

KOBE – SSAC Private Meet (3 of 5) [C]
Tuesday, March 12, 2019 – 13:30 to 15:00 JST
ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

KATHY SCHNITT: Hi, everyone. We have Geoff Huston on Zoom joining remotely, so we might want to get started.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Review work party.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hello, Geoff.

GREG AARON: Hi. Ben and Lyman and I are co-chairing this committee. Lyman is not online right now, is that correct?

KATHY SCHNITT: [He's not.]

GREG AARON: All right, so here's where we are. We are in the homestretch. The work of the independent examiner is done. They sent in their recommendations a few months ago. By the way, I touched base with Greg Rafert and Chris Llop from the Analysis Group. They

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.

are here this week, so they contacted me pretty much just to say hi because they're done with their work. But they wanted to know if we were on schedule to provide back our feedback to the board, and I said yes.

So our current work is to fill out what's called the FAIP form. This is a form provided by ICANN staff that they're using in the reviews. Basically, there is a section for each of the recommendations that the independent examiner made. Now the working group has gone through all the recommendations and we triaged them. Everybody filled out a spreadsheet and there was a high level of agreement among the working party members about which recommendations we want to check off on and say, "Yeah, those are great. We agree. We will implement them." And then there are a few where we are going to explain why certain recommendations might not be something we want to do, and we will explain why.

We're going to put all that information into this form. Lyman actually has been working on it recently. Kathy helped us fill in some of it. Some of the material also includes feedback from the admin team. It's our goal to get this form done basically within the next month. It's not due I think until May or June, but we want to go ahead and get it done. And then we have to send it up to the whole SSAC so you can review it.

We then send it into staff, and then a group of board members will take a look at it. They're basically the team of board members who do institutional reviews such as this one. Eventually, we'll meet with them, probably in the fall. But the idea is we meet with them, they talk with us about how the review went. We'll probably focus especially on areas where we're diverging from the recommendations. Then we know which ones we'll implement and we take care of it. And then we're done.

So the process is moving on schedule, and we might be done with it in the fall potentially, depending on when the board has the time to take care of this. And then we'll be good for another six or seven years.

Today, we can talk about where we diverge and what the work party will recommend up to the larger group. And then the working party has to fill in some stuff. But mainly, where we diverge is in some areas where the reviewer suggested we do more work in certain areas. Not so much because we're not doing an adequate job anywhere, but there are some places that would impose a lot of additional hours and responsibilities on the members, and we do feel we need to push back on that a little bit.

There are some things that we just don't probably have time to do, and we also don't want to impose certain additional requirements on our support staff. And there are some things which may not fit within the character of what SSAC is and how it does things. So we can talk about those things.

One thing to keep in mind overall is that the review has overall been very smooth and very positive. Some of the reviews that happen in other parts of the organization discover major problems that need to be addressed. SSAC has none of those kinds of problems to worry about. Overall, this review is more about continuous improvement and evolution but overall recognizes that things are going pretty well and SSAC is fulfilling its responsibilities in a professional fashion and everybody is working really hard. So where we're going to push back is where we cannot become superhumans and do too much because we are getting more and more requirements on us from the community.

Ben, do you want to add anything?

BEN BUTLER:

What Greg said. Admittedly, I think this review went very smoothly. I was a bit behind because of EPDP commitments and just catching up on some of the comments and feedback that some of the work party put into the triage document. And I just

want to thank people for their thoughtful comments, and let's just fill in the form and get it done, I guess.

GREG AARON:

So, again, everybody in SSAC is going to see this document in another month or two when it's finalized and we want to kick it up to everybody for a final review. We do want the entire group to endorse it and have the opportunity to ask any questions about the text that it contains. But we can scroll through it today. By the way, how long are we slotted for? An hour? Okay. As we close down the hour, the other thing we want to establish is our schedule for our next set of meetings. Who has control of the board?

KATHY SCHNITT:

[I've got it.]

GREG AARON:

You've got it? Okay, you want to just scroll down, Kathy? A lot of this we can click through pretty basically. We'll touch on the ones that are a little more interesting.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Can you increase the font size?

GREG AARON: That's not what's in Zoom is it? Or is it different?

KATHY SCHNITT: No. [inaudible] different. I just can't do both at the same time.

GREG AARON: Okay, I'll go by what's on the big screen. Let's go down to the first recommendation. We'll just go in order. Okay, obviously we have a purpose. We agree.

Number 2 please. "Ensure that each advisory report includes a high-level summary." In general, we do that already. This is mainly a recommendation to make sure that we're considering our audience so they can understand the high-level issue we're dealing with, something we need to keep in mind as we write. So, yeah, we agree.

[Number] 3. "Ensure that the board liaison reviews and provides feedback on both the summary and full document before submission." This is something that is in our operational procedures; however, they did notice some gaps in how this was executed. So they are reminding us of the importance of doing this. So we agree. And also Merike has been thinking about the second half which is the talking points that she wants to go into board discussions with. So we're good there.

Number 4. The admin team has also been working on Recommendation 4 which is making sure that the board request register adequately captures everything. One of the things we noticed is that there is a gap in the follow-up on our advice. In a lot of cases, the board has accepted our advice, has asked that something happen that's often a directive to the staff, but then we don't find out what the follow-up is. So the board advice register ends but not at the logical conclusion, so there are going to be some adjustments made to that. And that's good for us because we can see our advice actually getting accepted and things happening.

So next is 5. This is part and parcel to that, making sure that the actions are followed up on. We're doing some of that actually at this meeting with CZDS. That's follow-up on some recommendations from SAC097, for example.

Rod?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Just as an aside, any of the CZDS work party members, have we done a coordination meeting with Russ?

GREG AARON: Yeah, it's tomorrow at 8:00.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Awesome. Just since it's up there, I want to make sure.

GREG AARON: Yeah, we've got that scheduled for tomorrow morning. And I think the admin team has done an ongoing review of where all of our outstanding advice is, correct?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah, that's on the list.

GREG AARON: One of the problems we're trying to solve here is also at various times there has been a long gap between when we provided advice and when the board took a look at it or when the board took action on it and then when the staff did what the board asked them to take care of. In some cases, those gaps were years long. We're looking on closing those down. If we give timely advice, we also want some follow-up that's timely.

ROD RASMUSSEN: I'll go over our meeting with the [AAR] that we did over the weekend in our admin update.

GREG AARON:

Thank you. All right, Number 6 please. “For time sensitive issues, we should establish deadlines that take into account the decision timelines of other ICANN entities.” Now the idea here is we’re part of a community and we want to provide advice at the right times so people can think about what we’re saying. This also comes out of some work we’ve done in the past. Like we gave some advice about emojis and IDNs and things.

The independent examiners note that we have been working hard to provide timely advice and to give the advice at the appropriate times which includes the public comment periods. We’ve done a lot of correspondences as part of public comments over the last couple of years. So we’re taking advantage of that more. We want to continue to do so, so we’re going to note that. We’re also going to say some of our advice is not on a timeline. It’s on our timeline because we need that time to do the research and so forth. So generally, we agree.

Number 7 please. This is a piece of advice that says we “should develop a process to, when possible, provide a ‘quick look’ at a particular issue for the board. Such ‘quick looks’ might not be the result of a consensus-driven process but rather would disclose differing opinions.”

Two things to note about this one. We’re probably going to disagree for the following reasons. One, this seems to be the

result of one or two board members thinking this was a good idea because they were interviewed by the independent examiner. So this is not a request from “the board,” but it’s an idea perhaps raised by one or two board members. So that’s the weight it has. It’s just somebody’s idea potentially.

But the problem we’ve been discussing is the weight of SSAC advice comes from the fact that we’ve done our homework and we are speaking as an entire group. And we cannot lose that weight when we give advice. We also don’t want to be in a position where we don’t do our homework and don’t think of all the things we need to think of or have not adequately analyzed something.

So we’re probably going to reject this one. Now we do want to think about ways in which if there’s a really timely topic, we can do our work better or faster. But this particular mechanism might not be well-suited to our group and our function within the community.

Any questions? Warren?

WARREN KUMARI:

You said the weight of our advice comes from the fact that it’s got full consensus blah, blah, blah. That isn’t necessarily a “and it should be official SSAC advice,” right? There are certain topics

like, “Do you think emojis would be a really good idea in domain names?” that we don’t need to have a three-month work party to all get around and discuss and come to consensus and write a long document on. One would assume that the board asking Rod, “Hey, what do you think?” and Rod sending a short e-mail like, “Hey, do people think emojis are a good idea?” Seven people chime in and say, “It sounds like the worst idea ever,” and that would be a “quick look.” They’re not asking for a whole, long, comprehensive document. They’re like an easy way to get an answer to a question.

GREG AARON:

Yeah, my concern is that if we go with the full thing where there are multiple different opinions and there’s no relative [weight or] recommendation, all they get is a whole bunch of random opinions and it actually is more likely to confuse them than give them clarity.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

But there are cases where there’s a diversity of opinion on some subject, and at the moment we’re precluded from ever offering that pretty much except as individuals. So we just had a work party about IOT and the distinction between a report and an advisory was made. And it sounded like the report didn’t need to

be quite as authoritative because we weren't making recommendations. We were talking about the scope of stuff.

GREG AARON: I think Jay is next and then Rod.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: We also have Geoff Huston in the queue. Geoff, go ahead.

GEOFF HUSTON: I assume you can. In the triage document, it says unanimous agreement. We now need to come up [with] what to say for our rationale. And I'm trying to understand whether that means unanimous agreement not to accept it or unanimous agreement to accept it. Thank you.

JAY DALEY: Thanks. There are a number of occasions where I've had an initial view about something and I've changed my mind based on the things that other people have said. Where had I stuck with my original opinion, I would have been laughably wrong. So I'm slightly concerned about doing something that is so early in the process because I think that we learn an enormous amount by the conversation and discussions that bring things out and that that's where the real value is in that conversation. And

giving a view before that conversation, I think, is actually potentially shallow and misleading.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: To answer Geoff's question, I believe it was 100% that we needed to review this one and come back with something. Not whether or not we needed to agree or disagree with it.

GREG AARON: One of the things we could do here is say we understand the impetus for this, but the mechanism you're suggesting might not be the way to go.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Right.

GREG AARON: But here are the issues that we're concerned about. In the working group one of the things also somebody said was we don't get these kinds of questions from the board usually. The board asks us questions fairly seldomly, and they're usually complex questions. If they want to ask us more questions, then let's talk about that and how we interact.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Right. So that gets to the substantive point I wanted to make here is that this all depends on context. We actually do get a ton of questions from the board all the time, but they're not officially transmitted as a board resolution yada, yada, yada. They are some board member comes to some SSAC member and says, "What do you think about X?" That's one edge of the extreme to – or a community member, not even, let's take the board out of it. Oh, actually, that board is in this one on this recommendation, so I guess we have to include them. To the BTC may have a question, "Do you guys think you should comment on RSSAC037?"

So this gets into it kind of depends. I think the mechanism as an official thing that we're going to provide this "quick look" mechanism is probably not the right solution. However, this gets into areas where the concept of a standing work party or something like that in a certain area of expertise might be able to provide some technical feedback about a particular issue that might guide a later on real question. So this is more of a way of providing an easier way for us to have a thought about something that is not formally advice that we can then provide in an informal fashion.

I think that's where the frustration is. It's not with necessarily us not answering questions because we just don't get that many official questions. It's more the, "Hey, what do you think about

this?” and then silence because we don’t answer it. So I think that there’s a way of teasing this out and saying there are ways we can address issues that might come up that have a technical nature where we might be able to give some preliminary advice. But I wouldn’t call it a formal “quick look” process or something like that. You just don’t want to get it too formalized, but we internally can do things to be a little more proactive, interactive when things come up where we might actually help the board keep itself from making a bad decision about something. That’s [where] I’m looking at it.

GREG AARON:

All right, I see Jay, and then I’m going to close the queue. And, Barry, you want to go? Okay, why don’t you go first?

BARRY LEIBA:

Thanks. It’s kind of along the line of that. I would not like to say no to this. What I would like to do is spin it a different way. Maybe the “when possible” should be “when appropriate.” But I would like to leave ourselves open to saying, “Yeah, this may be appropriate in some situations and we can do that.” When you say that the weight of our recommendations is that they’re consensus-based, yeah, and nobody is talking about changing that. But there may be times when some sort of quick look process is useful, and I would like to be able to do that. So my

response to this to them would be, yes, we will put that in our abilities when we think it's appropriate to do.

JAY DALEY:

I have two specific areas of concern about this. One is it being mistaken for advice. I don't think that this can be in any way advice as Rod was saying. It needs to be very clear about that so whoever is doing this doesn't turn it into advice.

The second thing is this very, very odd phrase at the end "but rather would disclose differing opinions." It's an odd phrase. It's like it's looking for something there. Sorry?

GREG AARON:

I know what [inaudible]. One of the things that was in the back of our minds is we had a situation like this not too long ago with NCAP and board members started going to individuals.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

KSK roll.

GREG AARON:

Or KSK roll. And our advice was not particularly clear in some ways and then board members also started going to individual SSAC members, and there was a little bit of a confusion.

Last. Please make it quick, and we'll move on.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

I think some of the reason that board members ended up going around and asking other people is because it's often really hard to get an answer out of us. Because when they ask a question we say, "Great. We'll consider forming a work party and put it somewhere in the prioritization list and get back to you in a year or two." At which time they're like, "Grr!" Okay, that's a bit extreme, but we do take an incredibly long time to answer, and our answer is almost never yes or no. It's 14 pages of stuff that they have to wade through and try and interpret.

GREG AARON:

The problem with KSK rollover is they were evaluating risk and asked us what we thought about risk because they had a big decision to make. It was an example [of a] thing where we wanted to consider the angles.

So anyway, good feedback from everybody. We'll note all those, and then we'll work up something that reflects our conversation.

So let's move on to Number 8. "Formalize process for setting our priorities and identifying emerging issues." We've been doing some of this already, so the expectation is we'll continue. Rod?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Just going to add after the RSSAC meeting, their review came up with a more specific recommendation on this [and] a work plan. So we might want to actually say – when we were talking about doing that, we were talking about this as actually something we were trying to work toward. So we may not want to commit ourselves to it, but I thin internally that might be a way we want to try and go. And we’re already doing that a little bit, but a little more formalized so we can have a better – because we’re trying to allocate resources that’s both staff and our own people expertise wise.

GREG AARON: Right. And those will be the kinds of things we can note in this form saying, “Here’s actually what we’re doing right now.” So we’re working on this kind of thing in the following ways. This one comes out of a question in part from the community. People saying, “How does SSAC decide what to do, and are they looking at things that might be of interest to me?” or whatever. So that’s where it comes from. So we’ll agree, and we’ll elaborate here.

Recommendation 9. As we set priorities, we take that into account as we do membership and recruitment. We’ll talk a little bit more. There are some later questions about recruitment that

we'll get to. In general, we kind of try to do this anyway, and it's not controversial, I guess.

[Number] 10. This goes with 8. This is saying just “explicitly communicate the reasons” around why we choose the topics we do. It says, “New requests should be compared to the current set of priorities and communicated about.” I have to read the body of this recommendation again to understand and to refresh my memory about what the “new requests” are. People in the community sometimes want to suggest topics for us to look at.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Yeah, I don't remember what our consensus was on this one, but looking at it with fresh eyes we're not going to communicate out our internal decision-making process on how we prioritized somebody's pet project to the bottom of our list versus taking it on right away.

GREG AARON:

Okay, 11. We should continue to ask for money when we need it. No unfunded mandates. So we've been doing that with the NCAP and staffing and travel, and we will agree.

[Number] 12, internships. Now you'll see several recommendations scattered throughout that deal with our workload: trying to keep up with what's going on in the

community, provide input to projects like the EPDP and so forth, the things we get from the board like the NCAP. This is one of the ways that the independent examiner is trying to come up with ways for us to have more resources or get things done.

However, in the working party, there's some opinion that this might not be the way to go. We do have some Fellows and so forth, but there are some issues and Julie can talk about those.

JULIE HAMMER:

Yeah, I think we made the whole membership aware, but it was just a brief reference to it. Steve has advised us that we can't legally engage an intern under California law. But what we do have budget for and have actually got out a request for expressions of interest is funding for a research fellow. So that's actually in [inaudible]. Steve has – I don't know how many applications we've had, but that's happening. So I think we can respond to this that the intent of the recommendation is being met. We can respond to this, yes, agree; however, the mechanism is this.

GREG AARON:

Exactly. Thank you, Julie. And then lurking in the background was the idea that if it's somebody like a research fellow, they're up to speed. They have a really good background, obviously.

They're going to be able to help us immediately. But we don't have time to train up and manage people like interns.

[Number] 13. We should have a secure data location for use in our analyses. This still applies to NCAP, correct?

JULIE HAMMER: We think that might have been a misunderstanding regarding NCAP. And the admin committee's response to that is why we don't really think we need it.

GREG AARON: Yeah, we haven't had a lot of huge datasets to worry about.

ROD RASMUSSEN: And where we have, we've already got it budgeted for in NCAP. And if we do Phase 2 or Study 2, which we're hoping we do and assuming we do, then just in general that's something that ICANN org would actually supply, depending on when the need was. Just a recent discussion about the hijacking stuff I had with David Conrad in the hall touched exactly on that, and that's something they would provide.

GREG AARON: Cool. All right, 14. To do our job, we need to be aware of policymaking that is ongoing with ICANN. Now the first part of

that is we have to pay attention to what's going on and provide advice at the right times, especially when major initiatives are going on in the community. Andrew?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Geoff Huston, go ahead.

GEOFF HUSTON: Thank you. I really would like to note we've spent 35 minutes rehashing what is already in the triage document. Almost everything that has been said has been a repetition of existing work. Our time is valuable, and I'm really not sure what benefit is being served by simply going through what has already been done. We've isolated the six cases where we do think there is substantive discussion, and so far we've only hit the first one, Number 14. Could we look at the triage document please? Thank you.

GREG AARON: Sure. I'll note that Geoff is a member of the work party. There are people in the room who are not members of the work party, and this session is mainly for their benefit.

GEOFF HUSTON: That’s an important clarification. I wish I knew that at the front. So carry on then. But I do note this has been extensively discussed within the work party already. Thank you.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Just adding to that that we could actually kill two birds with one stone by doing the six and then going back to review whatever is [inaudible].

GREG AARON: Okay, we can do it in that order. All right, so we need to find the six.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: He said 14 was the first one, 14, 15, [inaudible].

GREG AARON: Okay, so 14, that’s where we are. Now the first thing is to remember that policy is part of our mandate. That is what the ICANN bylaws say. We are to provide policy advice. Second, it says, “We recommend the SSAC designate an outward representative to each SO/AC that is willing to have one. These roles should be structured to add minimal burden to our large set of responsibilities.” Okay, so that’s where part of the tension

comes in. We are already overburdened, and we don't think that can be done without adding burden.

It is a question to us though, are there places where it's important enough maybe to add a formal liaison like the liaisons we have with the RSSAC, for example? There's certainly a feeling in the work party that having one for each SO and AC is unsustainable, and that's going to take our time away from more important things. Rod?

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Yeah, and that's just a nonstarter. If you just start thinking about SOs and ACs. And then, okay, within the GNSO there's contracted and non-contracted. And then within those groups, there's different ones. So what level are we actually talking about here? By the time we do that, there would be one SSAC member liaising full-time with everybody else and we wouldn't get any work done.

So I think a response to this is that we have already established a formal liaison role with the RSSAC where we have a very tight alignment. Other SOs and ACs, we draw members who participate in those groups who can bring the concerns of those communities to the SSAC. But having a formal liaison role based on our own experience with the RSSAC representative is a very large job and takes a lot of time and is not a wise use of our

valuable and limited volunteer resources. Something along those lines. I think there's a lot of agreement that we don't agree with this.

GREG AARON: Yeah. Now there is one idea I'll throw out, which is just personally, which is do we need to have a formal liaison with the GNSO which is where the action is?

ROD RASMUSSEN: I actually think that could be detrimental in some ways given that we have – at what level are we talking about the GNSO? The GNSO Council? The GNSO at large? “At large” is a tough – you know what I mean – as a whole. How does that work? I know what you mean. GNSO is where the action happens. But that role, I don't know how that works.

GREG AARON: Interestingly enough, the GNSO says what that role would be. They actually will accept a liaison from any other body like us. It's like a liaison to the GNSO is like our liaison to the board. There is the opportunity, if we want, to have it. But the question is, do we? So there's that.

All right so we could go to 15. This was in the contention set, right? I'm sorry, yeah, Number 14 was in the contention set which I thought meant that there was disagreement within the work party on what to say.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

No. The work party in general [is] we can't do this. This is too much. We're going to say why that's too much of a burden, and we want to continue to have people going out as individuals participating in, for example, policymaking things.

GREG AARON:

Okay, 15. Well, okay, so why don't you say that?

JULIE HAMMER:

Okay. I was just going to say that seeing we have got the whole group, does anyone else have a view on whether that one case of a GNSO liaison is worthwhile considering or not? If everybody agrees that we can still [cover off] on getting that information back from the various parts of the GNSO without having a formal liaison, then that's fine. That's what we'll respond. But I just wonder whether anyone else wanted to comment.

GREG AARON: I certainly don't want to dominate the thinking process here. The other point I was going to make is that we are doing some work in the background to make sure from a staff perspective that we actually know what the resolutions are that may have policy effects. I'm sorry, SSR implications. And at least we've talked about doing a better coordination role in the background so we're not caught unawares, and I think that's where this came from.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I can understand the argument for the GNSO. Greg's statement of that's where the action is makes a lot of sense. So I don't know where to end up on this one. It strikes me as one of those things where that liaison job is going to be close to what Merike is doing with the board as far as a full-time job, and I can't imagine anyone here is going to be willing to take that on for that level. The juice ain't worth the squeeze on that one. But I'd like to get a little bit more. You seem to think that it would be almost detrimental to the SSAC to do it. I'm not quite sure where you – I'm guessing there's more there that I'm not aware of, and I'd like to have some more information.

ROD RASMUSSEN: So this gets into the politics of the GNSO. There's a lot of knives and a lot of multiple sides and the factions change and the

alliances move around. I could certainly see anybody who is put in that role and spends time [with it] being used for various purposes that are not very useful for SSAC and that person by their liaison role being oversubscribed with the word of SSAC. I'm just projecting what that role ends up being given that I spent a lot of time in GNSO meetings back in the day before finding a much better home here. So that's where I'm coming from on that one.

TIM APRIL:

So I probably play somewhat of a role as a liaison between part of the GNSO. I am part of their registrar stakeholder group, and for my day job I spend about ten hours a week wondering what they're doing there. I can bring things to the SSAC whenever I find something that's useful there, but so far there's been nothing that I can think we would really care about. If we were to have someone to expand to the rest of the GNSO, it would be a much larger investment than someone's time.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

I think this liaison is probably not the whole GNSO community but only to the GNSO Council, right? As the manager for the policy development process. So if SSAC doesn't want to put a liaison to the GNSO, one way could potentially mitigate this. So for example, we used to meet with GNSO at ICANN meetings,

and those exchanges would spark some back and forth. So maybe not a formal liaison but we resume those kinds of meetings like a lightweight so you don't have to put people there to follow. So that's just another suggestion. Thanks.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

So just while those guys are talking, another issue [you] end up with too is if you were named as the liaison from SSAC to the GNSO is, "Oh, what house would you naturally be in?" So if we made Tim our liaison to the liaison, "Oh, it's another representative of the registrars on the GNSO Council. Grr!" So actually, there are very few people that would be "neutral" in that environment. Just something to consider. I see this fraught with political intrigue that nobody somebody really want to take on.

GREG AARON:

Can we close it off?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE:

Yeah, sure. We have a hand from Geoff. Geoff, go ahead.

GEOFF HUSTON:

Yes. This is a really broad issue. Our experience with SSR2 and ATRT3 has proved that the time involvements, the whole issue of

to what extent SSAC is being represented versus the individual just doing it on their own, the degree in which these people get support are all totally open questions. I think we need to say that we don't commit to sending a liaison [name] to every single committee and to every single invitation and simply recommend that we would consider each on a case-by-case basis. [But] the resources of the individuals concerned [are] probably adequate. Thank you.

GREG AARON:

Okay. All right, let's move on to 17. This was one that just seemed like extra overhead I think. But people on the work party didn't think it was a great benefit.

[Number] 21. This one is about membership: recruiting plans, potential recruiting targets, meetings to attend in order to do recruiting, and maintaining a list of potential members. I'll turn this over to Julie.

JULIE HAMMER:

Yeah, we actually discussed this at some length in admin committee at our first face-to-face in December. We understand what the independent examiner is trying to head us toward here. But because of the nature of SSAC, to actually go targeting individuals and then put them through our membership

application process which may well end up rejecting them for reasons that are not necessarily to do with their ability but perhaps more to do with the fact that we already had plenty of the skills that they would bring is not really a useful way forward.

So what we're suggesting is that our response be rather than take that approach, that we focus more on identifying the skills that we have as a result of our strategic thinking. We should come out of that exercise with a better understanding of the skills that we need and then publish on the public SSAC website each year some words about the skills gaps that we believe we have and a description of our membership application process and leave it to people who believe they have those skills to actually apply and then come through our process. So that's our suggestion for how we might respond to that. That is, focus on skills not go out trying to recruit people.

GREG AARON: Barry?

BARRY LEIBA: Hmm. My perception is that it would be useful to reach out to specific people we think would be useful on the SSAC - where "we" means all of us - and let them know that there is an

application process and they might not be accepted. Can you say more about why the admin committee thought we should not do that? Because it doesn't seem to me that the people we might target would necessarily be looking at our skillset and say, "Oh, I want to apply."

JULIE HAMMER:

Well, what we could do is direct them to look at or suggest to them that they look at that. I think my answer to that is that we've had a couple of experiences where people have been encouraged by SSAC members to apply and that they haven't been successful, and it's really caused quite a lot of angst and embarrassment both for the SSAC member and for the member applying. So I personally am very wary of putting people in that situation, and I think that we can perhaps just as good a job by focusing on skills.

GREG AARON:

I'm going to add some color, and then we'll get to Warren and Mark. One of the things in the body of the report is the independent examiner thinking about things like diversity which everybody agrees is something we value. But the idea that we have to start going out and doing a lot of recruiting when – it's extra work and then there are some problems associated with it. So not creating this whole new way of doing things when we

don't have a huge problem to solve to begin with. I think that's part of what's going on here. Warren and then Mark.

WARREN KUMARI: So I don't think there's anything, or at least from reading the original thing, I don't think it's anything that in any way said, "You can't pick your friend and say, 'Hey, Wes, you should come and join this thing.'" I think this is more a formalized recruiting plan with goals and process and procedure and all of that stuff around it.

MARK SEIDEN: Thank you. That settles it for me, yeah.

GREG AARON: Anybody else? All right, let's go to 23.

ROD RASMUSSEN: You know, I don't think there's anything with representing to people that they might want to apply. I mean, just as you recruit for your business, you may not be the hiring manager. They might make it through the mill; they might not. It's not your fault if they don't. There are several people in this room that I reached out to who made it through the mill, and they've made great contributions I think. So I want to continue doing that.

GREG AARON: So we'll move on to 23. One of the other things going on in the background of this recommendation is I think some people in the community, and it is explicitly stated in the report, don't know how SSAC chooses its members. It's not a prominent thing, for example, on our web pages on the ICANN website. We thought about emphasizing that. "If you'd like to apply to SSAC, this is how you do it." That kind of thing. That might help with the perception.

This is also part and parcel of it. This Recommendation 23 is to "generate a list of academic or other institutions with research efforts and consider recruiting people or using them as invited guests." Julie, would you like to comment on this one?

JULIE HAMMER: Yeah. When we discussed this in admin committee, we weren't sure that this was really a problem, that this was a direction we wanted to go. Basically, what are we trying to solve here? An alternative approach might be to try and focus on having a few more members with academic ties.

GREG AARON: Paul?

PAUL EBERSMAN: Yeah, this is one of those wonderful intentions but practically speaking, one of them keeping a list up to date of who is doing research, even research or academics have trouble keeping track of who else is doing academic research in their own area. So I think that's predoomed. I think the other assumption here is while there is some value to if we know somebody is doing research in our area, inviting them to participate in a particular working group on an ad hoc basis, I think that much of the benefit that we bring in is operational rather than academic experience.

ROD RASMUSSEN: When we're done with this one, I want to go back to 22 for a second. Or whichever the one. No, 21, I guess.

JULIE HAMMER: 21.

ROD RASMUSSEN: 21. I haven't run this by anybody. This is my own brainstorm that I had a while ago and now it's clicked on this. I think what would be interesting to do here instead of SSAC developing some sort of formalized recruiting plan is actually taking advantage of the

fact that ICANN has this global reach in recruiting that it does already for things. In other words, we can say, “Here are the kinds of individuals we’re looking for to join SSAC. Here are the skills that we are looking for.”

And it would not be a bad thing to find ways to leverage resources, particularly when it comes to geographic diversity. Warren is shaking his head no, but maybe that’s to something else. But that might be a way of actually improving, if nothing else, letting people in places that don’t know about us that need a shot at actually being here that we could consider raise awareness that there actually is this thing.

Now that being said, I don’t need a flood of 10,000 applicants for joining SSAC. That would not work for us well. But there are other places or other resources that could be used. This thing here, that’s a staff position to do this kind of thing with the way it’s described there. So that’s just a thought.

GREG AARON: Yeah, okay. Thanks, Rod. All right, so we have five minutes left. So we’ve covered most of the recommendations.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

GREG AARON: We're going to move ahead. We've covered the recommendations except for the last few. But we got to all of the ones where there was a lot of diversity of opinion or where we definitely wanted to decline the recommendation.

There is a version of this, which is actually partially filled out already. The working party then just has to fill it in. One question for the working party members who are here is, do you want to have a meeting next week or are you going to be too jet lagged?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No.

GREG AARON: All right, we're off. And no staff support, right?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Right.

GREG AARON: Okay, all right. Yeah, so our usual slot, two weeks. And we could schedule it [continue] weekly so we can knock this out. Lyman has been doing some work in the background on the document itself.

So that takes us to the end of the agenda. You will see a polished version of this in a month or two. The goal is get this done, turned in before Marrakech. And that means we've done our homework.

Rod and Julie?

JULIE HAMMER:

Just one final thing and hoping that this is really noncontroversial. Recommendation 28 basically said that we should look at “updating the ICANN bylaws in order to allow for there to be a term limit for the SSAC chair.” At the moment, the bylaws specify that we cannot have a term limit for the SSAC chair. We have in our operational procedures got term limits on the other positions, but we are not permitted to term limit the SSAC chair. There's an opportunity coming up where the board are going to put through a range of noncontroversial nit fixing changes. So what Rod and I wanted to do was make sure that the SSAC membership would be comfortable to have that removed from the bylaws. That is, to permit the SSAC, should it so choose, to put in its operational procedures a limit on the time that an SSAC chair can serve. But that's at its own discretion. At the moment, the SSAC does not have that discretion.

GREG AARON: When we began the review work party in Los Angeles, not the last workshop but the one before, we went through the rationale for why we're the only group that can't limit its chair. There was consensus in the room at that time that this would be a good thing to do so we're like everybody else in the world. Up to you guys how to decide if that consensus has changed, but that was the consensus in the room at the point.

JULIE HAMMER: So could I ask if anybody would object to us putting that through as a noncontroversial bylaw change?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think term limits are stupid, but I don't see any reason that it makes it – it seems from our point of view it's a harmless change.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I agree [inaudible].

JULIE HAMMER: Okay, well, we'll get that put in to the next round. Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Well, [inaudible] out to the full SSAC [inaudible].

JULIE HAMMER: Ah, yes, good point. We'll put it out to the full SSAC mailing list for concurrence before we do that. Thanks.

GREG AARON: Okay, and then assuming there's consensus on it, then that becomes something for you guys and Merike to take care of. Okay, cool. All right. And we are done. Thank you.

We are done with that work party. Are we on break now or...?
No?

JULIE HAMMER: EPDP update.

GREG AARON: EPDP update. Okay.

BEN BUTLER: So what you just felt there is a small bit of what Benedict and I are used to. Just when you want a break, the EPDP is only getting started.

So I am so immersed in this, I don't admittedly have a really good grasp of within this group how much people already know or how much they even still care about the minutia of what's

going on. So I have some comments to give a status update but if it looks like we're losing more than two or three people to comatose, then I'll try and just run away. I don't know. Go ahead.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Just for input, we haven't been in the EPDP sessions that have happened here, and we need an update on that at the very least plus yesterday's session and anything that has come up vis-à-vis the mailing list. All that stuff and then where are we going.

BEN BUTLER:

Okay. Well then, that works out because that's exactly the talking points I have. I feel like, Rod, you and I have maybe talked about this and several other folks in here.

So Phase 1 is done. It consisted of 29 recommendations. It was published just in advance of this meeting. During the consensus call for the 29 recommendations which were taken individually, SSAC joined consensus on all but 5. Technically, we joined consensus on all but 2, but we had clarifying comments on 3. I'll give a very high-level of which ones we felt the need to make some comment on.

It is worth noting that every recommendation in the Phase 1 final report came with extensive amounts of compromise. Every

single recommendation was not ideal to a lot of the people in the room. It was just, “Can we live with it?” So that’s just an important lens to look at this through.

Three of the things that we joined consensus on but we needed to make sure we got our comments out, one was a recommendation about the format and timeline for Phase 2. There was a lack of clarity in our opinion to guarantee that Phase 2 is going to happen in an expeditious manner. That has been largely addressed after the report by Keith Drazek and the EPDP work party.

Another one was there’s a recommendation about contracted parties and the need for them to provide the registrants the ability to assign a technical contact. The way the recommendation is written, it sounds as though it is optional or I should say it would be optional for the contracted parties to even provide that. We think it was poorly written. The general understanding from conversations is more that it’s optional for the registrant to provide it but if the registrant so chooses to provide it, the registrars and registries must by definition support and be able to handle that data.

The third one was a question about the – yeah, go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: On that point, there was also contradictory language within the report itself on that point, on the technical contact. So the recommendation looked one way and then other parts of the report looked the other way, which we pointed out the inconsistencies, as did other groups.

BEN BUTLER: Yeah, we were certainly not alone on that one. It's going to be something that's part of the continuing Phase 2 deliberations. But we at least got on record as we believe it must be mandatory for contracted parties to support it. That is not a view that is held by contracted parties. They think it should be optional.

The last one that we agreed to but still opined on was registration data accuracy and the need for, in whatever the new system is, there to be an invalid complaint process whereby third parties, security researchers, etc., can make invalid registration data claims probably directly to the contracted parties or via ICANN Compliance. It looked like that was being left on the cutting room floor, but we mention in I think SAC101 maybe or at least in 104 that third parties have been able to accomplish quite a bit of good in the name of security by reporting bogus WHOIS data and eventually getting some of the bad domains taken down. And under the temp spec there's not

really a lot of room for that to happen because all the data is being redacted anyway, so we don't know if it's invalid.

The two things we dissented on, these are of a bit more interest, I think. The Recommendations 16 and 17 were that it was optional for the contracted parties to attempt to distinguish whether or not to apply GDPR based on in one recommendation the geographic residency I guess you could say because GDPR only applies to European economic area but a lot of contracted parties at this point are just blanket redacting for everybody. They want it to be optional so that some of those registrars and registries can continue to blanket redact if they so choose. We, of course, feel that registrars and registries should make a good faith effort to try at least and attempt to identify what jurisdiction somebody is in and apply the appropriate rules.

The second one is very much the same argument but rather than on a geographic basis we feel that they should have to make a determination on whether it is a legal versus natural person, a business or an individual. Because companies are not protected by GDPR and, in fact, most companies don't want to be.

Go ahead, Rod.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

I want to provide a little more rationale actually I guess behind both of those for the dissent because a lot of people here [aren't] on the work party. I think we did talk about this a little bit but it's not a bad idea to reiterate it because it is one of those questions that people may have for members, and it's good to know the talking point there or more background.

On the nationality or the jurisdictional thing, we anticipate that there will be other laws in the future, and actually probably today. In fact, I know there are today. That aren't just GDPR that require different rules. So punting this, creating a worse situation and putting everything under one regime is only going to get you in trouble in the future if you have contradictory rules based on your geography. So figure out the geography thing now because we're going to need it in the future.

And then on the legal versus natural, there's a couple. Lots of people are already doing it and showing that it's doable successfully at scale, particularly in the CC space. And then the other point there is that there is a potential use from a security perspective of being able to distinguish natural versus legal for a couple of reasons, but you can do reputation around that and be able to drive decisions around how you approach takedowns, blocking, all those kinds of things based on the claims made, natural versus legal in a "WHOIS" record versus what's actually showing up in practice. So there's actually some telemetry you

can get out of that, and that actually applies to the things we're looking at. It's not just about overapplication of the law.

BEN BUTLER:

Thanks, Rod. It may be worth noting that subject to change but it looks like the "easiest" way for contracted parties to attempt to flag whether somebody is a legal versus natural person is likely going to be tied to the registrant org field and whether or not it exists. It may not be that field, but there is an operational strategy in place by the contracted parties to clean up the data that's in the registrant org field so that it can be relied on and will provide them at least some comfort. Basically, it's an opt-in situation.

There's going to be a communication strategy soon to communicate to the registrants and say, "If you are a company and you want to have your registrant org field filled in, and this is what that means, then you have a galactic standard week to fill that in. And if you don't, then it will be redacted. And at that point, everybody who puts something in affirmatively is essentially opting in to being a legal person, depending on the way that message is phrased. That's probably the way that's blowing, but right now the registrant org field is very polluted data and can't necessarily be relied on.

So that's Phase 1. I'll talk a little bit about Phase 2 which is about to kick off. But there's an interesting in between thing, and I disclaimer this is policy nerd and not particularly technical.

The temporary spec, which is what the contracted parties have been living under, expires May 25 or 26, 2019. There is no mechanism to allow that temporary spec to go any longer than that. We don't have a plan in place to that's complete. There's no way that we could ever get something finalized before that standpoint.

So the contracted parties suggested and the EPDP has agreed to it – based on comments this week, I don't think GDD is particularly happy with the solution – but what we are going to try and do, and I don't think it has ever been done before, is enact an interim policy that takes effect on May 25 this year and is in effect until February 29, 2020. And that is essentially all the things that are currently in the temp spec will still be what everyone has to abide by, although they have the option before February 29 to start implementing the individual recommendations that the EPDP has come up with. So they can get a head start on implementing part of the final solution. Boy, that's a bad phrase. I shouldn't use that. Part of the final recommendation and policy that will come out of this.

But one of the things that makes that very interesting from a policy perspective is this interim policy will be published and go into effect without the usual GNSO public comment period delays because we can't afford to give that amount of time and, frankly, we don't want to hear the public comments on it. So basically, it's a Band-Aid solution to give contracted parties eight months to start doing the right thing.

Phase 2 which may turn into Phase 2 and 3, depending on whether or not we do parallel tracks, there's some significant challenges. We're still lacking several important components from a GDPR compliance standpoint that we have to have in place before a data protection authority or the European Data Protection Board can sign off and say, "Thanks for all your hard work, and that looks like it will work." It's entirely possible we'll come up with something and they'll say, "That's crap." And then we're back to square one. So we really need to get those things in place. It's not an EPDP effort necessarily so much as we need to hire data protection experts to do impact analyses and all that sort of thing. There's a lot of moving parts there. That's going to be a challenge.

The timeline and expectations, again, this is one of the things we pointed out. Most people involved in this process want to see Phase 2 completed so we can be done with this and move on with our lives as quickly as possible. But what does "as quickly

as possible” mean? We’re working on determining that this week. Indications are probably in the 6-12 months, but a lot of people don’t want to put a firm date or were willing to set a goal but not put a firm deadline on it. Because we had a firm deadline for Phase 1, and the end result was a mad scramble toward the finish where a lot of bad wording got in place and we don’t want to create that same situation.

Go ahead, Greg.

GREG AARON:

Phase 1, they figured out how to implement it as Ben has described. So one of the big questions is, how long is Phase 2 going to take and why is it important? Phase 2 is where SSAC does have some interests, as we’ve expressed in some of our previous papers.

Ben can probably do a better job of explaining the remaining policy questions that have been deferred to Phase 2, but one of the big things that’s going to happen in Phase 2 is a discussion of a revised way of accessing contact data. Because the temp spec has basically left the decision of whether to redact contact data or not to the registries and the registrars.

That was an expedient solution because ICANN didn’t start talking about GDPR soon enough, and it allowed the registries

and the registrars to assess their own level of risk, basically. All of them assessed risk differently, but what the result was is that a lot of them began redacting data whether or not the data subjects were in the European Union or not, for example. There was a loss in some cases of data in excess of what the law required.

And SSAC did comment on that saying absolutely do comply with the law. It's very important. But trying to establish where the law applies and not over applying the law is also important for contactability and other reasons, reasons including the fact that law enforcement and security people need the data to figure out what's going on in the DNS, make attributions, and find domain names that are being used for spamming, malware, phishing, and all those kinds of things.

There's going to be some inevitable loss of access to that information because the law does require that in the publicly available WHOIS system you're going to lose some of it no matter what. That's just the nature of the law now. But the accredited access program will involve a discussion of how the GDPR allows people to balance the right to privacy with other legitimate interests. And those legitimate interests are some of them listed in the GDPR itself.

It explains why you should balance privacy and security and lists some legitimate uses including protection of networks, protection of fraud, reporting problems to law enforcement, and those kinds of things. So this is going to be a discussion about balance, and there's going to be a lot of diversity of opinion about it.

And then there's going to be a discussion of how can we give a mechanism for certain parties to access the data and under a legal framework that complies with the law. The idea here is that people who are qualified under some set of criteria could get access. There's been a separate technical group that's been talking about how you could set that up using RDAP. That is a purely technical discussion. And there's a lot of legal questions here to be solved.

But the end point potentially could be that people who use the data for stability and security purposes will regain some level of access to it and be able to have that access in a timely fashion in an automated fashion using RDAP protocol. So that's something that the SSAC has talked about as being a laudable goal and it's really important for security operations and so forth. So that's also why we want there to be an end point to Phase 2, whatever deadline turns out to be the deadline. But it can't be an open-ended process that just drags on for years.

I do want to show you some slides that Dave Piscitello came up with.

[ROD RASMUSSEN]:

Yeah, and on that deadline and the like, [Göran] mentioned this I think in public and definitely in private that he really needs to take a full package to the EDPB. Your trick for remembering that acronym really works well, by the way, for those of you who know. Ben can explain later. Just split it in half. That's right. So this is a gating factor for him to some extent at least on one of his pronged efforts to get this as close to blessed/approved/whatever you want to call it in the EU. So that's another reason for, again, the need to get this done because really Phase 1 stuff hangs on this too. I don't think we're quite complete in all this, so I just wanted to point that out.

BEN BUTLER:

I definitely would like to go through the stuff that Dave sent in just at a very high level. In my opinion, these are the eight things that as SSAC and as the SSAC EPDP work party we need to have constantly at the front of our minds that we're going to need to figure out in Phase 2.

One is we need to put to bed the possibly for OCTO to have a research purpose to get their hands on probably

pseudonymized data. But we have to put that to bed, and we need OCTO to step forward and say what data they actually need and want now not just in the vacuum of GDPR.

We also need to be thinking about what data elements legitimate cybersecurity practitioners actually need. Because the “I want it all in hopes I can correlate and find some cool things and ways to identify people” is not going to be possible. For each query, that person has to be able to justify why they need it. Data minimization is a requirement in GDPR, so the extent that we can, we have to be thinking about what data elements they ac need.

Law enforcement access to data, theoretically that should be something that GAC would be the champion for but so far they really haven’t been. So we should probably just make sure that we’re giving them the appropriate footholds where we can.

Correlation of data, Benedict mentioned it yesterday. It’s not something that is strictly or has ever been part of WHOIS, but it was something that happened as a secondary factor. Is there a possibility for it? It’s a discussion we can have. I’m not necessarily saying we can solve it in Phase 2.

As Greg mentioned earlier, balance is a requirement under the legitimate purpose that almost all of this hangs on, Article 6.1(f). You have to balance the privacy rights and the security risks and

the benefits. There's a very high danger in every situation where we've talked about balance, we balance the privacy rights of the registrant and the risk and burden and cost on the contracted parties. If we don't force the issue, no one thinks about the threat to the ecosystem if we don't do this correctly. If we over redact, what is the threat to the DNS ecosystem? We're going to have to be the champions for that at every turn.

Lastly, we have to be extremely watchful for certain groups, and I'm going to try and take the moral high road and not name them, but there are three groups in particular who have constantly tried to latch on to our bandwagon in order to further their own purposes. They call things security that are not. And if we allow that to happen, we lose some necessary political capital with other groups. Intellectual property is simply not a security issue, and they will constantly try to make it so. Go ahead, Rod.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Well, actually, IP is an issue when it comes to phishing, but that's a special case. I'd like to nuance what you just said there about groups trying to latch on. That's been a thing for years around definitions of abuse, things like that. There is an alignment of interests, however, with parties who want to get access to data on a legal basis. I think that's been beaten into all the different

parts of this negotiation at this point, is that everything has to be done legally and balanced and all that. So it's important to remember that the interests that we have around getting access to data for security purposes and law enforcement are very similar to the other purposes.

So there is a good case to be made to work in good faith with those interests around how you solve those problems, especially when it comes to working on a universal access method. Because we all in theory – we, the communities – will all have to actually use some system and it will be the same system. That's part of our advice.

So let's be careful when we're talking about things in various places. We all have interests that align and don't align with every single other constituency out there. We need to just be careful that we're not too condescending or too off putting of one particular group as much as we may disagree with some of the things they're saying at times. And I'm just as guilty of that as everybody else is. We all have our thoughts. But when we're putting on an SSAC hat, whether we're up in front of a crowd or we're having a discussion or even in the bar, we need to keep that in mind so that we don't burn bridges.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is a time check: three minutes to the break.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Sorry. I know that Greg had some slides he wanted to show. I wanted to not really respond to what you just said but before we move off of all of this, you made reference I think to the implementation review team. Isn't this part of that? As part of the next Phase 2, isn't there going to be an IRT?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes? Could you say a little more about that? And what are we're going to do about that if anything?

BEN BUTLER: Yeah, thank you. One of the other things that has to happen concurrent to Phase 2 is kicking off the implementation of several of the recommendations that passed in Phase 1. That's part of how we're trying to scope how many hours a week we're going to continue to throw at this thing and, therefore, calculate how long it's going to take.

We will have some involvement. I don't expect SSAC to have a lot of heavy lifting in that implementation because, frankly, it's mostly going to be on contracted parties to implement. But we'll be involved to inform the process I think.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Yeah, so I guess the only comment that I would add is based on my experience with IRTs, the concern that I have is you ultimately still need a champion in the implementation phase. You have a particular preference. You need someone who sits there to champion the SSAC position. I was wondering, yeah, I thought there was still some discussion about whether it's going to be a separate group or part of the same group. And so to the extent that we want to have a champion for these things, I'm just worried about your time and how we might deal with that particular issue. That's all. Thanks.

GREG AARON:

Okay, Kathy, if you can just slide down, there are three graphs. This is something that Dave Piscitello put together, and you can see it on his blog at SecuritySkeptic.com. What he did was get some data that shows the before and after effects of the temp spec on the ability of people to find domain names that are involved in abuse.

The first graph is from Spamhaus. The blue part represents before the temp spec. This is the number of domain names that they're finding and can identify as associated with bad actors and therefore blocklist them. Based upon the WHOIS information you try to find all the domain names that somebody is running. And then the red part is after the temp spec, and you see what happens. Detection ability and the number of domain names listed falls by about 70%.

If you can scroll down, we then see the one on the right is the same kind of information from SURBL. After the temp spec goes into effect, less WHOIS data is available and the ability to correlate and find domain names and prevent harm drops by an even higher percentage for them.

This graph on the left shows two registries, .US and .GDN, that were not redacting data. They're just showing that for contrast. When the data is still available, you can still make those correlations, obviously.

So you can read Dave's blog, but what we're trying to do is have some information now about what's actually happening out there, how the change in policy is affecting operations and so forth.

The last thing I want to say before we break is Ben and Benedict have put in a huge amount of work. This has been probably the

most time-consuming commitment that anybody has taken on other than being chair and vice chair or liaison probably in a long, long time if ever. They've had meetings sometimes every day of every week. And it's an important subject, and they deserve our thanks and appreciation.

BEN BUTLER: I'd also like sympathy and pity.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We'll have to do that again when Benedict is here.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Patrick has a way to kick off the next meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We're on break now. We're on break now, so we come back at 3:15.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]