
ICANN70 | Virtual Community Forum – SSAC Public Meeting
Thursday, March 25, 2021 – 12:30 to 14:00 EST

KATHY SCHNITT: Hello and welcome to the SSAC Public Meeting. My name is Kathy and I'm joined by my colleague Danielle and we are the remote participation managers for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN expected standards of behavior.

During this session, questions and comments will only be read aloud if submitted within the Q&A pod. I will read them aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of this session.

This session includes our new automated real-time transcription. Please note that this transcription is not official or authoritative. To view the real-time transcription, click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar.

And with that, I'm happy to hand it over to Rod Rasmussen, SSAC Chair.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thank you, Kathy. And could we please get video enabled for the panelists as well? Thank you. Welcome everybody. Thank you very much for your interest in SSAC's work and for attending today's session. We all look forward to these at every ICANN meeting. And we have a lot to cover today as you can see from the agenda. We have three reports that we've put out since our last time we were all together in the fall or spring, depending on your side of the world but back in October/November time frame. And we also have ongoing work, quite

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.

a bit of it, that we're spending a lot of time on besides putting out these most recent reports.

And then we also are in the stage of our calendar year where we are looking at potential new members. I want to spend some time on that because really do need some input and help from the community to reach out and help stock up our membership with a diverse set of experts from around the world and we'll talk about that towards the end.

We're going to encourage as many questions as possible to be asked in the Q&A pod. We will attempt to have somebody get back to you during the session. If not though, we will try and attempt to answer all those questions and get answers back. If somebody does not have access to a keyboard, please raise your hand to ask the question and if there is some particular question that we need to get clarification on or dive into a little bit, we'll enable that for folks as well.

I see videos coming on. Very good. Good to see you all. Also, given the amount of topics we have we're going to try and limit our Q&A for each major section to no more than about 10 minutes or so just to make sure we get through all the topics. And we do have hopefully some time at the end we can come back and catch up on anything that was a "hot topic" that folks wanted to continue discussing.

So, that's how we will try and work our way through the agenda today. Next slide please.

So, for those of you who aren't familiar with the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC), here's just a quick update or overview of what we are and what we do. As you can see, we have 33 members right now. As I mentioned, we are looking to expand that at the moment. And our membership committee is starting to review applications right now that we will then process later in the year.

The area that we concentrate on is security and integrity of the naming system in particular but we also opine on other topics in these spaces with 116 now publications since the SSAC was created back in 2002. You can see expertise that we have there on the lower left corner and those are high level areas. We also have various other aspects where we look for skills, etc. for membership. Next slide please.

So, as part of ICANN's mission, SSR (Security, Stability, and Resiliency) are a key cornerstone to that and the SSAC was created to help provide advice and recommendations in this space. In order to that, internally what we do is we create what we call work parties that get together and look at a topic, form a charter and plan for dealing with the work; that may involve some research. Will definitely involve a lot of writing and references to work that's been done in other places. And the work party then reviews that internally. That's sent around once the work party has a draft that it is satisfied with, it was sent around for the entire membership to have a chance to review. Comments and feedback are taken from that and back to the work party for inclusion and then there's a process so that various comments and opinions that are deferred can be worked into the full consensus or at the end of the day

they may be published as an alternative view or dissent of the full SSAC consensus and included with the pilot paper which is then published.

On the overall process, we report directly to the ICANN Board. We will submit recommendations to the Board, they may be referred to other parts of the ICANN ecosystem or community. Particularly policy related things will be pushed over to the GNSO typically. And then we have in the past and we will continue to provide feedback on areas that will fall outside of ICANN's direct remit but are areas that touch on things, we'll talk about that in some of our current work. As an example, the routing work we're doing; looking at the impact on the DNS of that but that's an area that's not necessarily within ICANN's remit but has a direct impact on us from a security and stability perspective.

And then the Board itself will, if there's something that needs to be implemented based on their advice and their approval of it, will direct the organization to pursue some activities that could range from many different things from creating educational materials to actually changing the way things are structurally done somewhere. Of course, the Board does not have to take our advice at all and may decline it but does have to explain its rationale for doing so.

So, that is the process overall. Our members are invited as individual experts. They are not here to represent any employer or organization or association they may be part of, but they do bring the background and experience from those areas to the deliberations that we have so that we have that perspective which is really important for us to be able to have good representation from a wide variety of people throughout the

entire ICANN ecosystem that deals with these technical issues and the security implications of all of these things. So, we try hard to keep a diverse set of members to bring in those perspectives. Next slide please.

So, we have three recent publications. We're going to dive into all three of those in individual sections of this discussion today. The work party chair or co-chair will run through each of these topics and after each section we will take some Q&A on that. And this is the last slide I believe on the intros; by the way there's contact information here and on the main ICANN website you can always find information about the SSAC, who's in it, our backgrounds, as well as an application or a way to how to apply for membership if you are interested or know somebody who you think would be qualified. And I believe that was it for this one. Did we have any Q&A that I need to deal with before we move on to the next session?

JULIE HAMMER:

Not that I can see.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Not that I can see either. Good. Okay, Geoff Huston, I will hand it over to you to talk about our most recent publication, the public response to the SSR2 report. Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON:

Yeah. Thanks, Rod. And good morning all. Good God, it's 4:30 in the morning. What am I doing? I am talking about SSR2. Next slide please.

It was just a little over a year ago when we published our comments on the draft report from the SSR2 review team. And certainly, that was a relatively hefty effort. We had noted that there were 27 high level recommendations and 108 component recommendations, and in commenting on each of them, we're also concerned at the time about aspects of that report including the practicality of such a very considerable number of recommendations that were being proposed and there was a certain lack of situational context in that draft report and an assessment of the existing capabilities and strengths of the organization to respond to these recommendations. And so, we sought some clarity in what they were trying to achieve and how they were trying to get about it.

Now the SSR2 team spent an extensive effort on that final report and integrated many of our comments, which we appreciate. So, the final report, we published on the 27th of March our response to this. While the response to the draft report was of course addressed to the SSR2 review team itself, this is a final report. So, we're certainly not talking to the SSR team anymore, in theory there is none. This is now more of a public comment and a comment to the ICANN Board and ICANN community.

So, we didn't do that detailed an analysis paragraph by paragraph or action by action. However, we felt that at this time to be more appropriate to take a more general stance about what was going on here and what we certainly noted at the outset was that the fundamental conclusions behind these detailed recommendations, we endorse.

The underlying position, and it's certainly quite predictable, is that issues of security and stability are absolutely of paramount importance in ICANN's role in the Internet's naming system. And we in SSAC are certainly committed to support the efforts of the organization and the community in responding to that considerable set of recommendations that are in that report. We note that this time around, the report has actually made some effort to make these recommendations measurable with performance indicators as to whether they're achieved and how well they're achieved.

And the corporation of the earlier recommendations from SSR1 into this new set including metrics-based performance. We note too that this is a major piece of work and the review process has made extensive calls on the time and the efforts of the review team members. And the report represents the outcome of an extensive and diligent review on this topic. We'd also note that many others in the community who've been following this report have also had to make considerable calls on their time and volunteered effort in reviewing that report and making considered and careful responses to this.

We do not see this as being a small thing, it's quite a large effort and an ongoing effort. And in so doing I think it will take the organization and community some time—without putting a time frame on it, but some time—and some considerable effort to actually implement all of these measures and we certainly would like to see the organization focus quite determinedly on evaluating these recommendations and putting forward programs in line with these recommendations. At the time when this happens, we would certainly be there and ready to assist the

Board and the community in doing further assessments in detail on these and talking about their impacts, how they can be done, and what the intended outcomes might be in line with what was said in the SSR2 report.

So, with that Rod, I'll hand it back to you and somewhere between you and I if there are any questions on this, I'd be happy to respond. Thank you.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Thank you very much, Geoff. And I would just want to reemphasize what we discussed with the Board yesterday on this, is that we very much look forward towards providing some more detailed and substantive support on dealing with these issues going forward that have been identified by the SSR2 team and all their years of deliberations putting this out. And as those issues are being looked at and working with the Board to provide some further insights and potential recommendations on specific issues that they desire some further input on.

You can think of this looking at being able to focus our attention because there are so many things in that report and our ability to get good quality input is going to depend on focusing on the particular issues as they are considered and then some sort of implementation is moved forward. So, we look forward to that. Do we have any questions on...?

GEOFF HUSTON: We have a couple of questions there, Rod, but I noticed both of them are actually about something that we're going to talk about further on in this meeting. I cannot see any questions that explicitly address SSAC's 116 at the moment.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah, I don't either. I mean there's a question from Maxim about are any of ICANN legal or any legal advisors involved. We do have—a couple of our members have some background in legal issues, but I would not say that we have any official—or we do not have an official role for legal representation within the SSAC itself. We do consult with ICANN Legal over some particular issues over time but those have not been involved in those two reports to answer that one. And yes, the other one is purely on 114, so we'll answer that one when we get to it.

GEOFF HUSTON: By the way, we flipped the slide, there was one more slide but I'd already talked through all of this. So, before we can move onto the next one, just a last call for comments or questions. Seeing none, Rod, I think I'm done. Thank you.

ROD RASMUSSEN: All right. Thank you, Geoff. All right, we'll move on to SAC115. And I'll hand this over to Jeff Bedser. Jeff.

JEFF BEDSER:

Thanks, Rod. And good day everyone. Good to see so many of your faces. Good to hear some of your voices. So, SAC115 is a document on DNS abuse. It's not tackling the holistic approach of all things need to be done about DNS abuse, but we look at it as a roadmap with some suggestions on how to take the interoperability of the DNS that we all rely on and apply it to abuse handling wherein there are many different parties involved in hosting of a domain and the provisioning of a domain and they're all different companies, different entities in different parts of the world, different jurisdictions. So, interoperability can be handled in many different ways and we do see a lack of interoperability now between the different parties. But there is some interoperability, don't get me wrong, but there isn't a standardized method for doing it.

So, what the SSAC report covers—and actually before I get into that, just really quickly, this is an SSAC work party that consisted of invited guests from outside of SSAC with expertise towards abuse operations in registries and registrars as well as in law enforcement, and those names are on the document we published.

The report covers the following topics. We do define some aspects of the problem. We did not create new definitions, we adopted definitions because many of them were very similar. And getting into the battle of which definition is the best didn't seem to facilitate this discussion much on this particular paper, but we did point to the definitions we relied on to anchor the position. Existing support mechanisms and resources, primary points of responsibility for abuse resolution.

We spoke a lot about evidentiary terminology and standards, escalation paths between parties for abusive reports, reasonable time frames for action upon an abusive domain, and of course, you can't avoid the availability and quality of contact information because you have to be able to reach the party to get it addressed. So, it's a proposed path forward that looks towards harmonizing efforts and about addressing abuse. Next slide please.

So, our findings are pretty straightforward, and I don't think they'll surprise many people. The lack of coordination leads to inconsistent approaches. There's a lot of approaches, for example we call scatter shot, where a party trying to get abuse resolved will [send it to] every single part of the ecosystem the domain touches trying to get it resolved. And then [those] parties don't know which parties took which action and it causes a lot of confusion as well as a lot of extra resources being deployed across different parties.

There's an opportunity that exists for the creation for a single entity, we refer to it as a Common Abuse Response Facilitator to independently convene, facilitate, guide, and provide clarity and predictability to all stakeholders in the greater DNS ecosystem. And we say the greater DNS ecosystem we are referring beyond the ICANN community to hosting companies, to CDNs, to any other exchange providers, etc. in the space.

This Common Abuse Response Facilitator could also develop and implement a functional Internet-wide community model to directly confront the problem of Internet abuse, including DNS abuse. So, it doesn't have to be related to truly technical DNS abuse or DNS abuse,

but it could be an entity that deals with across-the-board victimization using domains.

ICANN has played a similar role in other initiatives that overlap with its mission and remit but do extend into the wider Internet ecosystem such as the Universal Acceptance Steering Group and the ICANN DNS Symposiums. Next slide please.

So, our recommendations are thus. Recommendation 1) The SSAC recommends that the ICANN community continue to work together with extended DNS infrastructure community in an effort to examine and refine a proposal for a Common Abuse Facilitator to streamline abuse reporting and minimize abuse victimization. I guess we can all agree that the longer an abusive domain is resolving, the more potential abuse and victims there will be from it and thus losses of personal data, of funds, etc. Define the role and scope for a Common Abuse Response Facilitator of course using SSAC SAC115 as an input to the process. The community effort should include domain registration providers that are part of the ICANN community, the other contracted parties. Communities beyond the ICANN community such as DNS infrastructure providers, content hosting providers, incident response community, and of course the anti-abuse community that does the detection of the abuse and of course other organizations that have worked on Internet abuse. And I'm sure everyone on this call can think of a number of them. While SSAC acknowledges the opportunity and need to create the anti-abuse efforts outlined in this report, we're really not advocating for any particular organization or entity to fulfill them. There's an opportunity here and there's some other organizations that

have come about already recently that can potentially fill part of this role or all of this role. And we're not advocating any one particular of them, but we believe there's an opportunity for one to take on this role. Next slide please.

So, that was my last slide. So, Rod, I'll turn it back over to you.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thank you, Jeff. Let's roll that back to the last slide in that section, slide 12 I believe it is. Thank you. Okay, so I see one question specific to SAC115 in this, which is more of one for me to answer because it's a SSAC process question. And this is a good area to discuss because it ties into some of the other questions that'd been asked or have been put forward in both yesterday and today...

STEVE SHENG: Rod. Rod, sorry. This is Steve to interject. Is it okay for Kathy to read out the questions?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Oh yeah. I'm sorry. Go ahead. Yep. [Processes.]

KATHY SCHNITT: And you're reading the one on 115, correct, Rod?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah. From Jeff Neuman at 10:50. Around my time at 10:50.

KATHY SCHNITT: On SSAC115 from a procedural perspective, how do we interpret the dissent when it comes to the recommendations? Is it the expectation that ICANN still implement this despite the dissents?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay. Thank you, Kathy. And thanks for reading it out, not everybody has access to be able to look at those things which is why we read them. So, this gets to a process question around how to interpret our reports and to interpret the inclusion of alternate views and dissents within those reports. So, the SSAC consensus is in the document, that is the main body of that. And whether it's some sort of implementation or other thing that would be included in any SSAC document that would be SSAC consensus opinion. However, the alternate views and any dissents are published along with the persons who may have provided them. So, those can also be taken into consideration as we were not able to reconcile those within our own process and those opinions are also valid to be put forward and be considered by the affected parties for whatever those things might be. Again, our advice may be to the Board, it may be to the broader community, etc. Inclusion of those points is important because those are reflective of those SSAC members who made them and their opinion on those topics. So, in a very generic sense, those should be considered as any advice that the recipient believes they're being provided should take those into account and their own decisions on what to do with them. And just taking a look [inaudible]...

JULIE HAMMER: Rod, if I may?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yes. Go ahead, Julie.

JULIE HAMMER: Actually, Robert has asked that we read out a question he asked in the pod and that I answered within the pod. And it's related to this point which is why I interrupted. Ashley asked, "In your first slide you touched on the process for drafting SSAC advice publications. Can you please elaborate on the process for reviewing and agreeing to publish an SSAC advice document? In particular, what is the threshold for publishing something in the name of SSAC?"

And I quoted SSAC operational procedures 1:1 on our consensus which states "SSAC members determine the content of documents. If members wish to withdraw from a document or register a dissent or an alternative view, these positions are included at the end of the document to which they apply. SSAC consensus occurs when the listed authors of a document agree on the content and recommendations of the publication with no final objections from the remainder of the SSAC, with the exception of any dissenting opinions or alternative views that are included at the end of the publication." And then I've said SSAC strives to achieve consensus in all documents but where that is not possible, alternate views and dissents are presented at the end of the document. Thanks, Rod.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Great. Thank you, Julie. And that ties up into one bow or with one bow those questions there. And we appreciate those questions being asked because we do have occasionally documents that include those alternate views and it's important folks know how to interpret those but also how that works in the full process. Do we have any other specific 115 questions?

KATHY SCHNITT: Nothing in the Q&A pod, Rod.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay. I've got a lot of things flying at me all at once here, so I'm trying to keep all the screens open. Okay, so then let's move on to SAC114 which is the response to Subsequent Procedures. Let's click on things here. And I'll go ahead and run through this one here. Next slide please.

So, the recap for those of you who weren't on the call with the Board yesterday, some of the items that were covered in that session; SAC114 was originally started as our public comment response to the final subsequent procedures document report. And as we got into that work, we looked at some of the issues that were basically outside of the scope/charter or meta-issues around the expansion of the utilization of the name space and thought that this would be a good time to bring those topics up and provide that input into the Board for consideration amongst all the other stuff that's going on in this area. It's a good time to reflect on that and make sure we're going all on the right path here,

at least from the perspective of making sure we have addressed concerns and risks, etc. So, we made this into a broader report. We included some of the recommendations that were more specific to the report, any side of this, Recommendations 4 through 7, and those details are in there.

We did have an opportunity to at least have a session with the SubPro team to go over most of those, which we very much appreciated. I thought that was a good conversation. So, those were at least discussed in an unofficial sort of capacity because we hadn't done a publication at that point, but there was an ability to at least bring those along.

But there were these meta-issues that were, as I said, a bit beyond the scope of what the SubPro team was tasked with looking at but are kind of more fundamental questions about where we're going that we were looking at bringing up at this point and getting into the conversation.

And we want to make sure that, by the time new TLDs may be delegated, in other words put in the root zone, where they're going to start having material impacts, these issues were at least considered and addressed in some form or another, whether that's because there was some change, or because the risks were accepted, or considered to be offset by other factors, is up for the Board and broader community to take a look at. But we're raising these issues from an SSR perspective in this document. Next slide, please.

So, let me go over the meta-recommendations first. This one is the [inaudible] one, I've been calling it, to really be introspective around the whole process, here: is the continuation of pushing out new TLDs the right thing to be doing to evolve the system?

And there are some [base] questions, there, that we talk about within the document. You can see some of the bullet points down below, there. And how does that align with the strategic goals? In other words, is this the right answer to the question of how we are evolving the unique identifier system?

And this is really a call for taking a look at that as part of the review process/of the strategic planning process, which happens to be ongoing right now. So this is a good time to actually have that discussion. We're not saying one way or another what the right answer is, we're just raising these issues that we believe need to be considered and addressed as part of this process. And there are some issues around being able to measure that, etc., which I believe is the second recommendation, if we can have the next slide.

Right. So that you know, we can actually quantify these things. I think this question has been asked as, what is SSAC basing some of these things on? We're basically asking fundamental questions and proposing that they should have measurable answers. One of the things that we do call out, I think, which is important is that this needs to be looked at holistically across the entire DNS resolution ecosystem.

So, that's not just the effects on, say, the root zone and those operations but also effects that, maybe, cross DNS resolutions, applications relying on the DNS, etc. In other words, a holistic look at these things, because we have seen examples in the past where introduction of things has caused technical issues.

While most of those are probably mitigated at this point, there are some interesting corner cases. But again, this is again looking at making sure we're able to measure these things and are able to, if there are issues that arise as you're expanding things, be able to do something about it.

And then, in particular, there was the question of scoping of DNS abuse—which has been a hot topic, obviously; we've just put out a paper on that itself—where the SubPro team themselves, rightly so, said, “Hey, this is not a new gTLD problem, this is an all TLD problem—not even just an ICANN remit thing. You have ccTLD issues, too,” which was perfectly fair.

So, we looked at this from a more meta-perspective, taking a look at some of the particular issues that arose in the 2012 round in some TLDs that, upon launch or shortly thereafter, became very large nexuses of abusive-type behaviors, including the ones that are being tracked by ICANN Org and the DAAR and have been quantified in the various definitions of DNS abuse that have been used within ICANN, to answer that question.

Very high concentrations of those, which led to some of those TLDs being blocked and some people ... And filtered in some applications,

and there are a host of concerns that arise around that when you have entire TLDs, or potentially even that practice of blocking and filtering, being spread out to any new TLDs, which there are certainly some indications that that has happened, at least in localized areas.

But it then creates other SSR issues as far as for the DNS to be able to resolve because parts of it are blocked out. It makes it much more difficult. And there are related things on that that aren't necessarily part of this, but we have been looking at those issues, as well, so they all inter-relate. So, those three are the meta-issues that we brought up.

Next slide, please. The other issues are more tied directly to what's in the report itself and take a look at some minor things in there. Also, brought up a couple of things that weren't necessarily covered but we thought might be useful, for example the reference materials from the providers.

One of the things we noticed in the first round is that operating DNSSEC in various registries proved to be an operational challenge after it got set up, so it would be useful for people to be able to have the materials to be able to operationalize things like that on an ongoing basis.

And we had some specific things around contention sets and intended use, and also that the NCAP work had gotten to a place where it will be useable within the ability to consider strings that may be of such a level that they need to be put into some sort of restrictive area and that that is in place as part of the process before TLDs are actually enabled in the root zone. So, those particular areas ... And we'll talk about the NCAP

project in a separate update on new [inaudible] work. So, I believe that is the last slide in that section, here. Let me just double-check that.

KATHY SCHNITT: Yes, Rod, it is.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yes, okay. Good. I'm sure we have plenty of Q&A on this one. So, let's get going on that.

KATHY SCHNITT: The first one is from Jeff Neuman and he did type it in the chat. It's quite extensive. "SSAC 114 states right up front, 'First, the SSAC believes that the introduction of more gTLDs to the root namespace is not consistent with ICANN's mission and commitment to keep the Internet secure, stable, and interoperable.' This sentence is definitive and not qualified, e.g., not at this point in time, or not until X, Y, and Z happens."

"Questions: what evidence does the SSAC provide behind this 'legal conclusion'? As none is provided in the report. B, does this statement in fact have a consensus of the 33 SSAC members? C, what specifically are the harms you have seen by the addition of new gTLDs to the root? And D, why would you make this conclusion then essentially ask ICANN to do a study to see whether the conclusions you have made in fact have merit?"

ROD RASMUSSEN:

All right. Thank you for that. There are several questions packed into one, there. So, a point to the document itself for the overall rationale for why we've stated that this is the time to take a look at this as a fundamental: how the evolution of the root system is done. I'm not going to get into semantics of what's legal versus technical, etc. I think that might be an interesting bar conversation.

However, the rationales were actually stated pretty clearly within that same paragraph or same section where that is, and really taking a look at this from the perspective of adding new ... Expanding the usage of TLDs through the appropriate tool. And it's the question; it's not necessarily the answer. It's a question at this point.

We believe it's one that should be answered and there are many aspects to that that go beyond SSR. We're not trying to opine on non-SSR issues in this response, we're just representing that perspective. And as we state in that document, adding more of something does not necessarily make it the best answer to a particular goal.

So I would encourage a broader discussion around that but it's really ... We're asking a question, here, that should be considered by the entire community before moving forward. I wouldn't take it beyond that. Hopefully, that will be considered and satisfactory answers for the community will drive what we do going forward.

As far as the process stuff goes, and discussed that already, the SSAC ... As I mentioned, we have work parties. They put out a ... Put together a document that's reviewed and put out for a review by the entire SSAC.

If there are dissents or alternative views that people want to express then they are added to the document.

Otherwise, that is the SSAC consensus. That is the way the process has worked since, basically, the outset of the SSAC. I certainly am not going to get into internal deliberations within the SSAC and in fact wouldn't even know the answer to who says what on any particular issue, and that's by design more than anything else. We provide the opportunity for our members to provide alternative views and dissents. Were there any other questions in that? That was such a long one, here. As I said, I'm looking at multiple screens at once.

STEVE SHENG: Hi, Rod. I think Jeff also raised his hand in the pod. Perhaps give him the opportunity to speak.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Sure.

KATHY SCHNITT: Okay, you're allowed to talk now.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Okay, thank you. Yeah, I'm sorry for the delay. Excuse me. Yeah, Rod, I understand your point about asking questions and I think it's great to ask questions. I think you might want to read your executive summary, then, because there are no questions that are being asked in the

executive summary. It's pretty definitive. There are two bullet points. The first one says, "The SSAC believes the introduction of ..." Well, I'm not going to read it again. "Is not consistent with the bylaws."

And then, the second one is that we should add greater levels of not only process but a systemic consideration. That's all that's in the executive summary. There are no questions being asked there. Sorry, there is a third but it still doesn't have questions.

I think you really need to take that and rewrite it to reflect what you're saying in this discussion because it's very different than what you're saying. I have no issues, or I have less issues, with what you're saying and how you presented it than what it says in the report because it is very definitive and no qualifications.

And then, the other part, which I don't think you answered, is that, yes, you may have provided some semblance of a rationale but there is no evidence. If someone is going to say that the introduction of more gTLDs is inconsistent with the mission, and to say that it's not keeping the Internet secure, stable, and interoperable, shouldn't there be some data or some evidence behind that other than kind of beliefs? Thanks.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Thank you, Jeff. I do take on your questions. This is one of the reasons we're missing our face-to-face meetings so much, is to exactly have these kinds of discussions where we can take what's written, and be able to have a better understanding of what was intended with the meaning of it, and take your comments on board about the way the

executive summary spells it out, versus the rest of the document, versus the discussion we had yesterday with the Board and here today.

So, those are important in that the intent of what we're trying to state here is not misinterpreted to be something that we didn't intend, and that's always a challenge when the written record, so to speak, is the official position and interpretations have been made based on that which were not the original intent. So, I think that's something we'll take internally and discuss how to address that.

And then, yeah, the second part of your question there is around evidence versus rationale. I take your comments on board there, as well. A large part of it, if it didn't become clear in the document itself, is more around what will happen in continuing expansion where we don't necessarily have data but we do have expert opinion taking a look at how systems work in general and making sure that we understand that, if we're going to continue to blow up the balloon, so to speak, at what point are we going to start having places we're going to have to worry about things not working properly or breaking, so to speak.

And that's the concern there, and again, that's more from a general systems perspective and a stability perspective of continuing to expand the system, which I think we've got to but it may not have come through clearly in the way you were taking it on. There are ... Obviously, we talked a bit about the DNS abuse issues and some of the actual issues that did occur, so there were some things that were pointed to. But I take your point on what we're basing that on.

But again, this is looking forward toward a potentially ever-expanding amount of utilization of the namespace and where that tends to take us over time. And those are some questions I think we need to be thinking about in cases of orders of magnitude, if nothing else. Is a billion too many? Is 10,000 okay? What's the growth rate? All these other questions have been put forward before.

There is typically a lot of speculation as to where we actually end up with that. It's a challenging topic space and we're raising that as an issue just to make sure that, A, we're aware of it, and B, if things do have impacts, as you move forward, you can do something about it with certainty. I think that the SubPro team did talk about a lot of those issues. It's in there. We're just asking [meta fundamental] issue. Okay.

KATHY SCHNITT: Merike has her hand raised.

ROD RASMUSSEN: I'm sorry, could you please repeat that?

KATHY SCHNITT: Merike has—

ROD RASMUSSEN: Oh, Merike. Please go ahead, Merike.

MERIKE KAEAO:

Hi, thank you. I very much appreciate this discussion because sometimes, when documents are read and the wording is maybe not as precise as it could be or gives off different perceptions, it's really good to be aware of that. The SSAC does not ... The intent was not that the program should not go ahead.

One of the items that I have been looking back on is that the SSAC had written SAC059, and that was back in 2013, and it explicitly asked for some interdisciplinary studies. The SSAC actually has been working with OCTO to try and align, well, what does that mean in today's world, given that that recommendation was written in 2013?

And so, some of the studies that had not been undertaken ... Part of what SAC114 is trying to describe is that these studies should be done to help inform the ICANN community about issues that may be affecting SSR.

And so, as Rod has been describing, the intent was more to really get at guidelines, and boundaries, and understand the issues surrounding adding new gTLDs. But I very much appreciate this conversation and all other perspectives because it's useful to know and be aware of. So thank you for that, both Susan, and Jeff, and everybody else.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

I see ... Thank you, Merike, very much. I see there's a bit of a process question from Martin on there. Would you mind reading that one out, Kathy?

KATHY SCHNITT: Absolutely. “Given the 5 years of dedicated work of SubPro members and the numerous public comment periods, why did SSAC not feed this into the community effort as part of this process, to provide opportunities for the working group to review appropriately? It seems disruptive to submit SAC114 to the Board at this late stage, after work-group consensus and GNSO unanimous approval.”

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thank you for the question, Martin. I wanted to call this one out in particular. There are a couple of anonymous questions, as well. I’m trying to get to more of these but we do need to move on. We’ll try and get back to that. But one of the things here I want to make sure to emphasize is that the first part of the document I was talking about were issues that we thought weren’t actually being addressed by the SubPro team.

So, there wasn’t necessarily ... And DNS abuse being one of them was specifically asked ... We actually asked this in the preliminary [point], as did several other SO/ACs and other folks making comments on the draft report: what’s the story on DNS abuse and what are you going to say about it? That’s when the SubPro team said, “Hey, this is beyond our scope.” Okay, that’s fine, and that’s why we included it in this meta-comment.

So, the meta-issues, we thought that wasn’t the appropriate place to bring it up. Some of these other issues were either ones that we brought

up previously or had come up in the revisions. We did have that working session with the SubPro team to try and go through that stuff, as well.

So hopefully, some of that was actually reflected in the work. Because we had these meta issues, we just included those as a point of reference into this document, which was released before the GNSO Council decision, by the way. This was released a month or so ago—a month or six weeks ago, I believe.

So, I just wanted to clear that up and that this is not something we released yesterday. We literally did release some stuff. 115 and 116 were just within the last 48 hours, so this one has been out there a little longer. But it's one of those things where we looked at issues that went beyond the scope of the actual work and [that's] submitted it. And this gets to a broader issue around SO/AC interaction, etc., that we have been discussing amongst the leadership of the SO/ACs.

And I think it's maybe a good example for us to work with on improving processes going forward as to how to actually do this interaction so that the right kinds of input can be put into processes at the time to make sure they're taken into account. And we certainly will take a look at this example because it was one where we had input to a specific group, and meta input, and how do you deal with that. So, thank you for bringing that up.

JULIE HAMMER: Rod, we've got two hands up from attendees: Jeff Neuman and Martin Sutton. Kathy, if you wouldn't mind enabling ... Oh, you've done it. If you would like to take their comments?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Very briefly because we have a lot of other topics to cover and I don't want to short-shrift those. But this has been one area where there has been a lot of buzz, so I don't mind giving it a little bit of extra time. We had some extra time from the first two. So, who was first?

JULIE HAMMER: Jeff had been first.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Yeah, thanks. I'll ask mine pretty quick because it's in the question and answer pod. Rod and Merike, there was a study done on the impact of the root—CDAR, I guess, was called the study, March 8th, 2017—and the conclusion to that report says that there were no impacts and, in fact, they could handle a ton more. I'm curious: did the SSAC consider that when it was writing its report? If so, just what was its view?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Well, I know that that was one of the things that was in folks' minds and that had been done. I can't give you a quick synopsis of our ... Not "synopsis." I can't give you a quick opinion on what the SSAC thinks

about that particular one, although it's something we could certainly ask our members about. But I don't have that off the top of my head.

One of the things that I think we did want to emphasize was that it's not just the root operations that are what we're flagging, here. There are recursive server operations, software applications, etc., that go beyond the root. So, there are other areas and that's an area where we don't have a lot of visibility and there are concerns about how things work.

We have seen challenges in the past when various schemes had been implemented by very large players and had affected DNS operations at the recursive level, enough so that you go, "Hm, I wonder what impact it will have there." So, it's not just the root operations that we're talking about considering here and measuring. And again, this is making sure that we understand the full risk set and ways to mitigate those risks. And then, Martin, you had a quick follow-up you wanted to have, as well?

MARTIN SUTTON:

Yeah, please, Rod. Thanks for this. I did put a comment in the chat earlier, as well, which kind of draws on the point of there were other groups like the GAC and ALAC contributing within the working group and along the way through the various inputs, and that worked really well.

So, the more you can think about that in the future, that will be really helpful, because the SSAC carries weight. So, when you do publish something like this, the Board takes notice. So, coming at this late stage

and then titling itself as a response to the final report suggests that it is referencing everything about content within the final report.

So, I think this perception versus intent is a serious issue because it's causing quite a lot of disruption at this stage after many, many people have dedicated an awful long time on trying to improve things, get things right, and move ahead. And this seems very quickly to be some kind of barrier that comes in the way.

What you're explaining doesn't seem to have that intention but, certainly from a reader's perspective, that seems to me what comes across, and especially as somebody that has participated heavily in that working group process. So, I really want to flag that and show you that there are some sensitivities, obviously, that are emerging from the publication of the report, which was just before the GNSO did consider its review of that output. Thanks, Rod.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Yeah, and thank you, Martin. I do appreciate it. There are challenges on all fronts. I think what you're getting at, as well, is that ALAC has been able to have some of its members actually take part and the SSAC did not have the official representation on that process. This gets into the overall conundrum we have: what areas do we have some of our volunteers spend time in the balance there?

For example, we do have official representation on the ePDP, which [inaudible] a lot of times, as it ... And our biggest challenge is, right now, we have 33 members. It's hard. Where do you put your resources? And

this is, again, part of the overall construction. I do want to point out, as I saw in the chat, that we really did appreciate the input that we had provided in the draft report.

It was largely incorporated and reflected in the final report, which I know we mentioned and I just want to say how much we appreciate that those did have an impact between the draft and the final report. That was very much appreciated by the SSAC. That was taken onboard. Merike, you have something you want to follow up on?

MERIKE KAEO:

Yeah, I just wanted to make a comment regarding Jeff's last question. I will refer again to SAC059 that was done in April of 2013 because there were two studies that were recommended to the Board at the time.

One was engaged with the community that may not have been fully consulted by previous investigations on the impact of the new gTLD program and, two, explore areas of concern relating to expansion of the root zone, [but either derived] from these communities or which have been identified by previous studies but they may not have been fully resolved.

And so, just a few months ago, as SSAC has worked very closely with OCTO and the GDP teams to make sure that all of its older advice had been implemented, or would be implemented, or what the status was. This has been recently discussed in terms of what these studies should be and could be today, given that things have changed since 2013.

And so, some of these aspects with the root scaling are unknown, what's going to happen. And so, it's just a matter of trying to figure out what studies could and should be further undertaken. That might help to give any kind of information in terms of what to watch out for.

And so, there are a lot of unknowns. From a security perspective, there are always unknowns. But you're trying to get as much information as possible to be informed to then help mitigate any potential issues. So, I hope that helps clarify some of this, as well.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Thank you. I'd love to continue this conversation. We're touching on many areas that are really important, germane, in trying to do that in various forms. I can't wait to actually be able to get back together physically because a lot of these things are best handled in sitting down, and talking about these things, and come up with interpretive issues, etc.

We've been all at this way too long with the pandemic. Not that this is an excuse, it's just a challenge we all have. But we do need to move on to cover the rest of our topics here, quickly. I believe the next one is NCAP. Let me see what I ... I got off-track, here.

KATHY SCHNITT:

It's NCAP, Rod.

ROD RASMUSSEN: NCAP. So Jim, I'm going to turn that over to you.

JAMES GALVIN: Sorry for that. I was coughing, I missed it.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yes, yes. [inaudible] you, Jim.

JAMES GALVIN: Yeah. So now for something completely different. The Name Collision Analysis Project, thanks to my co-chairs, Patrik Fältström and Matt Thomas, also, for all of this work. So, next slide, please. Oh, the first slide. That's good.

Just a quick reminder to folks: ICANN Board had tapped the SSAC to conduct some studies with respect to name collision. And there were two specific resolutions, one for specific advice regarding .home, .corp, and .mail, another for general advice regarding name collisions, especially in terms of what the Board could do going forward. Given that name collisions are a foregone conclusion, how is the Board to evaluate them in the future as applications come in?

And a couple of minor statistics there. We had 25 people in the discussion group. A little over half are actually SSAC members, 23 community observers, and we generally have around ten to 12 or 13 on any given meeting that we have been having. So, we've got a pretty good, solid group at the moment, here. Next slide.

Again, as a reminder, the original NCAP proposal had three major components, three phases, three studies, if you will. The first one was principally a bibliography of everything that had happened with respect to name collisions that we could find, and anything related.

We have obviously been at this for almost nine years, now, certainly more than eight. And that study actually did begin and it was completed last year in June of 2020 and delivered to the community/delivered to the Board. The community say that, too. We had the usual ICANN public comment period for all of that.

One of the outcomes of that study, and the collection, and that bibliography was the realization that things really have changed over the years. I mean, NCAP really did start [three] years ago. So, the infrastructure is different, what we know about name collisions is certainly different in that time.

So, we kind of were taking another look at it and even [studied what] the conclusion of the independent contractor who had done all of that work. We really should re-examine what was really proposed in study two, and so we took to actually doing all of that. I will come back to that a bit in the next slide.

So, study three is the only one that remains and it is explicitly intended to be a review of mitigation strategies. I mean, obviously, since the intent or the expectation is that name collisions will always exist, there ought to be an opportunity for mitigation of that. And what would that

look like, and how would the Board deal with that going forward? So, that's a remaining study. Next slide, please.

So, what we had decided to do in study two was in recognition of a changing infrastructure, or knowledge and understanding of name collisions has changed, is we revised the outline and rethought some of the major project elements and the resources needed to do this.

So, by doing all of this, we're able to do two things. One is we really did compress the overall timeline for this study two. So, we're down to 18 months. That 18 months, the slide here says that it would start upon Board's approval. We actually started back in January.

So, the current timeline for the work that we're doing here in study two, we are still on track to complete in June of 2022. Now, obviously, we're just getting started. This is ICANN. We know how it goes with volunteers but at least we're on a good path and we're doing our part to try to get there. It's also useful to point out that, having restructured the project, and some of the things that we're doing, and the way that we're doing it, we're able to bring the overall cost down by 30%. So, that's another win for this project overall.

There is still the question of study three and what to do about mitigation strategies. One of the big things that we did for taking out some of the cost was to eliminate the creation of a lab, if you will, for testing mitigation strategies. We're proposing a different approach for dealing with that, so we'll see how that goes in study two. But our plan is just as we did with respect to study two at the end of study one.

As study two is coming to the end, we will re-examine what we're actually going to do about study three, and what that might look like, and what we do or don't still need to do. So, we have been active for the past three months. Beginning in April, we'll kick off again.

We have had a great deal of data presented to us, thanks to one of my co-chairs, Matt Thomas, who stepped up and did a huge amount of analysis on root server data, from Verisign, from their two root servers. And we've just gotten dozens of charts of analysis of name collision.

So, in some ways, the real analysis work begins now as we come out of this ICANN meeting, by going back over all of that, reviewing the Board questions, and beginning to think about what we're really going to do with all of that and what it's going to look like.

So, I will end by offering one last opportunity and plea for people. Plenty of room in the working group. Please do feel free to join, as is typical with ICANN groups. I mean, it really is an open group. You just have to ask to join. You do have to fill out a statement of interest.

There are a few extra questions in addition to the usual ICANN questions that go there but once you answer them and they get posted you're in the group and you get to contribute. We're very interested in getting views and opinions. Now is the time as we begin to think about exactly how to respond to name collisions and what delegation process/decision process will look like in the future. So, that's it for me. Thanks very much. Back to you, Rod.

JULIE HAMMER: Jim, there is ... Jeff Neuman has his hand raised in the chat with a question.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Yeah, thank you. Thank you, Julie, and thank you, Jim. Full disclosure, I'm one of the members of the discussion group. I think that's the name of it. Yeah, the NCAP discussion group. The question I'm going to ask, Jim, I think you probably know, is that if the Board does approve the study two today and it takes 18 months from today, quick math, that's, what, mid-to-end of 2022? Yeah, end of 2022.

If we don't review study three until the end of 2022 and that one takes 18 months, you're talking about 2024. I've asked this question before. Why can we not do study three in parallel with study two? And if that's not possible then are you asking the ICANN community to hold off delegating new TLDs until 2024 or 2025?

JAMES GALVIN: So, thanks for the question, Jeff. Taking your first question, first, there are two parts to the answer. One part is we are actually doing a little bit of what might be considered pure study three work. One of the things that we're doing in study two, we added a [task to do] a root cause analysis on the mitigations that we do know about. ICANN has been notified and collected. A little over 40 have been submitted into their portal.

And so, one of the things that we're asking for support for from the Board, which will be on their agenda tonight as you indicated, is for a technical investigator to go out, and look at those, and gather up what we can learn about mitigation—what was done, how it was done, how it was decided—to just get as much of a picture as we can possibly gather out of that and see what we can learn from that.

So, with that in mind, we are, in a sense, already beginning the study of mitigation strategy. So, that part is ongoing. Other than that, you're right, it's a risk where we end up with study three, and I can't speak to that right now. There's not enough data. We really do need to understand name collisions before we can make a decision about mitigation strategies.

So, it's important to get through most of the analysis that we're going to do in study two with respect to name collisions before we can really speak to what we will or won't do about study three. So, what you're saying is clearly a risk and we just have to face that and accept it for right now.

We might have more information in six months or a year that would be better able to answer that question than I do today because we're really just getting started with study two. On your second question of asking the community to wait, again, SSAC's [abruptly-stated] position is just that we believe that the community, and the Board in particular, should make sure that it fully understands name collisions before making any decisions.

We think that there are security and stability issues and they weren't ... Just a full understanding, whatever that means. The action of whether or not to delegate, that's really on the Board and the community. We're not going to make that choice. Our job is to highlight where we think the issues are and the community has to decide for itself what it wants to do with that information. Thanks.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Thanks, Jim, and thanks for the question, Jeff. These are things we're trying to hurry along as much as we can but still do the work thoroughly, and your participation in that work has been very helpful and appreciated. We hope to continue that engagement because it keeps us going.

So again, turn now to our current work and try and get through this. We are down to our last 15/16 minutes here, so we're going to have to go through this very quickly, unfortunately. But there are a lot of things that are going on besides what we have already put out.

We've already talked about NCAP and we've got SSR2 stuff, abuse. The routing security, root zone early warning system, ePDP, or all the review implementation things, we're going to talk about quickly on separate slides. We do have the ongoing threat assessment/threat scan that we are working with the Board.

If you were on the Board meeting yesterday, we talked about that a little bit where we're sharing our assessment of risks, etc. And we've had some fantastic work done by our members and by ICANN fellows,

who have done some good work of taking our initial set of things and expanding upon those.

So, it's an area where we are looking forward to working more with the Board Technical Committee and the risk folks, as well, on an ongoing basis, and seeing how we can improve that relationship. And then, we have the workshops, etc., that we do, which we had yesterday for the DNSSEC workshop. Julie will talk about membership. So, moving onto the next slide, please, which I believe is routing. Russ, I think you're going to talk about that briefly. Go ahead.

RUSS MUNDY:

Yeah, thanks, Rod. This one, hopefully, will be just short and straightforward. We have an ongoing work party to deal with creating a document—that's the hopeful output. But as with all SSAC Work Parties and SSAC work we never guarantee that we'll get to an end-product but we hope to and we intend to publish an end-product.

The object of this is really to help provide information to the broader community about the security and stability impacts and implications of the routing system of the Internet and how operators can do things to help lessen their problems or risks associated with that.

Our initial audience that we're focusing this on is really the non-technical ICANN community. We hope it's useful to the broader, especially DNS, community. But to provide information about the routing system itself, not a whole tutorial by any means, but to explain how it interacts with the other systems like the DNS, and the security

and stability impacts if something goes wrong, and how it can affect the other systems.

So, this is really a first attempt to produce a document. It's intended to be really informational in nature. It may be the only one that SSAC publishes but it may be the first if we get to completion on this one, and it looks like other documents would be helpful to the community, here.

As with many of these, we are pressing to complete it as soon as is reasonably possible. But at this point, honestly, we don't have a solid timeline, but we do want to get it out to the world as soon as we can.

So, we have coordinated and have a person that is liaising to the ccNSO folks. So, they have been supportive of this work and its existence. I think that that's really all I wanted to cover. If there are questions from anybody, I can happily field those now or we can go on.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Thank you, Russ. I think you meant the RSOs, not the CSOs.

RUSS MUNDY:

Yeah, thank you. I spent too much time dealing with the RSSAC in the RSSAC world, as [inaudible].

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Yes, the numbers people are in the loop on that. I don't see any questions on that, so let's move onto the next one, which is root service early warning system. Remind me, Kathy, who was doing that one?

KATHY SCHNITT: Geoff Huston.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thank you. Geoff Huston, you're on the spot.

GEOFF HUSTON: Thanks, Rod. This is actually very early days for this particular piece of work. We're following up on some earlier studies where SSAC published some documentation and most recently a report from OCTO, OCTO-15, around the issue of, does an early warning system of changes in the behavior of the root service make sense? Is it feasible? What could it tell us and when? That's a fine and lofty goal, and certainly the OCTO-15 document looked at that and came to a particular conclusion.

We would actually like to understand a little bit more about what's behind some of this in terms of what factors play on the root service. Are these factors that cause sudden, spasmodic change of behavior, or are there evolutionary changes that you can see in advance of getting to a threshold point where it becomes what one would call "failure"?

However, well before that, there is a bunch of preparatory work which we are indulging in which is reviewing the past material, questioning those assumptions that are inherent in OCTO-15 to make sure that they are validly based, and then being able to make some more substantive and considered comment on whether this might even be feasible or

useful. So, we're trying to do a database review of that particular report without judging what the outcomes might be.

So, this is really an issue about trying to understand, to some extent, whether the DNS behaves in an evolutionary fashion where the signals of large-scale issues are visible and small long before it happens, or whether, as we're seeing in other computing environments, the system is tolerant of all kinds of pressures until it collapses, and trying to understand what sort of behavioral characteristics the DNS has in this area might be useful in the longer-term to understand, how do we assess changes and how are they visible?

So as I said, very early days at this point. It is just a case of reviewing documentation, understanding the prior work, and then looking at how there is data available or not that might help this. So, are there any questions on that? No? Back to you, Rod.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

All right. Thank you, Jeff. Really looking forward to that. It obviously ties into a couple of the other things we've been talking about today, as well, an important area to have an understanding in. Next up is the ePDP. Tara, to you.

TARA WHALEN:

Thanks, Rod. I'll crack along. We're continuing to do work on some of the outstanding issues from the ePDP on the handling of registrant data. Our work has mostly been focused on the legal and natural

persons question and how to differentiate and how to handle this type of data, and really talking about you can ... There are regulations on natural person data that are different from legal person data.

So, we're talking about how and what you can disclose. We're recommending that there be some explicit declarations about legal versus natural person, about who you are and whether or not the data can be published, and to provide some clear and explicit guidance, as well.

So, there needs to be clarity around, what are the implications of making this choice, and what will happen to your data? We also recognize, of course, there are new registrations and existing registrations. We have some legacies with some existing registrations where we don't have this differentiation and the state is known, so that we propose that there be another status of "unknown" while we make this transition.

And so, when it's indeterminate, then this is how we mark it. But then, we have some way of figuring out how to reduce this number by collecting this information somewhere along the path so that we can then eventually have a better state of knowing what is the status of the data and whether we can disclose it.

Now, we don't want to be overly prescriptive about this. So, we recognize that registrars are going to look at what their business process is and figure out what works for them in terms of a particular way of fulfilling these requirements, with the recognition that we want

the registrants to be well-informed when they make their choices and have appropriate choices to make.

And the overarching goals that we have with us in SSAC is to be able to ensure that there is access to the appropriate data, which we can use, for example, for anti-abuse purposes. So, we're moving toward this notion of appropriate disclosure and we expect, of course, that there will be use of differentiated access.

So, if you have something like security research, you will be able to make requests and get the data that you need for your purposes. And we're working on this further for the next few months while this phase wraps up. With that, I am happy to yield the floor for questions or for my next panelists.

ROD RASMUSSEN: All right. I am not seeing any questions on the Q&A. So, we'll move onto the next bit.

KATHY SCHNITT: Sorry. Go ahead, Julie.

JULIE HAMMER: No, I was just going to say that there is a question from Maxim Alzoba.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Oh. It's not showing up for me, so go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I have a question. As I understand, SO/AC is about technical expertise. Currently, what we see on the screen is an attempt of, I'd say, a legal expertise from the technical perspective. And also, hearing about the analysis of business processes, I think those two areas are way far from the remit of SO/AC and I question the value of such advice because where people are experts in some field doesn't make them experts in some, I'd say, quite different field. Thanks.

TARA WHALEN: Sure. Rod, do you want to handle that or should I?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Well, this is in respect to what we're talking about in the ePDP, correct?

MAXIM ALZOBA: Yes.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah, okay. So, we're part of the official ePDP process, here, so these issues are being put forth to all participants within the group, here. I'll also point out here that the breakdown that we have outlined here is an attempt to quantify this in a systems perspective; how would you handle these questions of dealing with, maybe, policy or legal questions? How do you actually handle that from a technical perspective is how this process is laid out, here. So, I'd beg to differ from

your analysis. Steve Crocker, I see you just came online. I'd like to hand that over to you.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you. I want to emphasize exactly what you've said, Rod, and respond to Maxim. You're right, Maxim, that SSAC's expertise is on the technical side. The challenge in the situation is exactly how to tease apart the technical issues from the value judgments that are involved.

One of the things that we attempt to bring into the discussion is how to finally separate those things. So, we're not in the business of telling anybody what those decisions ought to be but we are in the business of trying to evaluate what the consequences are and to identify where there is an entanglement between the various concepts.

So, to make it more concrete here, for example, the whole purpose of this distinction between legal and natural persons is how to handle the disclosure of the contact information. And so, one could ask, from a purely straightforward systems point of view, "Well, why not just get at that directly?"

I'll just leave it there without taking up a lot more time. But one of the things that is in there, the third status, the third bullet there, unknown, is, again, a contribution of a technical sort to help people think more clearly about how to handle the various cases which, in our perception, are getting tangled.

So, we agree with you that the business judgments and the value judgments belong elsewhere but there are multiple cases, I'm afraid, where we see the kind of dialog that's taking place under the rubric, under the heading, of a business judgment are in fact confluences of things that should be separated out from a technical perspective or from a systems perspective.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thank you, Steve. You said it way better than I did. Okay. We're down to the last ... Literally, the end of the session here. Could we get just quickly to the next slide? Julie, over to you.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks, Rod. I'll be very brief. We had our SSAC organizational review in 2018. The final report was delivered in December of that year and we had been implementing the recommendations that were approved by the Board in accordance with our implementation plan.

We're at the conclusion of that and all implementation is being completed or, for ongoing process, that has been incorporated into our operational procedures. So, we have requested that the Board consider deeming that the review implementation is complete. I believe that is on the agenda for this week. Thanks, Rod. Rod, you're muted.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yep, thank you. Could I just click down to slide 29, please? I just want to very quickly, since we're over time, here, touch upon the possible new

work because I already mentioned once on slide 28. These are areas that we have potential work parties in, and these may be of interest to the community, where DNS resolution is going to be going in the future.

There are a lot of big questions about that being asked right now, especially with: what browser manufacturers are doing; concerns there how DNS is actually going to work; some issues around DNSSEC DS Key management that are a bit tricky; the overloading of HTTPS. We talked about DoH and DoT earlier last year but there continue to be discussions here.

And looking at what data sets may be available and how we can take advantage of that for better understanding some of these issues that have come up. Lots of people have been asking questions about, what evidence do you have to base things off of? A lot of the times, it's very scant evidence and you have to [inaudible].

So, how can we do a better job with better data is a fundamental question. And then, some domain name hijacking concerns that are fairly esoteric but actually happen. Fair enough. And then, finally, Julie, do you want to talk quickly about membership outreach efforts?

JULIE HAMMER:

Yeah, sure. Thanks, Rod. Yep, go back one. We have a fairly comprehensive skills survey that is undertaken by all of our members and updated each year to give us an idea of what the breadth and depth of our skills within the SSAC ... Next slide, please.

And we also ask new, potential members to fill that out. We have embarked on a fairly ... As active as is possible in times of pandemic outreach to try to seek interest from new members to come on board the SSAC. And we have identified these particular skill areas as those that we would especially seek but also looking for more depth in the skillset we already have.

We are also interested in increasing the diversity of our membership, and particularly regional diversity from Africa, Latin America, and Asia-Pacific regions. So, our outreach is a little bit more difficult than normal when we see each other face-to-face but we do hope to try new forms of outreach as this restriction in travel continues. Thanks, Rod.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

All right. And we are in the process right now, so this is the time, if you have some folks in mind or you might be one yourself, of the year to get your application in or encourage others to do so.

As Julie mentioned, we really do want to increase our diversity geographically and experience-wise with different types of challenges and systems that folks have to work with in different parts of the world so we can do a better job of covering those concerns.

And it's a real challenge this time, so your help would be much appreciated. And I would ... So, the last slide, 34, is questions to come in from you folks. Firstly, we're over time. We spent a lot of time on some hot topics. But we really do appreciate these things and we have gotten

comments and questions in from the community that we have addressed in the past.

So, I would encourage you to provide anything like that at any time and you can contact us through either members you know or through the contact information on the ICANN website. I'd like to thank everybody for the discussion today. I think it's really important that we have these chances to engage and dig into the various things that we are coming out with in our publications. It has been more and more of a challenge as we have gone along in the last year where we haven't been able to get together and answer some of these things that we normally would in person.

So, we very much appreciate everybody bearing with each other on these things as we have been moving through this and looking forward to, hopefully in a not-too-distant future, being able to resume our things that we have been doing so much in a personal fashion because, in the past, it has helped a lot. We will endeavor to answer the questions that got submitted and add those ... I don't remember how the process works. Kathy, do answers ...? Can we still answer these things and have them added to the outputs from this meeting?

KATHY SCHNITT:

Yes we can Rod, I have them saved.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay, very good. So, we will do that because there are some we didn't get to there. I'm not sure how anonymous people got in when you're supposed to be registered but that was interesting. Maybe there's an SSR issue we need to look at there. Anyway, thanks again to everybody, our SSAC members and all of you who came and participated today. We really do appreciate it and value your input. Thanks a lot. End the session.

KATHY SCHNITT: Thank you very much. This concludes our virtual SSAC public meeting for ICANN70. We definitely look forward to another lively discussion for ICANN71. This concludes today's session. Please stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]