KOBE – SSAC Private Meet (4 of 5) [C]
Tuesday, March 12, 2019 – 15:15 to 16:45 JST
ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

ROD RASMUSSEN: Can we take our seats, please?

All right. We have a couple empty chairs sitting in front of computers, which indicates to me that we have people that may be outside. But that's being checked out.

Okay. And Geoff Huston is online. Hey, Geoff. Thanks for hanging. It's a little easier time zone for you, I think, than normal. So …

GEOFF HUSTON: Yeah. Two hours [off. Thanks].

ROD RASMUSSEN: Excellent. Well, welcome, everybody. I think pretty much everybody has been here for the last couple hours as it is. But welcome nonetheless to our full SSAC meeting, here at Kobe. It's been, I think, very long – well, not quite a weekful yet for me, but for … I don't know. Merike, when did you get here?

MERIKE KAEO: I don't know.

ROD RASMUSSEN: You don't know. Okay. [inaudible]. Yeah, it's been long. But it's been good. There's been a lot going on.

So what do we got? So here's the agenda as it is. This is kind of – well, the lightning talks, depending on who's here. We're probably going to have to stick fairly close to that. But the other parts here? We may have some [slot] back and forth. Most of you have been here for the last couple hours and we've gone through three of the work parties. So I don't want to spend a whole lot of time unless a few people show up. We can give a quick summary for those work parties.

So we'll see how much the first part takes up and then we may have time for [Metica] and then also, if we got some extra time, we may talk about in more depth a couple of the potential new work items. So that's my plan on addressing that.

Were there any agenda items that people wanted to bring up, not from the Admin Committee because we've been passing this schedule back and forth. I just wanted to see if there's anything else that people wanted to add specifically to the agenda before we started in on this.

Okay. Don't see anything. All right. So, next up, the Admin Committee update. So we've had our last face-to-face in person

EN

in December – of course, other than this past weekend, where we just sat and had an Admin Committee meeting, which I thank many people here for attending. We had a pretty good turnout over the time of various members. Some members were the entire time. Some members were part of the time. So we appreciate that. It's good to show up and find out what's going on and do some contributions and not just go sight-seeing. That's appreciated, especially for those of us who were stuck having to do this the whole time. So we encourage members to come and partake, and of course partake in some of the sites, too (but try and balance that).

But we had quite a bit of working getting prepped for this meeting. One of things we decided at this meeting is that we've put together a better checklist for future meetings because we pretty much do the same things so that we can make sure we hit all the steps and don't miss out doing things. There was a couple things that were like, "Ooh, yeah, we need to get that done," or we didn't do it but we spent time here, which we'd rather spend time when we're face-to-face actually getting some more substantive work done than just the logistics for the meeting.

But anyways, it was a very productive use of time. Anything to add on the Admin Meeting over the weekend?

Okay. All right. We have been continuing work on the wiki. I get these updates in my – I get a page change update every time somebody changes a page in the wiki, so I know when you've been making modifications, [Gabby] and Julie and whoever else is making modifications. So I know there's been a lot of work because I've got this whole folder full of hundreds of messages, thousands of messages. Something like that. So the wiki continues to improve and we'll hopefully start incorporating that a bit more into the processes, especially around work parties.

Then we had the review response. The SSAC review response was provided. That was out of the December meeting, actually. We didn't really update anything. But we just discussed some of those things today.

Then we've also had a lot of work, especially driven by Merike, over the December/early January timeframe around getting the BTC and OCTO and us all aligned – mainly get the aligned to getting things done. Thank you, Merike, for really a lot of effort in getting that through and to a vote on the Board Thursday. So I'm sure you'll have an update for that in your session later on. But that was a tremendous around of cat herding. As you know, it doesn't show up so much in things that are written down. It's time spent tracking people down and getting people to do something, which, over the holiday season, is pretty tough. So

that happened. So that's one of the thing we've put in a pretty fair amount of time in.

So that's the pre-ICANN64 stuff. Here we've had, as you can see, a list of four things there. Let me run through that. So the SO/AC leadership meeting. There's a meeting that happens usually the Friday before the opening of the meeting. So it's a meeting before the meeting of the various SO/AC leaderships. This is usually the Chair and Vice-Chair or Co-Chairs, depending on how they're set up.

What's interesting is that multiple people will show up for the smaller SOs and ACs but the GNSO only sends Keith, which is kind of an interesting phenomenon that happens as a result of the way they do their thing at the GNSO.

But anyways, this is put together by Goran to bring us together and be able to communicate things that are going on because there's not necessarily a lot of awareness of everything that everybody is working on. So it's a great time to talk about priorities, talk about cross-dependencies, etc., in a quasi-formal setting, without it being the big public meeting kind of thing. It's also an opportunity to do things. In the past, we've done things like the strategic planning exercise and things like that.

So this one was pretty much a "Here's what's going on in ICANN," a lot of discussion around the EPDP and next steps and

the thinking of what's going on, a lot of things you may have heard Goran speaking about in the more public sessions and getting a readout on that and then things that the Board maybe taking on. Cherine comes to the meeting, too. So the – I think Cherine was at the meeting, wasn't – yeah, he was there.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: And Chris.

ROD RASMUSSEN: And Chris Disspain was also there. So a couple of things, just highlights coming out of that. So we gave our rundown on priorities for SSAC and the like. One of the things that came out of that was from the GNSO, which has been reflected in comments from the Board – Cherine and Goran in particular to me – is around coordination with what we're doing with NPAC and what's going on with NCAP and what's going in the Subsequent Procedures PDP and trying to do at least a decent job of having some sort of informal coordination with them or at least having an understanding of what any dependencies may be from a policy perspective versus an implementation perspective on what we're doing coming out of the NCAP project. So we had a pretty decent little discussion about that at the meeting .

It was also an opportunity to find out that a whole bunch of other SOs and ACs have these little things they'd like to do to the bylaws [that] are non-controversial. So we threw our favorite one into the hopper as well. So it was a pretty productive time.

We also talked about the strategic plan and how the Board is looking for input on that or has looked for input. The comment period is closed, but talked a bit about that.

Anything else to add from that one, Julie?

Okay. Any questions about that?

Okay. All right. We met with the NomCom on Saturday, I think it was. It doesn't matter what day it was. It was over the weekend. That was the standard meet and greet and what are our priorities for the year and discussing the current openings. There's some machinations around the balance of three Board seats that are going to be filled. There are two potential renewals, so at least one new Board member will be seated. That one can't be from North America because North America is full. And there's concern because Africa and Latin America/South America are down to two members, of which I believe there's one member [and] one Board—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

ICANN 64 COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

ROD RASMUSSEN: Well, but there's just two per – Asia has more—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] two. Latin America, two.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Two. Okay. Two, two, two. And there's somebody rolling off, I believe, out of those.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: As I understand it, they said both of the African Board members' time expired, and one of the two South Americans' time expired – or Latin America.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah. So there's a strong emphasis because there's bylaws requirements about the diversity. You have to have, I believe, at least one Board member from each region. So if you know somebody who would be an excellent Board member from those regions, they've got an excellent shot of making it. So that's out there.

Any questions about the meeting with the NomCom or any other observations?

And, unfortunately, Robert, for those of you who don't know, was not able to join us. His mother is dealing with some medical issues and he's doing the right thing and making sure to take care of her. So if you haven't heard that or what have you, feel free to reach out to Robert. I know a lot of us have already. He's been on at least one call that we've had already. Actually, that was the Membership Committee earlier. It's the middle of the night now, so don't send him a text.

But anyways, unfortunately he wasn't able to be here, but, from the discussion of the way they're handling the straw polls and that voting process, so to speak, it sounds like we will have ample opportunity to weigh in on the various rounds to winnow down the candidates.

Is that what you were going to say, Chris?

CHRIS: Yeah. I was going to ask if things are getting better.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Well, from what Robert has reported to me, he feels that we have a good ability to represent ourselves.

CHRIS: Okay.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay. Now, the one that I thought was the highlight of our weekend of meeting with external parties was the meeting with the [AAR] team. Two things were discussed. The detailed one was around the implementation [in] the CZDS. It's not quite an epic fail but it was a fail as far as how it's providing service. We got into that a bit, and turns out there's a lot of moving parts, as there always are. There's always to sides to a story on these things.

They provided for a "Get this off your chest session and we'll take all the slings and arrows you have to send to us," which was very gracious of them. We had very constructive criticism offered up in a non-confrontational manner, which was appreciated. So they had a lot of input on that.

And there is a meeting to tomorrow at 8:00 – I think it is – in the morning between some of members who are consumers of the CZDS system – customers, subscribers. We call them "customers" because the customer is always right. One or two of the members of the staff who are responsible for that system can sit down and talk about things that would make the system

ICANN 64 COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

a lot more usable and reliable and all those other things. So that was much appreciated.

So that was the specific issue that we talked about.

The more broad issue that we talked about at fair length was around the tracking system of our advice, GAC's advice – well, I'm not sure if that's in the [R] system, but the ALAC advice is; the advice tracking stuff. This has been, I know, an area of concern for many members over quite a many years: what's going on with advice that we've created and how is that manifested down the pike, especially when there's some things fairly specific to that.

So we reviewed where they're at and what their goals are with that system. It was actually a really good presentation. We actually should get a hold of that presentation if we can, guys, and – you got it? And—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's on the wiki.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay. Oh, it's on the wiki? Oh, there we go. Could you point out on the wiki where it is?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's in the link.

ROD RASMUSSEN: It's in the link.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [I'll do that.]

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah. That would be awesome. I appreciate it. But don't send it to the thing. Send the link to the wiki. There we go. It was a really good presentation on what their goals are on that. A lot of this is tied into the new – excuse me – data initiatives and the new platforms and all of that they have implemented. I'm going to take a [sip] …

[How is that?] Those little pepperoni candy things. It looks like it's a little chocolate. It's pepperoni, which is even better.

ICANN 64
COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [inaudible]

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah. Anyways, so have a look at that presentation. It was very informative. It answered one of the fundamental questions we had: okay, we've been tracking advice we've given to the Board and the Board ending up with a final resolution out of it. That had been an issue in the past. Over the last or so, we at least have an idea of where that is and how that's tracking through. Those things are being done on a much quicker timeframe. So that part we will satisfied, or at least we had a pretty good idea of what's going on.

Beyond that was the question mark: the implantation and final disposition of whatever the advice happened to be. This is where things like the CZDS system not actually providing good service to those who used it or some other things that came up with and showed as examples.

I used an example of the SACs … oh, I should know this one. 090? Or 070? Whatever. Well, the PSL one, which I was the work party Chair on, where I showed them the example of where there were two recommendations and the final disposition. One said, "Do X," and the other said, "Do the opposite X," as the final disposition, to boil it all down, which was a bit embarrassing when I showed that. This is where we ended up. You don't even

have to understand the issue to understand that this is a problem.

But part of what their initiative was was to actually address this implementation side. So we had a really good conversation around ways this can be – well, they're working on better tracking in general. It's kind of hard for them team necessarily. They don't have authority over the various parts of ICANN, but they [weren't] trying to – I think Goran's driving some of this as well – being able to get information back from parts of the org that may be implementing things.

Then, also, [we] had a conversation around how they may be able to pass back things like, "Okay, we've got this implementation plan. We'll shar that back with the originating advisory committee," at least for their edification, and be able to say, "Hey, hold it. We see something wrong here."

What we don't want to create is a check-off process, where there would be some sort of quasi-approval process of whatever the implementation is. What we want is transparency so we have an opportunity to raise a red flag about something or be able to collaborate. For instance, if there's something highly technical and the advice is to get towards some specific output, [it's] to actually have a conversation potentially with the work party that created that.

So moving forward, there was a really good appetite for that team to actually work with his on seeing how that might work.

Questions on that before I move onto the next one?

No? Okay. Then, finally, we had the Admin Committee and a few folks that have been closely involved with the recent hijacking incidents have a meeting with the GCSC, the Global Committee for the Stability of Cyberspace?

Woo, I got it right for the first time! There's a lot of folks there that a lot of us know in various ways and from various forums. It's an interesting group, and they've been going around to ICANN constituencies. I know they met with the ALAC before us, and they met with the Board, and I believe they met with some of the other various parts of the community and are talking through their work they're doing on norms around stability of cyberspace but in particular around how nation states treat various aspects of the Internet.

[Ram], could you give just a quick little overview of what it is, since you've been involved? I'll talk about outcomes from that.

[RAM MOHAN]: Sure. Thanks. So the GCSC is in its final year. It was formed a couple of years ago. The rationale for forming GCSC was that there was a continuing increase in the trend of nation states

taking vulnerabilities and things like that and weaponizing them. So the idea was to come up with a set of norms for cyberspace for the use of technology and cyber in general.

The basic idea behind all of this is these are norms so they're not laws, rules – things like that. But if a nation state flouts a norm, if these norms – so the GCSC has come together. The commissioners have put out a bunch of suggestions for norms. They're getting feedback from folks. That was part of the session here.

But the idea is, at the end of the year, these norms go out. Hopefully they'll get some endorsement from other places – folks in the U.N., [Acian, OAC], etc., the associations of countries.

If they actually endorse these norms, the idea is that, if there is a country then, later on, that actually flouts one of these norms, it allows for somebody to come up and see, "You flouted a norm. This is not good behavior." There should be some rules for good behavior.

So that's the intention behind the group. Some of the norms that are put out there, from us as operational people, you will find to be either hopelessly naïve or tremendously idealistic or whatever you want to call it. But the intent is not about making sure that they're all implementable. It's about making sure that there is a bar, standards, that is proposed.

ICANN 64
COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

The power of the norm comes when the norms are flouted, which allows for other nation states to come up and say, "You didn't do the right thing." Thanks.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Right. The first norm was to protect the public core of the Internet, which touches on areas that we care about. So there were what I'd call two asks that came from them out of that. It was good to get the information and have a good discussion. I think that we had some input for them right on the spot around what was going on, and it was informative.

There were two asks, I would say, that came out of that. One was input from anybody at all on what they've written so far. So anything that could help refine the language that they've got. So that was ask number one. That's something any of us can do if you're interested in this topic area – I find at least some of these things really interesting myself – for you to be able to provide feedback. I'm not sure what the mechanism is for that, [Ram], but I'm sure you can help, right?

[RAM MOHAN]: Ask Merike because that was brought up in the session with the Board yesterday.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay. Feedback mechanism. So – okay. Okay, we'll work that out.

The second ask: they were asking for an endorsement, basically, of the norms by ICANN in general, the ICANN Board, and various SO/ACs they've been talking to. So we've been having a bit of debate internally already on the Admin Committee about what, if anything, would SSAC think about saying because protecting the public core of the Internet is something I think we really agree with as a really good thing as a norm, probably. I don't think there'd be much dissent around this table around that.

Actually saying something and endorsing a particular group doing that is fraught with political peril. So that's something that we will discuss further and may bring some other members in and give a recommendation around to the full SSAC. We can debate that.

Russ, you had a question?

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah. I've only very loosely and from far away followed this group. Honestly, they seem very almost scary about the things that they're going to produce in what is the end product.

So, if in fact they do have some material that they've produced, I would like myself to take a look at it. So if there's pointers that

could be sent to the SSAC list of places we could go look and read, that would be appreciated.

[RAM MOHAN]: Yeah, I'll take care of that. What's available I'll pass on. There was a couple of pages that they shared with us. I'll see if I can get a PDF or something of that that can be sent as well.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Just a – oh, Jaap, you have a question?

RUSS MUNDY: Well, the devil's in the details. [That's] the concern that I have about this, yeah.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: They have a website. That's where all the information is. Even the leaflet is there as well.

I have to say something more about it. [Oliver Copeman] is also part of this effort. He's left secretive about it than here [in the meetup meeting we had by accident in December. I was as well.] He explained how the norms were and all the fine details about them. Some of the language – he's very interested in how they came to get everybody on board, which is an interesting story.

ICANN 64
COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

So I guess some people are easier to approach to discuss with than the other people.

And since [Oliver] actually has office two floors above mine, I can probably relay stuff quite easily.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah, I was going to bring this up in my update but I might as well do it now since we're having the discussion. As I mentioned in the meeting too, I've been involved in an advisory capacity since the inception of this work. As I listened to the commission and the Board interaction also, it was very clear that the GCSC wanted to have ICANN issue a joint statement, but there was some hesitation because, again, ICANN as an org wants to really be very careful about making any kind of political statements. That was very clear.

There was discussion that, given that the GCSC has met with other constituents, like the SSAC and the ALAC, perhaps there could be statements made from the constituents. It wasn't yet clear whether or not that's something that ICANN wanted to definitively be done, but it's something I can see might have merit.

EN

But I do want to caution people because this work did come out of the fact that U.N. couldn't reach any kind of norms. So this is another endeavor, so you have to be very careful about this.

We want to make sure that, as we're – we want to be careful about any misconceptions, so I think there might be something to say. But I haven't yet wrapped my head around it because I'm very cognizant of other political things going on, where I just want to be cautious.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah. That was exactly what I – as I said, we've been having an interesting debate about that. I think the principles are something that we've actually spoken to before to some extent. But at least it's an interesting thought exercise of where things are going, especially when we've got these hijacking attacks going on that are front of mind.

Oh, I got the clicker. That's right. There we go. Okay. Looking forward, one of the things that I've said at the SO/AC leaders meeting is that one of the things we want to do is have a little bit more tangible security technical output this year. If you take a look at what we did in 2018, we spent a lot of time on NCAP, which produced a proposal but not really an actual product. It's a product. It was a very massive piece of work and it was a really [good] job by Jim and Jay and [Patrik] and everybody who

ICANN 64 COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

worked on it on the work party. But at the same time, it wasn't really an advisory of any sort. It was a, "Here's how we would approach this problem."

Then we spent some time on the KSK roll, and we all know where the KSK roll advisory came out. It was an advisory but it was a thin one. Then we spent a lot of time and a lot of our volunteer time on the EPDP, which was a community effort. Lots and lots of work, but at the end of the day, it has produced a partial solution to a problem.

We did not do a lot of production of other stuff –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [As CZDS]?

ROD RASMUSSEN: As CZDS, we did – was that this – that was last year, yeah. So that was actually something substantive as well. But we didn't have something I could point to and say, "Yeah, we may have moved the needle on some sort of technical security issues kind of thing. I'd like to make sure we concentrate on trying to do that this year.

I'm looking at [Cristian] a little bit because we're about to have the IoT thing come out, which, if you were here for that work

party, is a really good piece of work and I think will help the ICANN community define what IoT means in the DNS in our community. So that's great.

Then we've got a few other things we're talking about doing: [Doe-Dot doc deprive]. That's a nice potentially meaty piece of work. But it's one of the things I want to make sure we're concentrating on because one of the reasons we're here is to do those kind of fun things like that.

So, anyways, that's top of mind and how we wanted to try and prioritize work if we can.

Some of the things we're working on within the Admin Committee that we'll be spending time on next month, in particular when we meet face-to-face in L.A., is the Standing Work Party's communications plan. Those are both related to how we're going to recharter the [FAB] Working Party. So that's where we're looking forward on the Admin Committee in doing some of that kind of stuff, which isn't really – we're trying to get this administrivia stuff out of the way of the technical stuff and things like that.

So some potential new work that has come up. The first one there is on our slide deck. The second one there I just added because I'm like, "We should add this as something we should talk about." This is something I'd like to get some feedback on.

Maybe we'll do that towards the end of the meeting. You can think about this.

But the domain name hijacking follow-on – what kind of advice would we want to do something with? I know OCTO is very anxious to work with us in particular. If you were in the joint meeting with RSSAC, that was a big chunk of time we spent talking about this. Are there things – and they're trying to figure out who to say what to, but something needs to be said. So I think that might be a very high-priority thing for us to look at.

Then the TSG proposal just came out. Is that something we should weigh in on as far as just taking a look at it and saying, "Yeah, that looks good," or, "Here, you should take a look at these issues"? What's the public comment period for that open until, [Ram]? Do you know off the top of your head?

[RAM MOHAN]: It's actually open all the way through to, I think, April 17th of 16th or something like that. I don't know that it went through the ICANN public comment, the wiki, etc. – that piece – but the TSG is meeting face-to-face, I believe, April 16th or 17th or something like that, next month, and then we ship on April 23rd.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Hmm. Okay.

[RAM MOHAN]:   And then we're done.

ROD RASMUSSEN: And gone and disbanded. So that's something obviously any individual member could do at any time – comment on that – but if there was an interest amongst EPDP or even a broader set of people, since this is an access system kind of thing – who are you pointing at, Benedict? Or that is a request to speak?

BENEDICT ADDIS: It's a request. A couple of things. On the domain name hijacking, it would be great if we could invite external EPP experts. I have a chap in mind.

On the TSG, [Ram], how do we explain to this group what we've been doing? Is … Are we going to?

[RAM MOHAN]:   No. I mean, Rod sent a note asking me, and I provided just a brief summary of the proposed solution that those pieces – and I didn't get into any of the preamble and all of that because this is a technical group and I didn't feel like we needed to get through explaining the tech piece of it. But if there is value in it, I'm happy to do that.

ICANN 64
COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

BENEDICT ADDIS: Maybe literally just showing the model slide if there's a moment later on. A one-slide if there's [inaudible].

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah. That might be good. I know a lot of us went to the session yesterday, but not everybody did. So if we have time at the end of the – we've got some space for Any Other Business.

[Ron], did you have something you wanted to add?

[RAM MOHAN]: Rod, Benedict and I will be going at 5:30 to present the model stuff to the NCSG. So if you want to …

ROD RASMUSSEN: Oh boy. Should we send guards with you?

[RAM MOHAN]: Yeah. So just giving a timeframe.

ROD RASMUSSEN: A bunch of big dudes with machine guns. Okay. Well, let's see how we end up after Merike's done, and we'll see where we are before the lightning talks. We might squeeze it in there.

Okay. So those are a couple new work parties that weren't on our list last time when we all met. So if there's anything else that's come up, please let the Admin Committee know so we can add it to the list of potential work because we want to make sure, again, to hit that first bullet point.

Workshop planning. We still don't have a hotel yet. We can't do the DoubleTree. Oh, darn.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I know you're all so bummed.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah. Can you remind me of the dates again?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah. The week of the 16th, so it's 18th, 19th, and 20th.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Which month?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: September. The week of the 16th.

ROD RASMUSSEN: The reason I put this on the agenda – Julie pinged me about that the other day and I was like, "Yeah, I want to talk about that" – is not really the work—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can I ask a clarifying question?

ROD RASMUSSEN: What?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It says here the 16th through the 18th, but it's actually the 18th through 20th.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Oh, sorry. [It's the 16th , 17th, 18th, 19th.]

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [inaudible]

ROD RASMUSSEN: September 17th to 19th. Admin Committee would be before that on – yeah, it would start on the morning of the 16th. Yeah. And of course, you're all welcome to come to the Admin Committee

meeting, as long as you don't derail it too much. The appropriate derailer looked over at the right time.

The real reason I put this up, though, wasn't to talk about that, but it's the post-workshop planning. So several of you were able to make it up to Sonoma last year, and many more were not able to make it. So the question was – you don't have to leave, Warren.

WARREN KUMARI: [inaudible].

ROD RASMUSSEN: I'm sorry.

WARREN KUMARI: [inaudible]

ROD RASMUSSEN: But we wanted to do something post-workshop again, so the question was A) would people be interested in a repeat B) or something different.

What's that?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Before the meeting [inaudible].

ROD RASMUSSEN: Oh, before the meeting. No, probably post-meeting. It's a lot easier logistically too because we've got the Admin Committee meeting starting on Monday and there's a whole bunch of prep that actually happens before that. And I don't want to impose on our staff, especially if they'd like to come join us in doing something fun afterwards. So I just wanted to throw that out there for folks to think about. We can always find something fun to do around L.A. or some other thing.

And this not obviously a requirement. This is just something that, again, for those who went, we had a fabulous time. It was really good to get to know some of the people you may not have known as well because you see them at the meetings but you don't get a chance to socially interact and hang out and have a good time.

So I just wanted to throw that out there, that we're thinking about that. Any thoughts people have on that would be appreciated. We'll put something out there based on what feedback we get as to what folks want to do.

Of course, I have blocked out that weekend at our place so that we can do that again if need be, especially for those who weren't

able to come last time. We're getting really jealous about the pictures they saw.

So then the other stuff. I have some stickers here. I don't know if I have enough, but I have some stickers here. I joined a new constituency yesterday, and I'm proselytizing for people to join this constituency. It's a little sticker. It's the CCDG. The CCDG is the Cross-Community Drinking Group. I wish I had thought of this idea myself, but I have stickers. The stickers have different glasses. They're CCDG in a different logo of a different type of glass. So I've got about – hmm. Looks like I've got about 18 stickers. I thought I had another one of these.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So it's CCDG and an emoji. That's what you say.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yes. CCDG and an emoji. I don't know if anybody else has already joined this constituency, but I'm advocating for it. So I'm going to pass … let's see. Two this way and one this way. Then we'll have to find more stickers. But anyways, that was the other stuff I had.

Was there any other stuff you had, Julie?

ICANN 64
COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

JULIE HAMMER: No.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay. So I went a little over but I knew that we had work party updates that – whoops – that were going to be quick.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [inaudible]

ROD RASMUSSEN: Oh, that's the version – you snapped it before I edited this slide. So I'll make sure we cover the ones that aren't on there.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [inaudible]

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah. Whoever did the PDFing. All right. So could we just run through real quick a recap? Especially since, Ram, I know you weren't here for that and – well, Benedict just walked about again. He wasn't here for [inaudible]. And there's a few other people that weren't here for all of the work party work that we did today. So we'll just run down this list here real quick and just do a quick overview – I think five minutes – of what's going on. Or less.

So, Greg or Ben, you want to take the Review Work Party?

GREG AARON: I'll take it. Okay. So for those of you who weren't here, the current activities were filling out, basically, our form response that we will turn into ICANN. It'll be reviewed by the Board members who are working on this institutional review.

Basically, there were 30 recommendations that the independent examiner made. We classify most of them as continuous improvement suggestions. We go through them and basically say whether we agree or not.

We talked a lot today about ones where we're going to perhaps not agree or we'll ask some questions or give a particular slant in our answer.

One of the major concerns is we're full up on work. Our members can't take on too much more. So we do want to manage that.

I won't go into the details, but what you'll be seeing from the working party in a month or two is basically this form. It'll say whether we agree or not with each point. Most of them are yeses. Where we say yes, we're saying how we implement it and we'll take care of it and track it over time.

Then, on these viewpoints, we'll explain our positions, talk about alternatives, and ask a few questions. Those will end up being the things that we talk with the Board members about mainly.

So this is on schedule. We'll get this turned in well before Marrakech and the deadline. Then, probably sometimes in the fall, we go over those points for discussion, and then we will be done with the review, more or less. They'll be some follow up on implementation, but that's the last major hurdle in this process.

So it's going pretty well. You'll see that document and you'll be asked for feedback. We'll tweak it and hopefully then we'll be done sometime this fall perhaps. Then we won't have to do this again for another six or seven years.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Questions for Greg?

Okay, cool. NCAP. Jim or Jay, you want to give a quick update?

JAMES GALVIN: I'll start. So let's see. Three things. First, the meeting today was really just about a level set. I won't really go back through all of that. The slides are there for those who weren't there. So you can take a look at all of that.

The second to say is that, as Rod had reported earlier, just to remind folks, there's a pending resolution with the Board to kick off Study 1 in NCAP. So that's the good news. All of that is a good thing.

The better news is that we now actually get to do some work *knocks on wood*. So that's a feature.

The third thing, which is important to all of us here – I need to call out one administrative detail for everyone here, unfortunately – is, since this is really intended to an inclusive group, which is a step closer to being an ICANN working group, although we're doing our best to operate as an SSAC work party with just some additional details so that we can better fit with the broader ICANN community, one of the things that's required of everyone on SSAC who is going to be reviewing and be in included in whatever final work product coming out of this is you must fill out a statement of interest. You will see information about this coming out on the mailing list. There's a separate statement of interest with a set of explicit questions that everyone is going to have answer and put in.

Of course, anyone who is going to be part of the work party absolutely must do it. But even on the full SSAC, everyone will have to do it because you will ultimately have to review the work product and all of that has to be put out there for review.

One thing just to remind folks about – we're doing our best to track this and point this out to specific people – is, if you are potentially a candidate for submitting a bid for the RFP for any of the study groups, you do want to be careful about your role and what you do and don't participate in.

We have tried to split this in such a way that, with the new discussion group mailing list, which was talked about in the details in the first thing I said, in principle, the idea is that you should be okay because that's a public forum, it'll be a publicly archived mailing list, and all discussions are open to the public. So you should be okay, even if you want to be a bidder to be part of that.

As part of the Admin Committee, our responsibility will be to make sure that we don't bring any financial discussions or level of effort discussions to that list so that no one is exposed, although, again, it is still a public thing and a public discussion.

Nonetheless, everyone should make their own choice. I don't want to tell you what to do. You have your own considerations, and all of that's important, too.

You should keep in mind that, if you are ultimately going to be a bidder, it may very well be that you'll want to list a withdrawal in any final work product that comes out. That's just a

consideration to think about. But just wanted to put that on the table again for folks.

For everyone else, please, statement of interest. I think that's it, unless there are any questions. Unless Jay wants to add anything – [no?]

ROD RASMUSSEN: Questions – oh, Ram?

RAM MOHAN: Jim, it'd be good to also have some understanding of, if there are members who do not do it, what happens.

JAMES GALVIN: The statement of interest? Well, the short-term action if you don't do it is you won't be able to participate in the work and on the discussion group. Honestly, we haven't asked ourselves the question of what we're going to do about members who don't fill it out down the road.

So, maybe Rod, you want to say something?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah. So we do have the ability to withdraw from reviewing work. So, if we did a member who was on the full SSAC list, we'd

probably have to make an accommodation and create a separate list with anybody who'd want to withdraw. But I think that's easily handled. If someone doesn't want to put an SOI in, we just create – I hope that doesn't happen, but if it does, that's fine. We do the debate around the full SSAC without the members who'd automatically be withdrawn at that point.

[JAMES GALVIN]: I just wanted to pointed out that, when we were talking about this earlier, I thought Warren had a couple points he wanted to raise regarding the SOIs. Unfortunately, he had to step out right now, so I don't know if we want to tackle it again.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Well, not here.

[JAMES GALVIN]: Fair enough.

ROD RASMUSSEN: We'll tackle that within the work party, I think.

[JAMES GALVIN]: I think Danny has a point.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Oh, Danny?

DANNY MCPHERSON: I was just going to ask what's different about that statement of work versus the general SSAC statement of work? Why is this special?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Statement of interest.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Statement of interest.

DANNY MCPHERSON: I understand. I mean – I'm sorry. The disclosure. How is this different than any other one, I guess is my question – the ones we already have. And is this setting a precedent for every other one, like maybe we have an IoT one or pick a work party that we're going to do this for. You say it's not, but …

ROD RASMUSSEN: Well, okay.

[JAMES GALVIN]: So, again, the important thing to keep in mind is this is an ICANN working group. It's much closer to being an ICANN working group, and it's an ordinary thing in ICANN working groups, especially PDPs, for anybody who's a participant to fill out a statement of interest. ICANN has a baseline. There's a baseline standard statement of interest, which just identifies who you are. It's got some basic identifying information and who you work for and your affiliation. But individual working groups are also allowed to create a set of additional questions that go with it.

We have, over a period of time in the work party and with review by ICANN Legal, in addition to our own discussions about it, created an additional, I think, seven questions. There used to be a lot more of them, but we reduced it down to seven additional specific questions that we're asking people to answer and respond to.

The important thing, in telling people how to respond to the questions, is it's just a good-faith question for you. That's our advice from ICANN Legal. There are questions like, "What is your relationship to anything that might have happened in the previous application process?" and stuff that's out there. There's a couple specific questions about [inaudible] mail, too, for example, just so that that data is out there and exposed for people.

It will not be used to disqualify you. That's not the intent. It's important that you just put it out there that it's there. You'll have an opportunity to look at it and then decide what you want to do as far as that's concerned.

But I hope that answers the question. It's different because it's the standard ICANN thing as part of ICANN standard working group stuff. Because this is intended to be an inclusive opportunity for the community to work on this – remember, from the Board resolution – this is the way we're doing it. Thanks.

ROD RASMUSSEN: To put a point on it, we're trying to adopt what they do in the GNSO to a certain extent to this because this is much more of that kind of thing than we're running it. Because of this broader work party, [there's] this inclusive thing, so to speak – the broader discussion group, I should say.

Does that answer it, Danny?

I think you were actually involved in discussions like a year ago when we were talking about it.

DANNY MCPHERSON: I don't want to belabor this, but it just seems odd to me that everybody on SSAC fills out a disclosure of interest for something that work party does. If they have those interests, why doesn't their current SSAC disclosure already say that? And we're just going to be archived and is it going to be on that website? I don't care about the content of it, firstly. I don't have a problem filling it out myself. I just a principle issue with the entire thing. Anyway, I don't want to belabor it.

JAMES GALVIN: Well, a couple things on what you said. There's more detail. That's why the SSAC one doesn't work. So there's more information. And, yes, you're correct. The statement of interests will be public information. They'll be put on the wiki page for the project, so they'll be archived indefinitely as long as the project is archived, like any ICANN working group.

ROD RASMUSSEN: IoT. Cristian?

CRISTIAN HESSELMAN: So the status here is that we delivered a draft report of the role of the DNS in the IoT. It has two goals. One is to discuss opportunities, risks, and challenges – and challenges in the

ICANN 64
COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

broadest sense, so for the entire DNS industry. That's also why it's a report rather than an advisory.

The second goal of the report is to de-buzzword the term "IoT" for the ICANN community, help everyone in defining in what's going on, and also highlight the relationship with the draft strategic plan '21-'25 that ICANN put out there a couple months ago.

So as I said, the draft report is on the Google Docs drive. I'm going to work with Andrew to finalize it and to get your approval. I tentatively set a date for March 25th, but I'll talk to Andrew about the final timelines and let you know about that.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Questions for Cristian?

Okay. Julie, you want to talk about [Fab] – oh, I'm sorry. Was there a question?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [No, it's okay].

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks. The [FAB] Work Party had one meeting in which it considered the draft charter. There were seven elements of scope in the original charter, which arose out of workshop last year in Los Angeles – a range of issues that membership discussed at the workshop and said, "No, we'd like to talk about this more in a work party."

At the first work party meeting, there was a suggestion made that the first five of the seven items might better be dealt with after all in the Admin Committee and basically come back to the membership with a proposals on those issues. So we'll go ahead and do that. And the scope of the charter to be reduced to Items 6 and 7 related to the concept of standing work parties and how that might work. Also, how we better present our SSAC position to the community.

That's very, very closely aligned with some of the ideas that Rod has been developing in his communications plan, which has been briefly mentioned to the SSAC in our January meeting this year but not fully briefed in the same way that he's shared it with the Admin Committee.

So at this stage we're somewhat on hold because Rod hasn't had the headspace to further develop some material to feed into the work party that fleshes out both of those scope elements. So

we're just going to put it a little bit on the back burner until Rod's got an opportunity to do that.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah. So we've got a week off next week anyways, so hopefully we'll hit the ground running the week after that. That's my hope. I'll try to make that actually happen.

Any questions?

Okay. So the two that didn't make it on here that we should cover. And the next one would be EPDP Work Party, so Ben or Benedict, update?

[inaudible]

BEN BUTLER: Yeah. So Phase 1 implementation. There's a brainstorming session tomorrow morning. We have several meaty, difficult issues we still have to figure out policy-wise from Phase 1. Then Phase 2 is all about access for legitimate actors. We're going to have to be very engaged in that process.

We're still also trying to determine what the expectation of commitment of time per week is and derive from that a goal of when we're going to get Phase 2 done.

That's about as brief as I can go.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Questions, particularly from people who weren't here for the more in-depth review we did earlier?

No? Okay. The other one that didn't make the list: Membership Committee.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Membership Committee is, at this stage, still processing an application, and we're waiting for all the materials to come in and do the annual review of SSAC members up for renewal this year. So we'll probably really get into that next month.

Kathy this morning sent out a reminder to everyone that there is a survey for everyone who would like to put in comments on the members under annual review. That's an anonymous survey. So we won't begin our work until that time period has expired on the first of April. If you do submit it on the first of April, we won't treat it as a joke.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah, they'll label it, "Therefore, if you actually do …" but please don't. Yes, so please provide that feedback. It's invaluable to the Membership Committee to get that if you can manage to take some time to do that.

One thing that we've been talking about related to the Membership Committee is our onboarding process. Not that we want the Membership Committee to do a project on this, but we want to figure out how to do this, thinking through bringing on new members. The last member we brought on actually could have written this manual, which is Dave Piscitello, so it wasn't much of a process there.

But for other new members coming in, there is a learning curve of what's going on, how do work parties work – all those kinds of things. I don't think it's too heavyweight, but I think one of the success factors for new members coming in may be related to understanding things and knowing that they can get involved and how to get involved and those kinds of things. We don't do a really great job of actually mentoring people through that or even providing much guidance.

I'm just thinking about, because this comes up at annual review time, how, a lot of the times that we end up having a Membership Committee not renewing somebody, it was somebody new who may not have actually felt like they knew what to do and, as a result, didn't jump in and start doing things. It does take a little while to just get used to it.

It's not that heavyweight, but that's one thing we were thinking might be a success factor. So we'll probably be coming to the

ICANN 64
COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

broader membership at some point to talk about doing some work there. We'll run that out of Admin most likely but still have people give input on that. Then, if we want to set up a buddy system or something like that for new members – but have that discussion so we can work to succeed right off the bat, rather than saying, "Okay, we're going to throw you in. Hope you can swim." So there's that.

Another thing on that would be thinking about a little bit of the institutional memory and the ethos of the SSAC – what we're here to do and the overall goals and the thoughts around that and also the way we want to treat each other and all that. There's the ICANN code of conduct and all that.

Us cynical security types have a tendency – yeah, yeah; exactly – to, when a new idea comes up, to sometimes are like, "Nah, that's no good." Sometimes that leads to group thing. Things like that we just like to say, "Hey, you know" – and we're usually pretty good about that, but not always. But especially as new members, they may come from – oh, I don't know – an environment like, say, IETF, for example – I just picked it randomly for some reason – where flame wars and things like that are normal. It'd be good to have a heads up on that coming in. And a good reminder to all of us who've been here for a long time, too. So that's something on the horizon/backburner – whatever you want to call it.

Any thoughts or questions on that last bit or anything on Membership?

Chris?

CHRIS ROOSENRAAD: So we danced this a little bit as far as the recommendations were concerned earlier about how to increase the diversity from a geographical outsider perspective. Are there any sort of – I don't want to say mandates or anything like that, but is there any guidance that we've supplied to the Membership Committee regarding that at this point?

JULIE HAMMER: No. A lot of this gets tied up back with some of the recommendations of the review. The guidance that we would like to be able to generate in the future would be guidance around skills. That is, we need to do some more work on be able to represent the skills base that we currently have in SSAC through some of the strategic planning that we might do, or at least reviewing the security environment, work out what skills we believe we need, look at what skills gap that is, and provide guidance to the Membership Committee on the priorities in that way but also make that publicly visible.

But we've got a little bit of work to do on tools to support that whole activity. That is, how do we actually extract from our aggregated skills survey data and categorize that so that we can understand what we've got, let alone what we need?

So good question but we're away from actually answering that. So we haven't provided the membership guidance in that [light].

CHRIS ROOSENRAAD: I can certainly understand, as we go into detail, doing a greater analysis. But it's fundamentally obvious that we're very North America- and Europe-centric in our membership right now. I think we've all talked at different points about how that is providing us a bit of a blind eye in some areas.

So, while I recognize that there's a larger effort to try to go deeper into that, it would be nice for us to have at least a high-level focus on trying to grow our diversity in those areas to start with.

JUILIE HAMMER: Yeah, I agree. We've got some ideas formulating about putting some thinking into a discussion paper that we might evolve and circulate and having a much great discussion on some of these issues in Marrakech.

So, yeah, it's quite a complex one, but you're absolutely right. There's a lot of things to think about there.

ROD RASMUSSEN: And you heard me at the RSSAC meeting. We do have a clear fundamental need for geographic diversity, but really, we don't need another smart person who works on big networks in Asia-Pacific or something like that, although that'd be nice. You see different kinds of attacks and things like that, but what we really could use is people who have to deal in environments that are challenged because that's a totally different security/stability kind of issue.

We don't have a whole lot of experienced – we have some, but we don't have a whole lot of at least current practitioners in that field [more likely]. So I've said that in a couple of places, that really would like to increase that.

And, frankly, that pressure comes from outside as well because we do not look like the ICANN ideal diverse group. That does cause comments in various places. You do want the people you're talking to feeling that you're legitimate based on, when they look at you, them saying, "Okay. I see that there's somebody on there that at least is representing people like me." So we do need to address that.

Frankly, if I was running those kinds of networks in those kinds of places, I might say, "Yeah, that's nice they know about that, but I don't need to pay attention to them because they don't live and walk in my shoes." That kind of thing.

So that's an area we can all do our bit in and try and make sure we get people interested at least in applying. With the caveat they may not be accepted. That's always got to be remembered.

[JAMES GALVIN]: Fair enough. I just want to make sure that we don't let the perfect be the enemy of the good here and that we don't wait so long that we miss the opportunity to start actively recruiting in areas that we know we need today.

ROD RASMUSSEN: This isn't it a new problem, so I think we've already [inaudible].

[JAMES GALVIN]: Fully understood. Okay. I'm beating a dead horse. Got it.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay. That was it from that. Merike, I think—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

ROD RASMUSSEN: No, we haven't taken that. I don't think we've taken that. Well, maybe we have. But, Merike, over to you for – oh, and let me click it. There we go.

MERIKE KAEO: Great. I don't have any slides, but I was looking around when people are looking at slides, and most people were looking at their laptops. So I feel okay with that.

A couple things Rod had already iterated on. So NCAP has been top of mind since December. It was the top agenda item for the BTC starting in December, all through February. Actually, March. There is a very high confidence in a Board resolution getting approved this Thursday, at least to do Study 1.

I want to thank the entire working group for all of the work done last year. That was several times [I was] actually recognized by both the BTC and OCTO when we went through all the timelines with iterations of meetings and trying to close in some of the misunderstandings as we looked at the OCTO proposal and the NPAC admin. I was trying to reconcile where some of the differences in considerations came from.

There was a lot of work done over the holidays, both from the NCAP admin folks and also by OCTO and the BTC. So I'm actually

pretty impressed that, at least in the last three months, we had a great push and at least are making forward momentum.

In terms of the BTC, there's a really good cadence going. There's a lot of consistency now in the monthly meetings. There are agendas that are preset to find. I mentioned that previously, but we had talked about having a joint NPAC admin/OCTO/BTC meeting as things progress. My proposal will be to have the first ten minutes of each of the scheduled monthly BTC meetings be utilized with that, with the caveat that, if there is more to discuss, then there'd be separate meetings because, as we realized in January, trying to herd the cats between the OCTO team, the SSAC team, and the BTC team, it's challenging.

Another thing that is getting very high visibility within BTC is also the RSSAC037 work. So I'd say NCAP and RSSAC are kind of on par in terms of high-priority and visibility within the BTC.

Then third is also looking at overall DNS ecosystem security-related aspects, which, due to recent events, is getting also bumped up in priority. The BTC has been tasked to take a look and see what ICANN's role is within looking at overall security and DNS security And even from the meetings with the GSCS, where does ICANN play a role?

One of the things that I will ask from the SSAC is, because the BTC has such good cadence, if the SSAC feels that there are

ICANN 64
COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

items that I should be brining up to the BTC, I would love to actually have some explicit comments on that because Ram certainly, I think, after ten years, knew inherently, by osmosis somehow. But for me, at least knowing what the SSAC feels would be relevant for me to bring up to the Board would be really good to know.

And while we have weekly admin meetings, sometimes I think even the Admin Committee needs to know from the work parties where maybe they want to bring something up to the Board to see whether or not maybe there is some kind of prioritization needed.

There was quite a bit of dialogue on the CCT reviews. Obviously, from all the conversations going on here, the Board didn't do a very good job in communicating what it meant in terms of its resolution. We've had a lot of feedback on that.

But one of the things I was wondering myself is whether or not the SSAC might want to give some kind of comments on specifically the CCT or the SSR2 reviews. I don't know whether or not that's something we want to consider or not because I'm trying to figure out: are we always going to look to the Board to task SSAC? If that's the case, then I believe my role then would be, well, I would bring that up to the BTC and then the BTC would make a recommendation to the Board. But I will never do

that without knowing that SSAC actually feels that it probably wants to provide a comment.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Let me respond to that. We can comment at any time. We don't the Board to ask us to comment. In fact, I don't want to get in that habit because they'll just ask us to [do] more stuff. But I bet you can keep that [herd] under control.

But I would say, though – just a question on the CCT review – is that the buzz I've been hearing around this ICANN meeting is that there's a lot of dissatisfaction with the Board response to the CCT review.

Can you maybe shed a little bit of light on that from your perspective?

MERIKE KAEO: Yeah. In a lot of the constituency meetings that were actually happening today, the Board spent a lot of time in the last 24 hours, I'd say, really listening to what the comments have been already. They're looking at, yeah, the resolution could have been written better. It was more a matter of how the communication was done. So there was a lot of clarification. I look at it in parallel as how we dealt with SAC101.

ROD RASMUSSEN: [inaudible]

MERIKE KAEO: Yeah. But the good thing is the Board is taking it seriously. But it also speaks to something that has been near and dear to SSAC's heart in terms of where's our advice going. There's recommendations. What's the prioritizations?

What's become clear to me now, being part of the Board, is that every constituent's – I mean, there's all kinds of recommendation. On one, you had 122. The CCT? It's 37. While the CCT review did have high, medium, and low prioritizations, that doesn't always happen with every constituency. So who actually does the prioritization? And if you accept all the recommendations and there's work to be done and budgets to be allocated, it can't work like that.

So there have been discussions in terms of how we [make] more effective some of the statements that have been publicly yesterday. This is something as a collective we all have to work better at.

So my takeaway also was from the SSAC perspective. When we give advice, how we can raise a priority to a certain item when

you're looking at the collective recommendations that the Board has to look at?

So it's a hard problem, but the CCT review comments really highlight that to an extra level. Go ahead, Ram.

RAM MOHAN: Thanks, Merike. On responding to – [it kind] of has SSAC to SSR2 or to CCT. I caution against us at this point putting in or committing to put in some level of effort. It's not clear to me what actually happens to comments after they are received on the other side for those efforts in particular. It seems like we have a full plate of things to do. So that's just from a pragmatic point of view.

Down the road, though, on efforts like SSR – I don't know if there's an SSR3 or whatever – we get to put somebody on it, and hopefully our input can go in through that individual, rather than us doing something in a public forum.

MERIKE KAEO: I appreciate that comment, and it reminded of something I wanted to mention. I actually looked at the entire CCT review, and some of the recommendations also had parallels with SSAC advice. So that's where I figure my role is also for the Board to actually talk about, "Well, this recommendation actually talks to

this particular SSAC document that we have and recommendations that SSAC also made." So maybe raising it as a priority.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Good question. Any other views or anything for us to say that hasn't said by somebody else on the CCT review? Or should we – oh, we have a meeting with the Board on Thursday. Or should we just [let] that one [lie]?

You can get back to me later.

MERIKE KAEO: I'd have to think about it. There was one – I always laugh because I always say, "Oh, look. That's just like SAC074," which is easy for me to remember. But, yeah, for those who are new, Ben Butler and I led that work. So credential management. So that's my little bandwagon. But I don't know at this point in time.

But that brings me actually to the next point I want to make. I think we have an opportunity to have a really great dialogue with the Board. With the attacks that have been happening, with ICANN trying to figure out what is its role in this entire ecosystem of security, ecosystem is also a "How do we deal with the RIRs, the first community, things like GCSC, and other global entities

to really look at cybercrime and all of these issues?" What is ICANN's role? So possibly bringing that up and really asking questions and starting a dialogue I think would be quite useful because here, collectively in the SSAC, we have our fingers in so many different global entities that are dealing with cybercrime in some way, shape, or form. So it might be useful to give our viewpoints. It was just something I thought about yesterday.

Then, also, the advice tracker. This is something that feel by the wayside. I was actually hoping to have an update on quite a few of the older ones. I had spent some time with Andrew and Steve looking through them. NCAP took most of my cycles on the last three months.

But one of the things that I'm going to go through with staff – it was great to hear with the [AAR] review folks that they're also going to try and help as much as possible.

Today I had an epiphany. I'm like, "You know, maybe I should just fly to L.A. for a week and just get it done."

ROD RASMUSSEN: We're going to be there in April.

MERIKE KAEO:	Yeah, exactly. Because otherwise it'll probably drag on. It's an hour or two here and then it takes me another half-hour to get my head into the whole review thing. But that's something that absolutely I just want to get to closure on because, even as we looked at some of the really old recommendations that haven't been closed yet, it looks like they were usurped by the things because some of them are seven years old. But really to get to a current status and then figure out what is actually going on.

One such example is SAC074 again. So they're actually implementing it. They're doing a tutorial. They're working on that, specifically just SAC074, and I'm going, "Huh. How come we weren't aware of this? I just happened to run into somebody by accident."

So that speaks to the discussion that we had here during the admin meeting that, should there be a dialogue when you're starting to implement so that the SSAC can also see how it's getting implemented – with some other concerns that we had, where the implementation wasn't exactly what SSAC had thought the implementation would look like.

So I think having a dialogue also sooner in terms of how things are implemented is going to help quite a bit.

ROD RASMUSSEN: I forgot to mention this earlier when we were talking about the meeting with the [AAR], but one of the things we talked about was the advice that we have that's active today, recent, and has been tracked and all that. Then there's this pile of things from, like, 2010 that are just sitting there. Greg, that's the one that's been bothering you the most, I think, that they're just sitting there. Nothing is happening. What's going on with that?

So there was an offer to collaboratively triage that and figure out which ones have been overcome by events in one form or another so they're not wasting time trying to deal with those and then concentrate on cleaning up and getting out of stasis, as it were, anything that old that actually still is applicable because they're all just sitting there. There's a big, fat number of things that haven't had any progress. They don't like that, as obviously we don't either.

MERIKE KAEO: Yeah. That's really all I had for today, although I'm also trying to get time to update the Board liaison wiki because I think that's also going to be a place that I'm hoping other SSAC members can click on and see what's going on.

Then, if there's topics that are you think are top of mind because the work parties that you're leading are a part of them, either get me engaged in some of the calls. I can't be in every work

ICANN 64
COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

party every single call, but certainly, if there's important discussions maybe when you're getting to the recommendations and want to see how to write the recommendations so that the Board will understand them better, I would certainly welcome somebody pinging me. A couple of people have done that and it's been extremely useful for me, just so I can be part of that work at its closure.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Questions?

[GREG AARON]:   Are you comfortable that you have everything you need from us to talk with Board members about our positions on the EPDP?

MERIKE KAEO: Now I do, yes, because I reached out, I think, a week ago to ask for points. Thank you, Andrew, for actually forwarding a bunch of stuff to me. I also had a discussion with Ben and I've been keeping up.

That's a thing also. I have to get better also. When I send out an e-mail and I ask for something, I'll probably end up putting a timeline on there, just to say I need input and I need it, let's say, five days because I do have a habit of just saying, "Hey, I need

input," and then sometimes I hear nothing. So I'll just say by five days, and then when I don't hear anything else, then we'll go to another strategy in terms of who pokes who.

JULIE HAMMER: Just to follow up on that, I think all of us need to get a bit better of also responding to you, Merike, and recognizing that you are under pressure. When we see something from you asking us to give you information or do something, we need to respond more promptly as well. So having that timescale is really going to be very helpful. Thanks.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah, I concur. I will help poke where necessarily. But, please, we have an opportunity. This is our liaison to the Board, so when she says she needs something for the Board, that's a great opportunity. So, please, if it's in your area and it's something you care about, provide the feedback so that we can actually get some things done. We have a luxury in SSAC that most other folks around ICANN don't, which is a direct line. So let's take advantage of it.

Any other questions?

ICANN 64
COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

[DANIEL NANGHAKA]:	I have a very strange questions, probably to the Board. How do companies like GSC sneak into ICANN? In general, what is the mechanism of doing it?
MERIKE KAEO:	You know something? ICANN actually … let's just say that ICANN really though very carefully how it was going to do this. The GSCS was a little bit unhappy of the fact that ICANN didn't directly offer to pay for items.
	So the way things worked out was that, actually, the Japanese host was the one that enabled the GCSC to be here. ICANN, in discussions with them, were very deliberate to make sure that they were able to be here because of the Japanese hosts' generosity and that, because ICANN was meeting here, there was space available. So it wasn't an ICANN/GCSC joint item.
[DANIEL NANGHAKA]:	Okay.
MERIKE KAEO:	Yeah. Just to also respond to Greg, I'm actually really happy that you asked. This is what I'm looking for also, that it's a two-way street, where people say, "Hey, can I update you on something?"

Quite frankly, I may not know what I don't know, so we may even want to have a ten-minute conversation or 15. So I always welcome that.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah, I think in general, as part of the work party process, there's obviously a natural hand off as you're writing a Board resolution type language. But as we're coming to the end, you want to be briefed up really well.

We are at break right now, so we'll come back in 15 minutes for lightning talks. I'm sorry we didn't get the TSG diagram up there ,but we did at least finish our regular program on time, which is excellent. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah. Well, you've already sent around the links to the TSG stuff, so yeah.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN 64
COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019