to that. But that would be ideal if we could, so that we're not doing this [inaudible] because we certainly have a reasonable idea. I think we know to a certain extent what study one involves. Certainly, I think well enough to put it in a description in an referral, I think. Hopefully, if we don't, we've got a larger issue.

ICANN 64
COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

JAMES GALVIN:	No, I think that's right. Again, the project proposal itself is intended to represent the statement of work. We probably should do an iteration with the study two and study three things like we're doing with study one. Yeah. We'll just have to work through. We'll add detail as part of the evaluation of contractors when we have it and presuming we'll have some opportunity to work some of that in. Go ahead, Ron.
ROD RASMUSSEN:	A couple of thoughts on process here and work party effort, potential work party effort. First, on the creation of the RFP and all that, that's kind of an intense activity. It's a gating activity. So, I'd suggest maybe having – contemplating having an additional extra meeting or two to help move that along, potentially. Then, the post-RFP, people working on things, I think this is something to have as a discussion is how much interaction with contractors and questions that they have and helping with them do their job would the work party have.
	I think that, obviously, we don't want to just say, "Hey, here's a black box. Go off and do that and give us an answer back." That will lead to sub-optimal results, so we need to think about how we want to manage that part. I know you've been thinking that.

[MATT LARSON]: Yeah. And also, along those lines, OCTO, we don't want to be a bottleneck. I have no desire to be any kind of, say, gatekeeper between SSAC and the contractor. So, we'll have to figure out the rules of engagement, as it were. But from my perspective, as long as we don't overwhelm the contractor, I think any communication – all communication is beneficial.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The keyword in my mind in all of this – and just me speaking personally – has been iterative. I fully expect that the rules of engagement allow for SSAC to iterate with the contractors in all cases at all times. So, partial results from them are always helpful. We will add questions as we go through things, especially during study two when we're actually trying to look at real data and figure out what we're doing. We expect to work with whoever is actually conducting the analysis to develop the questions and go back and ask the questions again. We're going to need an iterative kind of process here. So, it's good. I just want to emphasize that, see if anyone balks at it. Sounds like you're on board with all that, too. So, that's just an important part of evaluating the contractor, that they're willing to work with that kind of model.

In essence, we want them, really, to sit in and be part of the working group in that way, so that they can be hearing. We'll

probably want someone to join the discussion group and to be part of it and they're working with us and talking to us about what's going on so that we can be working interactively. That's what I would expect.

JAY DALEY: Yeah. I think we need to manage that because that means they could be doing a lot of interaction that they're charging for that really means listening to people going backwards and forwards and that sort of stuff. It's great being paid to do that but we might want to use their time more efficiently.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, I understand. So, manage it, yes. There's a difference between giving them something actionable to do and just making sure that they're keeping up with what we're doing so that they can see the context that goes with the questions we're asking. So, yes. Okay. So, that's the work study one stuff.

JAY DALEY: So, does anybody have any questions or does anyone think we've missed anything on the actual practicalities of where we're going to move forward? Steve?

STEVE SHENG: So, in the discussion of the statement of work process, are we … Is the SSAC planning to exclude those potential members who is going to bid for the study?

[JAMES GALVIN]: Not in the development of the statement of work because it's going to be done in the discussion group. It's up to them to not be present. It's up to them to exclude themselves. Okay, yes?

JULIE HAMMER: I thought that what we had agreed was that anyone who participates in the development of the statement of work automatically precludes themselves from bidding for the work.

[JAMES GALVIN]: People need to understand that. Okay. What I'm suddenly concerned about is we were doing all of that when we were having the private work party list that we were doing things on and that was [for] SSAC members. This work here now is going to happen on the discussion group. It's going to be public anyway.

What we're taking out of this is all of the financials are out of what is now public and no part of the budget or the hours will be …

JAY DALEY:

Sorry, can I answer this? I think we need a two-step process. The first one is the public general requirements, the general thoughts about what people think should happen which we put together that goes to OCTO. Then there's a separate private one which is the actual discussion of the details of the statement of work that comes out of that, because I think OCTO will need our support in producing that and that's the bit that will need to be restricted.

[JAMES GALVIN]:

So, just to say that again to make sure this is crystal clear. So no, you can be part of the discussion group and you can be part of this general requirement of the statement of work because it's all public anyway. It's on the public discussion group. It's the private part when we have the detailed interaction with OCTO, if they want to have discussions about level of effort and how they're translating this into the RFP. That will be private and only done with the Admin Committee.

If there's any questions or concerns about that, we're going to have to sort that out as we get into this, but my feeling is, no, SSAC members, even if they're going to … They can be part of the discussion group because anybody from the community at large can join the discussion group, and if they want to join it,

they can do that and they'll put out a statement of work and even if they're going to bid on it, that's okay because they're not going to be part of the budget process. It's all public anyway. Yeah, there's no advantage.

We're even not going to have any financial discussions on the internal work party list. So, it's not that conflict of interest goes away, but you really have to decide for yourself how far you want to go with that. But it should be set up in a way that no one actually is excluded from the discussion group. Matt is being thoughtful. I just want to make sure he's taking all that on and all that makes sense to you based on—

MATT LARSON: I agree with that reasoning.

JAY DALEY: Steve, you look slightly perplexed.

STEVE SHENG: I would say those who participate in the discussion of the statement of work I think definitely have an advantage because you understand it's not just the work themselves but the reason and thinking behind it.

[JAMES GALVIN]:   Suzanne?

SUZANNE WOOLF: Yeah, but if that discussion is taking place on a public mailing list – I've been listening to this very carefully and if that discussion is taking place on a public mailing list, the perspective contractor has no advantage over their potential competition, just by being a member of SSAC, because the discussion is taking place in public.

STEVE SHENG: As long as it's a public list, then there's a level set.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And we're going to be careful to keep the financials and level of effort, if you will, discussions internal to the Admin Committee at OCTO.

[JAMES GALVIN]:   Okay. That leaves us with one last discussion point, topic, to talk about for this meeting, this agenda. This is actually the last slide. Folks may have observed. We certainly have gotten hit with the general question in public forums and meetings that we've had in the past and the community certainly has not forgotten about this, although maybe SSAC members aren't getting hit with it.

Certainly our admin committee here has been hit with it. I know I've been asked separately by people. But there are questions about the relationship between the NCAP work. There are two questions, really. Questions about the relationship between the NCAP work and the launching of the next round of new gTLDs and then in general there's a question of the relationship of the NCAP work with the subsequent procedures PDP policy development work going on in ICANN.

One of the work products out of that subsequent procedures PDP will be the Applicant Guidebook for future rounds, certainly at least the next round of new gTLDs and presumably the production of the Applicant Guidebook will have to happen before they actually launch a new program, so the question is in part about how soon they can launch a new program and whether NCAP has to finish first and then there's also the question of whether our work will influence their development of the Applicant Guidebook. So, that's sort of the context for this discussion point.

What I put here in the slide in the second bullet is SSAC has been very clear about what we've said about the timing of the next round, relative to NCAP. We are trying not to make the decision. We're leaving that decision to the board and the community to sort out but we've been very clear that we believe there are security and stability issues with launching a new round without

fully understanding name collisions. Implicit in that of course is that there's an expectation that our work finishes and it comes to closure but we're just trying to leave some wiggle room there for someone else to decide how they want to do this.

We've explained this clearly in our responses to the public comment to questions that came in, in response to the initial draft of the project proposal a year ago. So, that's kind of where that is and we'll continue to repeat all of that issue.

Nonetheless, there is an opportunity for us to think about how we will interact or if we will interact with the SubPro working group and what advice can we give them about how our work may or may not influence their production of the Applicant Guidebook.

Those bullets up there represent … I'll take ownership of them. They really are just my point of view about thinking about our work and where it is most likely to influence what they're doing and when we would be most prepared to have something substantive to say to them.

But this is certainly open for discussion. This is an opportunity for people. Consider it an open question. We don't necessarily have to decide this today but there are things to say here and we should think about what we want our relationship with them to be and how we want to do that. Jay, go ahead.

JAY DALEY: Just a reminder, we had a lengthy conversation on some of the work party calls where we agreed that we believe that there were different risks at different stages here that effectively we believe that there was a risk in having the call for applications to go out before the end of study two and that we believe that there was a risk in having delegations go ahead before the end of study three. So, the reasoning being that … The first one is a bit complicated but there were a variety of reasons why we thought that we needed to have an understanding of the problems so far before people could start applying for those things to prevent people making applications that were obviously bound to be rejected and that people potentially trying to deliberately bias through the use of whatever botnets or something, sending data to try to prevent somebody getting a particular string.

Then, the second bit about the delegation bit was that because study three is aiming to understand the mitigations that we felt that delegations of anything that was considered potentially a name collision string needed to be wait until we've done the study of mitigation so that those could then possibly be applied to that.

So, that's all we've said so far and we said that in the public comment and we've had that discussion about it.

The other thing to point out is that the people who are running SubPro and who are trying to drive SubPro are the same people who responded to our public comment with a number of things such as could SSAC please make a statement that SubPro should not be held up or so the next round should not be held up by NCAP? They asked us to very specifically state that and we refused saying that that was not our job to make that statement. I think we repeated that at least 13 times throughout the response to the public comment.

So, we can expect I think significant pressure from the SubPro people for us to try to enable the next round to go ahead but of course ultimately this is not our decision at all. This is the board's decision. Rod?

JAMES GALVIN: I may add one thing, Rod, if you don't mind. In the large, what this is really about is managing our relationship of the NCAP work with the broader ICANN community and SubPro is there. We might want to look to have an opportunity to have a little bit of a discussion with them about how we see all of this stuff but it's true we want to be very clear about our messaging so we want to have a little discussion about what explicitly our

messages are so that we can then have a joint meeting with them of some sort or some definition of joint meeting and just clear the air and establish that we're willing to work with them and make sure that we will offer them advice along the way as we have it and promote a better relationship with that particular group in general. I apologize. Rod?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Then, Merike after me. She may have the same point or same point from a slightly different perspective. So, at the meeting of the SO/AC chairs, leadership, and ICANN staff and some of the board or ICANN policy folks on the board – Goran and Chris Disspain and I think maybe one or two other board members – that is kind of a kick off to the process where the SO/AC chairs kind of have an opportunity to share what's going on and all that, this came up, specifically from Keith Drazek who is chair of the GNSO. I expect a quasi … I said, "Don't make it formal, please." But a quasi-formal ask for us to do an informal coordination with SubPro. And we had a discussion at that time saying, well, we could probably put together a couple of people from the SubPro and a couple of people from our team, so they can understand and maybe hear for the 14th time where we're at at this.

But also, there's a little bit more subtlety to this in that the PDP itself is developing policy and policy is kind of one level of it and then you have the actual application of that policy and the operationalization of it, which is different, which is the implementation phase which ends up being drafting of the Applicant Guidebook which is a process which takes a fair amount of time to do.

So, the burning question for them is are there policy implications at their level now that can be answered after study one, after parts of study two, etc. I think that's the place where we can have a realistic conversation with them about what outcomes to expect, etc.

This also came up in conversation with Cherine and other board members as well that I've had during the week. So, it's likely to even come up in our meeting Thursday as well that we will have … There's concern that we are talking with the SubPro team on this. And Merike, I assume you wanted something on the same …

MERIKE KAEO: Yeah. I think it's going to be very useful if during the board session that we have, we actually have some explicit comments or questions and make sure that we have the right expectations set with everyone. Also, I've had a lot of discussion around NCAP

EN

with the BTC and I haven't yet sent Rod the e-mail, but having a lot of checkpoints as 31 gets going I think will be quite useful and there had been that notion of having monthly meetings between BTC, OCTO, and the SSAC and yesterday I started thinking, "Oh, shoot, yet another meeting." I thought why not in the monthly BTC meetings have a 10-minute check? Because certainly OCTO is represented there and SSAC. So, I'm going to recommend that and then that way there will be monthly checks also within the BTC. So, I think that would help as well.

[JAMES GALVIN]: I had a conversation with Akinori last night reminding him about what we talked about before. Steve and I talked about maybe having staff put together some times that we could potentially meet. So, we need to coordinate all that and figure out how we want to do that. Because I think there may be, at least for NCAP, there may be a need to have a little bit more than a 10-minute section, but we need to figure that out.

MERIKE KAEO: Yeah. The intent was to set something up specifically periodically and then when it was identified that we really should have a separate meeting, then set that separate meeting.

ICANN 64 COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So, not to muddle things too much but given that this is roughly the same community that we're going to probably be running into the most issues with EPDP 2.0 or phase two or whatever it's called, do we want to try to figure out some way to do quid pro quo here and try to leverage our helping them out with an informal or formal statement on SubPro as a way to get some of the things we want on PDP 2?

I'm serious. Ultimately, this is a political process and we need to be honest about that and we need to identify what is the most important to us as a security community and if there is some kind of a claw-back model in the next phase of the SubPro – so, if we identify something later on – I don't see why we can't be quite congenial on this topic if it helps us get what we want on PDP.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I actually agree with Chris. I guess I'll frame it in this way, though. We may not want to do anything in a public way and in a public forum and in that open discussion, but I think you're absolutely right. We have to seek to align our interests here in the background and go on with this. So, we need to figure out what that means and what the right way is to do that. I'm sorry, that's how you get stuff done around here. It really just is. Go ahead, Jay.

JAY DALEY: Yeah. A couple of things. I'm not convinced these are the same people because the problems are the privacy advocates within NCUC, NCSG and stuff, and they're not really that involved in SubPro. They are to a degree. And those that are involved in SubPro I think are already aligned with.

The biggest issue is that we actually, I suspect, are the intellectual property community trying to over-align with us so that we ride on the coattails of security to explain why they're doing their things. Anyway, I think it's all far too political and we shouldn't be attempting it.

JAMES GALVIN: Well, we can have a political discussion at some point about how you get votes through the GNSO Council and the like. I think that the general thought of being helpful and cooperative to folks that may have different opinions than us on other issues, it's always good to build political capital. Well, we'll see from Tim's lightning talk today an opportunity we've had to do exactly just that in the last week and I've been taking full advantage of it, so I'm aware of [inaudible]. But thank you for bringing that up. It's always good to think of ways to build relations and favors.

ICANN 64
COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I was just about to say we're actually over time. We're eating into our own coffee break officially. It's all Chris's fault, otherwise we would have been right on time. Any other questions on this topic at all and any other business? Let's just do both of them together. Does anybody else have anything else they want to offer or say? If not, then thanks very much. Watch for some stuff to start to happen on the mailing list. We've got some admin things to do and we'll do our best to move that along quickly. We're adjourned.

KATHY SCHNITT: Everybody knows, coffee break, and it's RSSAC at 10:30 in room Ruby.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN 64
COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019