

---

ICANN69 | Community Days Sessions – Joint Meeting: SSAC and GNSO Councils  
Tuesday, October 13, 2020 – 09:00 to 10:00 CEST

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody. Welcome to the Joint SSAC and GNSO Council session on the 13<sup>th</sup> of October 2020.

Please note that all GNSO Councilors and SSAC members have been promoted the panelists. Panelists can activate their mics and type in the Zoom chat pod. To do so, please remember to select “All panelists and attendees” in the dropdown menu so all can read your comments. Panelists should not ask questions via the Q&A pod. We asked you to kindly type them clearly in the chat pod.

We are welcoming observers on our call today, so warm welcome to you all. Observers on this call are silent observers, meaning you cannot activate your mics nor type in the chat.

As a reminder to all, this call is being recorded. Recordings will be posted on the ICANN website shortly after the call ends. All panelists must remember to state the names clearly before speaking. All panelists on participants on the call and must abide by the ICANN Standards of Behavior. And with this, I’ll hand it over to Keith Drazek. Keith, please go ahead.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you very much, Natalie. Thanks for getting us kicked off. Hello, everybody. Welcome to the Joint GNSO Council - SSAC meeting

---

***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.***

---

for ICANN69. This is one of the early sessions taking place in the community bilateral session portion of the ICANN69 meeting, which is taking place over the course of three weeks. The GNSO Council actually had our first bilateral meeting with the GAC early last week and this is now the second meeting that we will have bilaterally with other parts of the ICANN community.

So, Rod, I'm very, very grateful as always for the SSAC and for your willingness to engage with us on issues of mutual interest. And I'd like to thank you and SSAC colleagues and staff support for providing some slides that will help guide us through our conversation today. So with that, maybe I can hand it over to you for some opening remarks from SSAC and then we can get started. Thank you.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Sounds good. Thanks, Keith. I'm really happy to be able to get together virtually as it is with the GNSO Council here and quite a number of attendees. It's great to see all the interest in what we have been mutually in common here. I greatly appreciate the time.

We did put together a few items to talk about. I think there's some really interesting things for us to go over. I'm looking forward to the conversation. And if there were any other topics that had occurred to you, Keith, or the Council that weren't being covered here, it would be good to add them in so we know where we are timing-wise as we walk through this. I think we should be in good shape walking through but we'll see.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yeah. Thanks very much, Rod. Agree. I think the items that you've listed here are pretty well covered. I think the issues that we'd like to discuss and the GNSO Council is particularly interested in the SSAC's recent work on the topic of DNS abuse. We understand that the SSAC has had a work party under way and that there's an expectation that there will be some work product coming from that in the very near future. And we certainly look forward to that as it will help inform the work of the GNSO on the topic and we can get into the substance of that.

I'll ask if any other councilors or if anybody has any additional topics they'd like to suggest, please type it into chat. Same goes for SSAC members, if there's anything that anybody feels is missing from here then we can certainly add that in. But I do feel like this is a pretty comprehensive list.

So maybe, Rod, if we could just jump right in and keep an eye on the chat, obviously, in case something gets suggested. But why don't we jump right into the next slide and focus on the topic of DNS abuse? I'll just tee it up by noting that for really the last two years, this topic of DNS abuse has received a lot of interest across the community from just about every group that you can imagine that there's been quite a bit of activity, discussions in SO/AC cross-community panels, various sessions around the last three or four ICANN meetings. And I think there's a recognition that we've talked about it quite a bit and the question now is: is there more that can be done? Is there some action

---

or activity that needs to be taken by the community, and what does that look like? I think the work of SSAC and the SSAC DNS Abuse Work Party will be critical to helping inform the broader community about perhaps a framework that we've discussed. So maybe I could hand this one back over to you.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Thanks, Keith. I think you've teed this up pretty well. There are a couple of different things we wanted to talk to here, this section. The work we've been doing, as you mentioned, that has been underway—and we'll talk about that in some more depth here in a moment—and then after that, have a discussion on any gaps that you see based on what I can share with you today on that and other questions you may have that we may be able to at least provide some thoughts on, even if it's not in the current work product we're working on going forward. This is a broad topic area.

But concur that we've been talking a lot and it's great to have these engaged conversations, especially with pretty much all the SO/AC groups having chimed in on this and very thoughtfully. And I think there's been a lot of, well, some of the conversations in the past are still with us. I think there's been a lot of recognition that there's a common set of issues that we all want to address and we want to take those on and do that across the community in a way that makes sense. Thank you for moving to the next slide.

So just some highlights on what we're working on. So the way that SSAC works—this is a quick review for those of you who may not be as

---

familiar—we create what we call work parties which tend to be members of the SSAC that have background in a particular area that we’re maybe covering. Those topics range quite a bit and as you might imagine, we have people with different levels of expertise in various security and stability topics. We put that group together and we come up with a Charter, we bash that around, get that approved by the full SSAC, and then we go to work and try and discuss an issue whether we come up with some sort of work product.

That may range from something educational to something very specific where we may have advice to give to the Board, to the community, to other SO/ACs, etc. Then that work product gets presented the entire SSAC for their review and comments, and that could include people who may have some expertise in the area we were working on, who weren’t part of the work party and usually due to day job issues, but they can take a fresh look at it and give us some perspective, along with those that may not be as familiar with that but which gives us the capability of getting the thoughts of people who aren’t necessarily as familiar with the problem space to make sure we weren’t too esoteric or did a good job of explaining what we’re doing.

And then once we do that, we see what kind of consensus there is across the entire organization or SSAC, and then try and work out any difference in the comments that comes in around the approach or the recommendations we may or may not have within that. Then once we do that, we then publish that document. That document could include if we don’t come to full consensus on stuff, alternate views on a particular issue or particular set of recommendations or typically just

---

parts of the work where one of our members may have had a different—where it's a minority kind of opinion things. But we like to make sure that's transparent and it's also presented, not just the full view. So that's a quick overview of that.

Where we are in the process right now, as we do have a draft that has been sent by the work party to the full SSAC for review on that and we are in the process of incorporating some fairly substantial set of comments back into that paper, there's some significant ones that we're going to have to work through. Unfortunately, we thought we were going to have something, hopefully, ready for this. We've gotten a lot of input that we need to take into account and the work party has to work through that to make sure that we are taking that into account, and then anything that we can't address that fits in the consensus of the work party and the broader SSAC. We have to provide an opportunity for any of those issues to be written up as an alternative view by the person or persons that have that viewpoint so that we can present the whole thing.

So that's where we are right now. I'm not sure what the timeline on that is going to be. Those SSAC members will know that these things sometimes will get done really quickly and sometimes may take a few times going back and forth, but we definitely should be able to get something out here in the near term. Having this virtual meeting is kind of messing with our base schedule so I'm not sure when that will be out and available, which shouldn't be too long. If we can get things worked out, I'm thinking, in a matter of weeks, not months or quarters or years as it has been in the past.

---

Then the slide there shows—that’s kind of the outline of the way the report is written right now on the topic areas we’re going to be covering here. We are not trying to redefine abuse, that’s an important thing. We decided to avoid getting into that kind of morass of an area because our definitions of abuse that ICANN community is already using, so we refer to those within the documentation. That could be a whole other thing that we could attempt to do, but what we really talked what we wanted to get into is how you deal with those. In other words, what are the actions? What are you trying to get done? And what are the things that are impediments to dealing with abuse issues that we’re seeing repeated over and over throughout the industry? Also, what we’re getting feedback from the parties that are trying to deal with it both from the reporting and the victimization side, and the various parties, whether it’s somebody within contracted party or web hosting or e-mail providers or what have you, that have to deal with that from what’s going on in their service. Those are the broad areas we’re trying to deal with and provide some thoughts on that. So it’s a little bit more practical I think of a focus on that.

One of the things that’s also important in this work party, we took advantage of one of our operational procedures that allows us to invite additional non-SSAC members to participate in the work party. So we actually have several people that have joined the work party that aren’t full-time SSAC members but have background and domain registration services, both from the registry and the registrar perspective, as well as law enforcement and dealing with abuse. So we

---

had a few other folks come in and participate on that and offer some, I think, really good inputs to the folks we already have on that.

So that's where we're at with that. I'm not sure—it's 3 AM for the work party Chair, Jeff Bedser. Jeff is on the call. He's a panelist. Jeff, did you want to add anything that I didn't cover?

JEFF BEDSER:

Thanks, Rod. No, I think you covered it pretty thoroughly there. We are going to the last steps of the process. I think we have in the executive outline we've provided there some more details about where the effort is going overall, with hopefully getting the last steps of SSAC approval in place. We are participating in a DNS abuse plenary next week, I believe. This would cover it a little bit more thoroughly at that time as part of the plenary.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Thanks, Jeff, and thanks for being up at 3 AM—and for everybody who's up at 3 AM in the East Coast, including Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yeah. Thanks, Rod. Thanks for the update and the overview. Obviously, this is really important work to help inform the community broadly about the SSAC's views on the topic, and various parts of the community will need to take this on to figure out next steps of their own, including the GNSO and the GNSO Council.



---

Just briefly, I think, as most know, the topic of DNS abuse is with the GNSO Council currently because some of the CCTRT recommendations that were assigned to or referred to the Subsequent Procedures group were referred back to the Council by Subsequent Procedures so that there would be a holistic approach considering the issues and not only limited to developing policy recommendations for a future round, that there was a recognition that if these are issues important enough for policy work that they should be considered for all TLDs.

So, the Council has that on our agenda for further discussion and it is something that we recognize is important, and also the subject of GAC advice to the Board as it relates to addressing those issues related to DNS security threats, DNS abuse prior to the launch of the next round of new gTLDs. So this is obviously something that the GNSO Council moving forward will need to take up to figure out if and what level of policy work is needed. And obviously the work that SSAC has done on this will be very helpful in figuring out the path forward there. I think there's an open question as to what the next steps are. Is it best practices? Is it community work cross-community? Is it a PDP through the GNSO? I think the SSAC work will help very much inform sort of the path that we take forward.

So I'll stop there and see if anybody else would like to jump in any further reaction, Rod. I know we have a fairly full agenda today so I don't want to cut this one short in any way, shape, or form, but we do have a few other things to talk about. So, any further comments on this one?

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Let me just add—and it looks like some hands are going up so I'll just be real quick. Yeah. What we're trying to do is provide some foundational work that could then be adopted as framing for various questions that need to be answered in policy work, and hopefully lead to either some sort of best practices or approaches that can be taken by the community and adopt it. This issue is bigger than just the ICANN sphere of influence too, which is important to remember. Registries and registrars often get pulled into issues where they don't really have a direct relationship that's most appropriate—and we're going to talk about that in the paper—to deal with the issues but there is that that kind of kill switch, if you will, that people are tempted to try to pull. And so there is a role that sometimes inappropriately and reluctantly you have to play, and there are some rules in the escalation in dealing with issues as well. So we try to spell those out. But this may be a bit broader issue than just thinking about the contracted parties in the ICANN sphere and thinking a bit broader about that. We're going to try and do that in the paper as well so that we can have a conversation that's even larger at some point in the future.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Rod. I'll come to Michele next who has his hand up, but I just want to note, one of the questions that you've asked in the slide here is what gaps in addressing DNS abuse does the GNSO Council believe currently exist. One of the things that we've been hearing I think from

---

ICANN Org is one of the gaps that they've identified and that I think has been identified broadly is lack of consistent data and the need for improved data collection and data reporting that would then provide a scientific basis for being able to assess and look across TLDs and across operators, and to have a better sense or more visibility into what's actually going on. So I think that's one of the things that we've heard quite recently is one of the missing tools, when we talk about dealing with the topic of DNS security threats and potentially bad actors, is the lack of or sort of insufficiently reliable data. And so that's one thing that we've certainly heard. Michele, I'll turn to you next. Thanks.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Thanks, Keith. Good morning. Yeah. It's unfortunate rather you don't have something to actually present to us this morning, as this will be my last opportunity to do this. But anyway, I suppose in kind of broader terms, I would hope that whatever does come out with this is based on facts and data and isn't overly influenced by hyperbole because all too often, many of the discussions around DNS abuse seem to go into hyperbole more than facts. Some of the points you made I think in your introduction were helpful.

With respect to the GNSO, the GNSO can only influence gTLD policy and, by extension, contract. And as you pointed out, in many instances these issues are outside the remit of ICANN, outside the remit of contracted parties. I think it may be the output of some of this might be simply to say there are issues and they need to be dealt with but

---

not specifically within the ICANN sphere. And I'd also assume that when you are looking at DNS abuse that you're looking at it across all TLDs and not just gTLDs. Thanks.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Yeah, and definitely the yes on that last question. It's not just TLDs, it's IP space, it's e-mail. It's everything. And abuses. Everybody ends up getting complaints about everything I think to some extent. So it's a complex set of questions. And yeah, I totally agree on the reliance on not just—hyperbole is one case, anecdote in the other. Unfortunately, this gets back to what data is available, what's the quality and efficacy of it, which is another discussion where we actually are having within the SSAC and I think in a broader look, as well as what are the data that we have available to actually make good policy decisions with that goes well beyond abuse, as to lots of other things too. But in the SSAC's perspective, this is SSR issues.

And do we have good data? In some cases, we do, and in other cases, we probably don't. But that's one of the things that's not on the agenda here but we are having conversations in the SSAC about taking a look at as well. I think there are definitely some improvements we can all aspire to be able to make better decisions around how to do policy moving forward. Because it's much better to do it based on comparatives and lots and lots of real world data rather than just a few anecdotes here and there, and people's opinions.

---

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Rod, and thanks, Michele, for the point. If there are no other hands at this point, we probably should move on. So if we could move to the next slide.

The question posed is a question about the next steps for the EPDP, and we're referring here to the EPDP that was originally launched to focus on the Temporary Specification and the need to replace the Temp Spec related to registration data and, more recently, the EPDP Phase 2 work on the Standardized System for Access and Disclosure. I think, as most are aware, the GNSO Council did approve the Phase 2 recommendations on September 24 during the Council meeting.

At our Council meeting this, October 21, we'll take the official step of delivering those recommendations to the ICANN Board for its consideration. The question here is about some of the issues that were identified and in the Charter from Phase 1 and Phase 2 that were not on the critical path or not deemed to be on the critical path for the SSAD in Phase 2 but that were still identified as important topics by a range of community groups and members. And so the question here is, what is the Council's thinking for issues not addressed or not resolved in the EPDP Phase 1 and 2, and specifically talking about legal versus natural and the topic of data accuracy.

So the GNSO Council over the last several months, in anticipation of needing to plan a path forward on these issues, has formed a small team. That small team has provided and presented a recommendation to the full Council to basically lay out the plan for moving forward with work on these issues.

---

The current proposal is essentially to create two separate tracks. One would be a track within the EPDP, so basically an extension or a reconstituting of the EPDP team to focus on the topic of legal versus natural persons. And also the question of unique identifiers related to e-mail, and that would be one bucket. And then the separate track or the separate bucket would be focused on the topic of data accuracy that would require some additional scoping. So that is actually on the GNSO Council's agenda for our meeting on the 21<sup>st</sup>. There's, I think, been quite broad support for the small team's proposal in this matter.

Then of course, the follow-up question is, what is the timing for the initiation of these additional work tracks? I think in this particular case we see the legal versus natural and the reconstituting of the EPDP team as probably the lighter lift, although we'll have to find a new Chair for the group and also to confirm with the various stakeholder groups and SOs and ACs that had members participating, whether the members will remain the same or whether they want to recast their contributors to the EPDP team to focus on this topic. So there's a little bit of administrative work that needs to take place there. Then the topic of data accuracy is one that's going to require some additional scoping effort and have a separate track of its own.

So let me pause there, Rod. I'll kick it back to you if you have any follow-up questions, but that's essentially where we are on the topic of the Priority 2 issues that were left over from Phase 1 and Phase 2. Thanks.

---

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thanks, Keith. That is in line with our previous conversations. Thank you for confirming that's the direction you guys ended up heading. This has been a big lift for everybody.

Just for clarification, we use that e-mail, a pseudo anonymization thing, is that the issue you're referring to?

KEITH DRAZEK: I believe that's correct. If I'm wrong about that, I'm sure somebody else will correct me.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay. That's an interesting issue, obviously, from an SSAC perspective, and the pros and cons and approaches to doing that. Sure, we'll look forward to continuing participation on working on those particular issues. As you know, those are ones we've been very keen on since day one, so looking forward to getting those resolved as soon as possible. That was fairly in line with what I expected. I just wanted to make sure that everybody had a chance to get caught up on where things stood.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Rod. Any questions, any comments on this one? If not, we can move on. Okay. So, Rob, I'm going to hand this one back to you. I understand as SAC113 has been issued. It talks about the SSAC advisory on private-use TLDs. Obviously, this has some relation to or at least potential relation to the ongoing policy work in the gTLD space related to Subsequent Procedures' next round of new gTLDs

---

and all of that. So I'll just hand this one back over to you to tee it up.  
Thanks.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Great. Thanks, Keith. I'm going to give an outline here on what we just published and then see what questions and thoughts you may have from the GNSO perspective. You may end up with this handed to you by the Board so we made recommendations to the Board and they can [inaudible] things up, which is a topic later for our conversation. Can I get the next slide, please?

To give you a quick overview of what we're talking about here in this last paper, it may seem a little esoteric but it actually is very germane to the things that we've run into in our name collisions analysis. If you're familiar with the NCAP work we've been doing, that's the Name Collision Analysis Project, which is trying to understand why we have different names kind of leaking out in the DNS that people are using for different who knows why. One of those kind of creation or one of the sources of the background radiation, if you will, of names out there, a lot of things they're doing this for kind of a private use. In other words, they're trying to create their own little namespace that isn't really on the normal DNS tree and using that for various things.

An example of that would be like .belkin for Belkin routers. They actually use this thing for provisioning. Just an example, which is not a name they didn't apply for or anything like that and creates a whole bunch of traffic to the root. It's an example of a device vendor creating their own custom namespace that's not supposed to really interact



---

with the DNS, yet it does. And there is really no provision for that in the DNS hierarchy. There is a concept of that in the IP address space. If you're familiar with the RFC 1918 space—that's a little geeky—but if you've ever programmed your own home router or network at home, you might have said, "We're going to use this address starting with 192.168.0 or 10.1.0 dot something." Anyway, those are things that are set aside and are scoped out by the IETF in the IP space. These are for private use. It shouldn't be routed, etc. We won't talk about how those leak out too because they do, but that's a different issue. But that's an analogy that a lot of folks can use to understand that.

So to solve this problem in the past, in SAC062—and we still stand by this as best practice—is that you should really use a domain name that you have put into play and use some sort of a domain or sub domain on that for doing your internal stuff but just routing it and controlling it yourself, and that's still the best practice. While that advice has been out there, a lot of people aren't aware of it or just ignore it because it's a lot easier to do something else.

This has been a concept that's been bouncing back and forth between the various groups and within the IETF, and there's a long history around that I'm not going to dive into, but it's been bouncing around a bit. And it's not as clear cut as it seems and there are some issues around the how and when, but we were able to get consensus on at least this concept within the SSAC and provided that advice the Board. So what we're saying is that we should identify a string and set that aside for this private space that can be designated. On the next slide, I've got criteria for that. We don't have any specific string so we're not

---

saying, “Use this word or words.” It’s definitely specifying one could be more. That’s a policy decision.

But the criteria here are obviously valid so it has to meet those normal requirements. So no emoji. That’s an inside joke, sorry. It’s not already delegated. It’s getting kind of obvious. Making sure that it’s not confusingly similar, and that’s going to be a bit more of a challenge. It is relatively short, memorable, and meaningful, which also gets to be a little bit of a challenge, but there are there are plenty of examples out there.

With that, we think that a lot of this ad hoc usage that is creating these collisions that would otherwise cause problems, especially if you want to expand the namespace, a lot of that ad hoc usage would be addressed or at least anecdotal evidence from conversations with some device vendors and service providers that they would use such a thing. Obviously, not everybody’s going to use it because they won’t hear about it or get to pay attention to what’s going on. That would also provide some predictability. If we say, “Designate this thing and it will never, ever, ever be delegated in the DNS,” then people will have some certainty that whatever they choose won’t end up all of a sudden resolving somewhere and causing a big security hole. A side benefit of that is hopefully we will reduce some of the background radiation that we get to the root servers. And maybe even make sure that if people want to get a TLD some point in the future, there isn’t some massive distribution of devices that are happen to be using that name that makes that really difficult to do and you have to say through collisions analysis that that’s not advisable to do.

---

So that's an overview of what we've come out with in SAC113. I'm very happy to take questions on that. I'm not sure who else is on the panel.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Rod. Thanks very much for the overview. That's really helpful. I see that there are a couple of hands up here in chat, and also there's a comment or question that's been put into the Q&A pod, I think. So if you want to take a look at that. Maybe we could go to James and then Maxim, and then if anybody else from SSAC would like to contribute or jump in, then by all means. But maybe we could just get to the queue real quick. So, James?

JAMES GANNON:

Thanks, Keith. More of a comment than anything else. This seems to have become a relatively hot topic recently out of nowhere. So I'm just concerned that we have multiple streams of the DNS community all working on this topic with very little coordination. So we have IETF and DNS [inaudible] still adopted Roy Arends's draft on private-use TLDs using an ISO code. We have now SAC113 on the topic, and also it's interlinked into GNSO policy as well. I know when it came to IESG on the IETF side that there was a discussion with the ICANN liaison, but I noted that that never came as far as the GNSO Council from a policy perspective.

So it just seems to me like this seems to be a topic at the moment. It's a very specific topic. There's some suggestions out there, given that we have an adopted idea that has been drafted by an ICANN staff

---

member at the IETF. It seems like that could be an area that might get traction. And I'm just wondering—and I don't have a solution for this one because I'm coming off Council so it can't be me—who is going to coordinate, because I think all three groups have a seat at the table. I think SSAC needs to be there from a SSR perspective. I think GNSO needs to be there from a policy oversight point of view, and IETF from a policy implementation point of view and really formalizing it. Do we have a mechanism to coordinate between those three bodies? And do we have a plan between, at least on our side, SSAC and GNSO? I think this could be a good opportunity for us to work together on something that's of interest to both of us and that we have a goal and respective role to play.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, James. Just to reinforce one of the things that James said is that the GNSO Council has not discussed this in much depth or detail at all. So there's no GNSO Council position or sort of a consolidated view on this, but I think this is a really important opportunity to ask the questions that James just did in terms of next steps and better coordination and where the implications are. So with that, Rod, I can hand it back to you or we could go to the queue further.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Let me just try and address that because there might be some other questions there. There are multiple years bring here and this has been an issue that's been kicking around in the SSAC for a while. It

---

actually took us about a year to come out with this. So there's been some work that's going on in the meantime.

The current proposal that you mentioned is not incompatible with this one but it is different. There's some coordination to be thought of there. That's the .zz, I believe. This is actually a string that has been proposed. Then there are some other things about actually whether or not you put it into the zone and whether you sign it. There's some open questions about how to actually accomplish some of the different things and goals you may want to do with that. I would note that the SSAC did not provide any guidance in that arena. There's a lot of discussion within SSAC about what to do, but we were able to come to consensus on what we did push out there.

There is an informal coordination role between the IETF and ICANN Board, the liaison. I don't know so much from the GNSO's perspective. And then there's also overlap between the SSAC and the group within the IETF that's working on that, as we have a couple of our members are actually in leadership or are active members of that IETF group. So I think there is some coordination there. If there's a policy where the GNSO takes on how we actually coordinate that is a really good question. I don't have an answer for that at the moment. That's definitely something we need to be thinking about.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thanks very much, Rod. Maxim, you're next and then to Michele. Thanks.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

A few notes. First of all, a description of relatively short, memorable, and meaningful TLD is just a good TLD. It's what's people are fighting for. And from bureaucratic perspective, this advice gives preference to corporate entities over everybody else because ICANN is about protection of public interest. And this advice is about protecting of corporate interests of vendors who do not care about what's going on in the world. So why should we honor their choice? Because if we allow that, we will see now it's about like 10 or 20 names. We will see thousands of names. It will be not predictable what is possible to use and what is not possible to use. So it's very dangerous advice. Instead of like try to pile your garbage and do not leak to DNS. Effectively, it says, "Do whatever you want in your appliances." Anyway, we will have to shut up and eat it. So it's a bad advice in terms of not being compliant with ICANN Bylaws because it's not about public interest. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Maxim. Rod, go ahead.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

I'm not sure I understood. Are you saying the SSAC advice is bad advice because we're saying, "Do whatever you want"? I'm just trying to understand what you just said there.

---

MAXIM ALZOBA: Effectively, you suggest that a vendor who chose some TLD have preference over what's going on in the multistakeholder model where the community elaborates some rules under which TLDs of next generation are go to one [hand] or another basing on the application, etc. So it's quite dangerous to create a door through which at vendor could go and get whatever they want. Thanks.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay. All right. My apologies. I wasn't clear. What we're proposing is exactly the opposite of what you just stated. We're saying here is a place for if you're a vendor or a service provider or somebody who's providing something that wants to use a name that doesn't exist today, instead of just creating your own, use this. Whatever this is, ICANN would designate it, which would come through the policy development process. So I think we said exactly where what your position is, Maxim. It's don't pollute the potential TLD space as a vendor with whatever you want. Instead, A, you should be using your domain name you already own and just use a sub domain of that or something like along those lines. That's our standing advice. And if you can't do that, put it into this controlled garbage space, so to speak.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yes. Thanks very much, Rod, for the clarification. Thanks, Maxim, for the question. Michele, you're next.

---

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks. I suppose the [mass] IP range is a good analogy but the key differences that all devices out there, unless they're really badly coded, respect that difference and understand that space, whereas with this private TLD concept, that's not the case. I mean, even if you somehow come up with a very short list of quasi TLDs that should be used on devices, at the moment there's no technical way to enforce the usage. I could still set up .rod or .keith on my private network. Is it technically possible to somehow rewrite how all these devices work and just limit them in the future? Or is this more a case of putting a kind of a pin down to say, "This is something that people need to be aware of"?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Right.

MICHELE NEYLON: I'm just not sure you understand what I'm trying to articulate. It's just that with the IP addresses, it's clearly delineated. Whereas with this at the moment, I can do whatever the hell I want even though best practices might say stick to something logical.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah. I think you're bringing up a use case. I used the idea of a vendor as one use case here. Another use case is if you have a private network and you want to use your own naming infrastructure under it. Think about .corp, for example, which was one that Microsoft had instructed people to use for probably a decade or more as their internal



---

corporate network TLD which cause corp name collisions down the road amongst other things.

You have the same issue with the local number space what you do in the namespace. If you bring two private name spaces together, you have to deal with the inevitable internal collisions you're going to have on that. We actually talked about that, I believe, in the paper that you still have that problem. You have that problem when you're reassigning networks, when you merge two companies together that were both using the same IP space internally. That doesn't really change that part. There is a use case where people may want to take advantage of a TLD that will never exist in the overall DNS root to be able to do some of the internal networking stuff, and they know that if they were using something like that and then it won't be delegated so that all of a sudden their internal traffic would be external traffic. So it does solve that problem. Again, our recommendation on that would be to use a proper sub domain or networking on the domain they've already registered that is in the global DNS. But again, some people don't want to do that and want to have the capability of doing that.

This gets to a little bit to Jeff Neuman's question as well and what's the incentive? Incentive is for people who are looking for a solution to this particular problem who don't want to use a fully delegated namespace area. We're not going to solve the problem. I think we outlined that in the paper as well. We're not going to solve all the problems. This is about reducing kind of the collateral damage and the noise that's out there. We don't think this is going to be a magic solution. It will never be someone's going to go, "I'm going to use

---

this.” It is going to be used by a number of people. And again, over time, that kind of gets baked into things. I don’t expect something like this is going to be backwards compatible with a lot of older software, but hopefully frontwards compatible if we adopted as an IETF standard and designated via ICANN policy. That’s a pretty strong incentive for people going forward to get things right.

KEITH DRAZEK:

So thanks very much, Rod. I think we’re all encouraged hearing about the expectation that if this advice is taken on, that there would still be some policy work required to accomplish it, essentially. So I think that’s helpful and obviously another area for the GNSO, GNSO Council to coordinate with SSAC and other parts of the community on any possible next steps, depending on what comes out of the advice.

I just want to note that we only have about 11 minutes left on the call and I think we have a few other issues so I’m going to suggest that we move on from this one. But thank you very much for giving us the overview on SAC113. I’m sure there’ll be some further conversation on that. So if we can move to the next slide.

Okay. So this topic is new gTLD subsequent procedures, and the question that’s been posed from SSAC is, “Given that SubPro PDP chose to not address some issues considered germane to all gTLDs, including DNS abuse, what’s the Council’s thinking in addressing these areas prior to opening another round?” I think I did refer to this earlier, acknowledged that the Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group co-Chairs had referred the issue specifically referred to it by the Board

---

from the CCTRT recommendations back to the GNSO Council for consideration, and that's exactly what the GNSO Council will do. After we see SSAC's Work Party paper and basically continue to pull together the relevant information past work that's been done, recent discussions, understanding the various positions of different parts of the community is to try to appropriately scope any future policy work that might be required on the topic and noting that there is GAC advice as it relates to timing concerning the launch of the next round of new gTLD. So I think we did cover this one a little bit earlier but I'm happy to answer any questions on that. Then obviously there's a couple of sub bullets, some questions about, how does the Name Collision Analysis Project work fit in, and what's the best way for SSAC to provide input to GNSO processes, given the short public comment timeline that existed for SubPro? Rod, maybe I can hand this one back to you.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Yeah. I think the last—part three actually ties back into the rest of the question and topics. We wanted to this. Let me defer that one. One of the things that came out of looking through the SubPro stuff was some of these meta issues that really apply to all TLDs, not necessarily new TLDs but when thinking about expanding the zone. What are the things that we want to make sure we've at least accounted for that happened in the last time that more of these meta issues that apply policy perspective across that? And how does that affect potentially the timing and the way we approach a new round as we move forward? I think there's some important questions, and then obviously

---

you're having those discussions within the Council itself. We're going to be providing some further thinking along those meta issues ourselves as we're working through some stuff that came out of that questions that we asked ourselves when reading through the subsequent procedures more around these meta issues. So, we will have some questions probably in an upcoming document soon on that, but I just wanted to kind of figure out if you have any thoughts on where the Council was thinking on how to deal with some of those issues, what those thoughts were?

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yeah. Thanks, Rod. I think at this point, the Council is aware of the work that's ongoing in the Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group. Obviously, the public comment period that was open has closed and that now the working group and staff are going through the process of analyzing those comments, looking for, in particular, anything new that's been raised in terms of suggestions or concerns or questions. And so the Council at this point is essentially waiting for the Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group to deliver its final report to the Council for consideration. The current target is the end of the year towards the end of December, but we also recognize that there's been quite a bit of input provided by ICANN Org, by ICANN Board, by all of the various parts of the community that need to be fully considered.

So I think the Council's position on this right now is that we're looking to support the PDP Working Group in concluding its work and making

---

sure that it has the resources that it needs to do so. But I think at this point, I'm not sure that we have any sort of broader position or view on some of the issues that you've described. I mean, DNS abuse obviously is one that we've acknowledged because there was a formal referral of that topic back to the GNSO Council. So that's something that we will take on while recognizing that there is the GAC advice and the expectation that that work should be concluded before the launch of the next round.

I actually don't have an answer for you on the question about the NCAP work but I will just follow up to say if you ask what's the best way for SSAC to provide input to GNSO processes, the first step would be to participate directly in the working groups themselves because that's where the substantive work takes place. Next would be obviously providing input through public comment periods. And then finally, of course, like other Advisory Committees, SSAC has the ability to provide advice to the Board. And of course, intermingled there, I would certainly encourage SSAC and GNSO Council moving forward, if there are concerns or process questions or anything like that that we maintain an open dialogue and have the opportunity to flag concerns or flag issues that may arise before they get serious. So let me stop there and, Rod, I'll hand it back to you.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Actually, good because we only have a few minutes left. Can we just slide down to slide 12, because that actually ties right into what we wanted to bring up here? And I think this is a good place to finish on

---

and because this is something to think about moving forward. And I look forward to working on this with your successor here shortly on this.

It's been really interesting in the last couple years having some formal representation on the EPDP, and then over the years SSAC has participated—our members, not SSAC itself but our members have participated in PDPs over time, some more, some less, or some not at all. That's certainly a way to participate. But there are a couple of things. One, when we do provide a recommendation to the GNSO Council, there really isn't a process for that other than we do it and every time we've done it, you've been courteous enough to give us some sort of response back. We may not all always agree on things but there's no kind of formal process for that. But there is a formal process for us to work through the Board, and then the Board often refer some of the things we do, or GAC or ALAC or whoever over to the GNSO for consideration, and that gets put out to the PDP, potentially.

Then that's not always clear that once kind of scum gotten handed off, how that hands back. So we've done a lot of work with the Board over the last three years to really get a good process together. So our advice that goes to the Board, we know what happens with it as the action request register and we're just an implementation, the whole bit. That's really helped us a lot with cleaning up a whole bunch of things that have been sitting out there for like even up to 10 years. But we don't really have a process for going through that from our organization to yours or yours to ours if you wanted to ask the SSAC something or ccNSO, any of the other ones. So really there's an open

---

question. How do we actually do a better job of that? And then are there some things where you have the PDP kicked off where there are some SSR issues where you would want to have some more formal input from the SSAC, for example. It might even be RSSAC, for example. I'm going to throw other people under the bus here but I'm just trying to think about how we do a better job of coordinating process, which ties into the meta issues we're all talking about with the Board for the next two weeks. It would be a good thing to kind of finish on, we would really like to coordinate better and thinking about how we can track advice, and if it gets stuck somewhere, how to unstuck it.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Rod. I think that's really helpful and constructive in terms of trying to ensure the processes are working well, and if they don't exist today, to find a way to create them. I see Rafik has his hand up. So, Rafik, over to you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Keith, and thanks to Rod. Just a few comments about this. First, I think it's important to have the participation of SSAC members from the beginning of the process, I think that's helpful. It's more I think effective to give input from the beginning when the deliberation is going on within the PDP so that can help in terms of working on the recommendation.

---

Regarding the process or if we need some more formalization, I'm not sure if it's needed or required or something important maybe for SSAC to feel that there is guarantee that we will respond, but I think we can ensure that if there is any communication or any letter from the SSAC, the GNSO Council will respond in due time. And so we have this, maybe it's not the first meeting, but something maybe we can plan for future. I do believe some of the topics were introduced to GNSO Council to get more awareness about those issues. And so this may be one of mechanism we can have, this joint meeting, in regular basis. But also if there is any advice that if you send to the Board, you can also maybe send to GNSO Council before you proceed if you think it's something we need to have a look at. Also I'm not sure we need some formal mechanism, but if needed, we can discuss about that. So we can use this different channel, if it's helpful. But again, yes, participating in the PDP because that's where your members can give all the input in that perspective from the security and stability for DNS. I think that will be really helpful in terms of feedback, etc.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thank you, Rafik. I note that there's been some additional comment or input saying that there's an expectation on SubPro that there may be a call coming up sometime in the next couple of weeks to discuss a SSAC input verbally, and that there were invitations early on in the SubPro process for all parts of the community to participate and contribute expertise and leadership and all of that. But, Rod, I think your points here on this meta discussion slide I think are all very helpful in terms of sort of laying out what can the next Council do in



---

terms of identifying ways to ensure that SSAC advice and input and expertise is incorporated into our processes so we can be as informed as possible. So I think this is a helpful slide teeing up future work.

And with that, Rod, I'm going to hand this back to you at this point. We're just about a minute over. I just say thank you very much to you and to SSAC colleagues and to everybody that joined, all of the attendees, for your attention and participation. So, Rod, last floor is yours.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

All right. Well, thank you, Keith. I'll echo all of your comments to all the participants. There's a good crowd here and all of the questions were brought forth. This is a conversation we want to continue to have. We definitely want to try and schedule these going forward as well. I think there's some things in this last slide here, especially when we're thinking about formal advice that's gone through the Board and gets passed along, who's got the baton and where it end up is really important for all of us to know. So hopefully without being too much of a heavyweight process, we should try and figure out how to best do that. And then we're going to continue to do our best to participate in all the process we can with a 30 plus member, all volunteer group that's trying to do its own work, too. So we'll keep trying. Sorry if we end up chiming in late on a few things. There's only so much focus we can have at one time but we'll do our best. So thanks again, everybody.

---

KEITH DRAZEK:                      Okay. Thanks, Rod. Thanks, all. With that, we'll go ahead and conclude.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE:            That concludes today's call. You may now disconnect your lines and have a great rest of your days and evenings. Alex Pablo, please stop the recording. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**