
ICANN72 | Virtual Annual General Meeting – SSAC Public Meeting
Tuesday, October 26, 2021 – 12:30 to 14:00 PDT

KATHY SCHNITT: Hello, and welcome to ICANN72’s SSAC public meeting. My name is Kathy, and I am joined by my colleagues, Danielle and Andrew. And we are the remote participation managers for this session.

Please note that this session is being recorded and does follow the ICANN expected standards of behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form as I’ve noted in the chat. We will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of this session. If you would like to ask your question or make your comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphone when you are done speaking.

Also, this session includes automatic real-time transcription. Please note the transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the real-time transcription, click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar.

With that, I will hand the floor over to our Chair, Rod Rasmussen.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thank you very much, Kathy. Welcome, everybody. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, whatever time zone you're in. I have the advantage of having the home time zone. Unfortunately, we’re not

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.

actually doing this physically. I'd love to have you all in my part of the world to enjoy our great weather today. But hopefully we'll be able to meet in Seattle at some point in the future.

Today we're going to hold our regular session of the SSAC public meeting. We do it all ICANN meetings.

Can I have the next slide, please? Here's the agenda for today. And we will have, I think, plenty of time for some Q&A and an opportunity for folks to bring up topics of interest at the end of our session here. And we will have various topics covered by members of the SSAC and myself over the next 85 minutes or so. We will have an overview and then some work that we've recently released and updates on work that we're currently undertaking and some thoughts on where we may be going in the near future and also a discussion about SSAC membership.

Next slide, please. So for those of you not familiar with the SSAC, or just as a refresher, we are currently 36 members appointed by the ICANN Board, though we have a Membership Committee process that goes out and looks at people who apply for membership and actively is looking to recruit new members from various backgrounds, which we'll talk about a bit later. And we advise the ICANN community and particularly the Board on matters related to the security, stability, and resilience of the Internet's naming and address allocation systems. We have a lot of different backgrounds and expertise on the committee, represented by various members. And we're constantly trying to make sure we are up to date on the latest changes in technology and threats to the DNS and Internet ecosystems. We have published 119 different

official documents in our SSAC series of documents with recommendations or tutorials, etc., since 2002 and have additional correspondence we've done beyond that, more administrative and ICANN-community-related topics.

Next slide, please. The way we fit into the process here or the processes we have internally and with the Board are outlined here. In general, we take a look at topics—this is the bottom-left box on your screen there if you're looking at the presentation—where we form what we call a work party within the SSAC membership. So it's a subset of our full membership, [with] typically subject matter experts in each of the areas that may be affected by an areas where we have chartered some work to do.

We'll do research—that'll often involve our support staff and potentially even outside experts—and come together to write a report based on the things we find in our research that may or may not contain some recommendations, some overviews of problem areas, etc. That'll be reviewed and approved by the full SSAC membership. That often can be an interesting process of going back and forth aa we have our members chiming in on things that are in the report or may not be in the report that could be useful to have. And then we'll publish that report.

If that report contains advice, [particularly with] the ICANN Board, there's a formal process for that, where we have a system, a registry, that we formally communicate back and forth with the Board with to make sure that the Board has taken on and understands the advice as we intended it. That could go back and forth a little bit to make sure of

that. And then the Board will then take some sort of formal action on that advice. And that could either be referred on to another organization like the GNSO for policy development. There could be third parties that it could forward information on to. There have been instances where we kicked off interactions with the IETF or other outside forms. It could go directly to the ICANN organization itself for some sort of implementation. And of course, they can decline the advice but with an explanation of why the advice was declined.

So that's the formal process. And it's an important one to remember when we do have advice that is published. It is considered and either passed along, implemented, or declined. And we go from there.

Next slide, please. So we have three recent publications. We're going to be going in-depth on all three of those. There's some information there on how to find out more information about the SSAC as well as [how to contact us]. Then we will now proceed into discussing some of our recent publications.

So can I have the next side, please? So first up is a report on the root zone root service early warning systems. And Geoff Huston, I'm going to turn that over to you to run through that.

KATHY SCHNITT:

Rod, I don't see that Geoff has actually joined us.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Oh. Well, there's a glitch. Well, no worries. We could cover that. We have one slide on that here. So that was SAC 117. We did a couple of things in that. The objective was to take a look at all the different publications, etc., that had been done, looking at ways to determine if there's going to be some sort of problems, trouble, or concerns with the root zone and seeing if there was a way to create some sort of early warnings system—in other words, the light dial measure of some sort that would provide some sort of heads up that there's some issues on the horizon.

This was kicked off after OCTO produced OCTO 15. So we went and reviewed the literature and particularly very expensive list of the various publications and summaries of many of them in that document. So it's a really good reference, if nothing else, to the various work that has been done out there on this topic area.

And then the other objective was to bring that together and determine if the conclusions that OCTO came to (and OCTO 15) ... if we concurred with those of the SSAC. And we did. The current level of technology and understanding of the root zone operations, etc., makes it really difficult to try and create a technically accurate root zone or root service early warning system. There are several factors in that. It really comes down to what is normal, what are the conditions, etc., that allow you to declare things that aren't supposed to be where they are—those dials and settings, etc.? If you think of a temperature gauge for your engine in your car, if it gets enough, you will know that is a problem and you need to deal with it, [like] put a little light on or something like that. There are no equivalent data and indicators that would provide that kind of an easy-to-understand warning light, so to speak.

And we actually do a lot of review of the literature around early warning systems and systems that are understood, etc. Because the Internet and the root zone system is so new, it's really hard to nail down those kind of parameters at this time.

That said, the work that is being done to better understand and gather that data may at some point lead us to that. We just aren't there yet. And the stuff that has been described within RSSAC 2 and RSSAC 47 are really important. And the SSAC concurred that that kind of data collection, etc., should be continued.

I'm going to ask if there are any SSAC members that were on that committee or on that work party to add anything else that I may have forgotten—

KATHY SCHNITT: Geoff actually has joined now.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Oh. Jeff, thank you. Jeff, did I miss anything or is there anything else you would like to add to my [inaudible]?

GEOFF HUSTON: Sorry about that. Let joy be unconstrained; I've joined! Sorry I was late. Look, no, you're absolutely right, but be very careful of the interpretation of what we are saying. We are not saying that the root is infinitely scalable. No one is saying that. What we are saying is, is there a threshold point that we could detect in advance when the current

functioning and operation of the root system undergoes a state transition to something that is less stable, less, if you will, functional, than what we have now? And what we're saying is we don't understand where that threshold state might be in advance. We don't understand what it might look like. We do understand we can't infinitely scale the root, but that pathway from here to that hypothetical state doesn't have, at this point, any visible signs when we're transitioning to something that is going to degrade.

So what we are saying is we can't build an early warning system that predicts failure at the time when failure might be of relevance. That is different to saying, if we make it big enough, it's going to fall over because that second statement is true. It's just we don't know when and how that's going to happen, which is a less formal statement than what was in SSAC 107 and what was in OCTO 15. But I think we're all on the same page. Thanks.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Thank you very much, Geoff. And, yeah, I think that distinction there is really important as we're having discussions in other parts of the community around adding TLDs, etc. And the question becomes, when do we know if that's going to be problematic? And we've been having internal discussions in the SSAC around the concept of a flattened namespace and all the implication that could mean—that is, what that curve looks like, etc., and how you get there and eventually to a point where you don't even recognize what it is. It really is a bit of a mystery and a scenario where we may be doing some more work on. But at the

current level of understanding of where we're at, we concurred with OCTO that there's just not a practical early warning system you could implement today.

All right. And Russ, I see your hand up also. You were on that work party. Would you like to chime in a little bit on that?

RUSS MUNDY:

Yeah. Thanks, Rod. I'd like to just add to what you and Geoff just said and point out that, included in this particular publication is acknowledgement that it's good to continue to work towards having a measurement system that ... at some point in the future, something akin to an early warning system might be able to be developed. But it's also, yeah, to point out that we shouldn't give up on building the monitoring and load-watching efforts. RSSAC has undertaken efforts to do that and are continuing to try to update those. So we can't measure it today, but that doesn't mean we should give up on trying to measure and develop such a thing.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Thanks, Russ. Thank you very much. Yeah, that's really important input there that is in that document. And we fully support the RSSAC's continuing work in this space and also OCTO's as well in trying to better understand these things and trying to get us to a point where we can have some better predictive analysis that we can work on to better inform not just the ICANN community but the overall Internet

community on directions and on how things are going. So really important stuff.

Okay, let's move on to SAC 118. And I'm going to turn that over to Steve Crocker. Steve, please?

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you, Rod. So SAC 118 relates to a portion of the GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process. The portion that it relates to is Phase 2A, which followed Phase 2, which followed Phase 1. So "expedited" has to be understood as having a kind of special meaning here, measured as years as opposed to seconds.

The Phase 2A policy development process focused on basically two things. One was what to do regarding distinguishing legal versus natural persons because the GDPR provides protection for natural persons or what we would call real people, as opposed to legal persons, or what we might otherwise call businesses.

The other thing that the working group focused on was a piece of complexity regarding unique contacts. I'll cover each of these separately. And I also want to acknowledge that Tara Whalen and I were the two SSAC participants. And she was involved far longer than I and, even though I'm doing the talking at the moment, she gets a huge amount of the credit for all of this.

I'm just looking at the way these are described, but yes. So inside of the working group there was, as I say, a lot of focus on the distinction between legal versus natural persons. Part of the discussion was

whether or not that should be taken into account. Another was whether or not it was sufficient even if you did take it into account because, from a privacy perspective, even a legal entity might have a lot of personally identifiable information. So just making a distinction between a business, per se, and a person might not get at the underlying issue of whether or not privacy is to be protected.

We made a number of contributions in the working group. We added to the public comments and filed a minority report, all of which is in the context of the working group process. But we also said, you know, there's something odd about this whole thing, which is a huge amount of attention at trying to make the distinction among particular registrants as to which ones should be treated which way, all of which is—here's the unspoken part—based on a number of parties that want to have access to as much data as they can get—and the pause here is because this is the part that is the unpleasant part—and a deeply held belief that they can't get access to anything other than what's public, so they have to make as much as the data as possible public. That's quite different from the general expectation that some information would be public, some would not be public, and that appropriate parties should have access to all of the data that they need, even if some of it is not accessible generally to everybody. And it's that disconnect between the underlying lack of credibility that there will be eventual access to the data that they need even if it's protected versus ... that led to putting a lot of emphasis on trying to squeeze the last little bit out of making information public.

So one of the key things that we wanted to say—and we wanted to say it both within the confines of the working group, which operates within the charter that its been given and so forth, and we wanted to say it outside of those confines and say it from the perspective that SSAC has in which we can make a comment that isn't necessarily entirely contained within the working group rules—is that there's something broken here and that the thing that's broken is a clear path for enabling access to the protected information for all of the different parties that need to have it and for making that access effective in the number of ways in terms of cost and speed and certainty and efficiency and so forth.

So that's one big piece of what we said. And that's packaged up in the SAC 118 report to the Board.

The other area focused on has to do with access to communications with registrants—well, the use of synonymized e-mail addresses—which actually ... Again, there turned out to be an underlying confusion. Two separate and really quite distinct purposes were being tangled up. One is, how do you provide access to registrants without disclosing who they are—sort of anonymized access to them—so that you can forward e-mail and say, “Hey, I’m interested in your domain,” or, “I see the following problem,” and not expose the registrant to general open access?

The other is a desire to cross-correlate a number of registrations to say, “Hey, look, we see that the following registrations all have the same nexus. They all have a common registrar behind them. Even if we don't

know who that registrant is, it would be helpful to know what that correlation is.” And so some folks thought that, if you could have a synonymized e-mail address, that would show you the correlation even if it didn’t show you who it was. And as I said, the other motivation or possibly using synonymized e-mail is being able to contact the registrant without necessarily disclosing directly who they are.

In our view, those two things are completely separate and they don’t fit together and neatly as it might seem. But we can go into some depth about why that doesn’t work. But I’ll just leave it that. And if somebody wants to probe with questions, we can dig into it. But [we] basically said step back and untangle those two motivations and deal with them separately.

Here’s the slide about what we think is required for an effective and efficient system that would satisfy the multiplicity of needs for access to the non-public information. So here’s five attributes. We’re using “timely” here in the sense that the whole system needs to come into operation soon. “Separately” is, from a timely perspective, how fast responses come. We’ve seen discussions where it’s claimed that a three-day response is perfectly sensible. If you compare that to the under-a-second response that existed prior, that’s a factor of 1,000 slowdown. That’s not a small matter. In some cases, that may be okay, but in many, many, many cases, that just makes it an unusable system for how it was being used before.

And then there’s the question of how reliable it is and predicable and what hurdles/hoops does one have to go through even if you’re going

to authorized and how long and how expensive and how painful a process that is. And it feels like we're some long distance from achieving all of those qualities, but there's no reason why they can't be achieved. This is not as hard as many, many things that are built in this world.

Next slide, I guess. And then this is our recommendations on the legal versus natural: that there should be a way of making that distinction and it can be used, but it's not sufficient to put all of the eggs in that basket.

Next slide. And then this is the formal recommendations regarding synonymous e-mail. The first bullet says there's two separate policy objectives, and the next two bullets deal with treating each of those separately.

Next slide.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

That, Steve, is the next publication, which you also had a hand in and honor of presenting as well.

So just a head up to folks that are listening in. Please, if you have questions, etc., Kathy has provided some instructions on that. And we will gather those up and work through those after we've gone through the updates on all the various things. As I said, we should have plenty time for Q&A towards the end of the session here because we've got a long time. So if you have formal questions, enter those in, as Kathy has placed into the chat. Thanks.

Steve, I'll hand it back over to you.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you very much. So this is a wholly separate matter, even though it's the same voice you're hearing. So given that there is a newly formed working group, a GNSO working group, focused on the transfer of registrations—it's revisiting what the rules are, particularly in light of the changes in what data is accessible with WHOIS, so there is a relationship there ... And transfer of registration actually has two different versions. One is transfer of registration from registrant to another, like you sell your domain or it transfers to somebody else. And the other is you're transferring a registration from one registrar to another. So a registrant may retain control of the domain name but may want to change who the registrar is.

Each of those transactions—of course, there could be a transaction in which there is a both a change of registrar and change of registrant at the same time—can cause a disruption in the operation of the domain name service underneath the registration. So let me be very clear about that. The primary purpose of a registration, of registering a domain name, is so that you can then use that for some service—websites or other kinds of services—in which case there has to be a DNS operation underneath it. Everybody understands that.

It is very common for the registrar to provide that DNS service as part of the registration—and not only very common but it's also extremely common for that to be at no extra cost. So it's sort of lumped in as a service.

Because of that, when a registration changes, the underlying DNS service may have to change with it. That is, the registrar may not be willing or not expect to have to offer DNS service to the new registrant or the new registrar. They may expect the new registrar to take it over. That can lead to a disruption in in DNS service if it is use. Now, if it's just a parked domain, that's not an issue. But if it's one that's actually being used?

To add an important complication, if it's a signed zone—that is, if DNSSEC is being used to ensure the integrity of the data—then the transfer process, in order to maintain continuity of service, has to not only retain of continuity of access to it—that is, resolution—but also of the signature checking process—that is, validation. There is a technical sequence that will preserve that across any of these changes, but it is a bit complicated.

And one of the things that we wanted to say as a contribution to the GNSO working group that's looking at all of this is to pay attention to that aspect as well as the integrity and validity of the registration transfer itself. It's not their primary focus but they listened and were very, very polite and took that in. The processes that we're describing here also have to be addressed in other settings and, indeed, are getting a lot of attention on the technical side, which will be described as continuing panel discussion in the DNSSEC and Security Workshop tomorrow. I think that'll be the sixth in the series of such panels. But that was a message that we wanted to provide as a consciousness-raising exercise at this point. Thank you.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thank you, Steve.

Next up we have an update on the Name Collision Analysis Project. Jim Galvin is going to run through that for us. Jim, please?

JIM GALVIN: Thanks, Rod. Jim Galvin for the record. And welcome, folks.

Next slide, please. I think it's probably fair to assume that most people have some familiarity with NCAP at this time, so we shortened up all of this just to remind people that there are two Board resolutions that were offered up to SSAC, one asking for specific advice about corp, home, and mail, and then, in a single-sentence pitch, some general advice about how the Board can deal with name collisions in the future, given that they're present and there will be another round at some point in time here.

Just quickly noticing that we've got a pretty decent-sized group, a fairly good regular attendance during our weekly meetings here, with 25 discussion group members, about half of whom are SSAC members, we get about half of that at any given week in our meetings. And of course, I do want to give thanks and recognition to my Co-Chair, Matt Thomas, who's also here with us today.

Next slide. As we've said in the past a few times, we have organized our work in this Study 2 into five overall tasks. The first of course is a root cause analysis, which is just looking at the name collision reports that

ICANN did receive. Those who've been tracking the past round will know that, when there was a pre-delegation step prior to the actual delegation of the TLD, there was an opportunity and a process for those to experience a name collision, if you will, to report that. And ICANN had a way to collect those.

And so we have a report that is ... We have a document that we're producing as part of this Study 2, which is looking at all of those, and we're trying to gather what we can from that to see what we can learn about name collision. And that's in progress.

We've been doing some additional data collection that's ongoing. If you've been tracking the discussion group itself, you've just seen months of detailed analysis of name collision data from root server operators. And we're beginning some outreach now with some global resolvers where we're hoping to get some data that we can use as part of our analysis here, too. It's an ongoing work. There's always new data coming in and we're looking at it, and it's coupled to our Task 5.

Similarly, we have, in the second Board resolution, nine bullet items which are essentially questions to us. We've been calling them the Board questions. We've been [iterating] over those questions as we've been learning about name collisions going through this process. And we will, of course, more directly, and more formally, I suppose, provide answers to all of those points in our final work product in this process. And that's coupled directly with Task 5.

In response to the first Board resolution, we have actually, as a result of having done a lot of the data collection and analysis that my Co-Chair,

Matt Thomas, did, produced a case study of corp, home, and mail, LAN, local, and internal. We added a number of other top name-collision-exhibiting names to this case study. We do have a draft that's currently in review in the discussion group. And it is currently actually on ICANN's public comment schedule. We expect that'll come out sometime early next year and will be available for review by the community at large before we package up a final copy to deliver to the Board when this Study 2 is currently scheduled to end in June of next year, in time for ICANN74.

And we are now deep in the discussion group in our Task 5, which is ... The name collision analysis is what we're calling that task. Basically, that's the development of the analysis workflow. And that's where we're going to be providing the advice to the Board about, "Okay, you've got an application for a new TLD. Okay, name collisions have been exhibited by that particular string. What are you going to do about it?" And so we are providing our workflow in ... We're now going through the process of developing this in detail. What are data are we going to the Board that it can use to assess how it wants to respond to the presence of name collisions? It might reject the string. It might allow for some remediation. It might allow just for mitigation and allow for the name collisions to continue. So we're providing some methodology for the Board to use as it assesses the presence of name collisions and what it wants to do. And that's what we're deep into now.

Next slide, please. That analysis and workflow that we're producing is based on what we identified as critical diagnostic measurements. These come out of the case study of corp, home, and mail, LAN, local,

and internal that we produced. We have actually characterized each of these elements and what we need to know about these elements. We're looking at how to assess the values that one gets out of these things.

An important thing to keep in mind is, in the 2012, folks will remember that a lot of the discussion about what to do about name collisions depended on answering the question, what harm was there and is there a harm to human life? That seemed to be a principal characteristic that we were looking for in all of this.

One of the things that we are getting to and trying to change the dialogue around is to talk about the impact caused by these critical diagnostic measurements. So you collect these measurements up. We want to look at these measurements. And the way to assess them is to consider the impact that comes from both the volume of each of these and the diversity of them. And so, as one particular example query volume. That's DNS query volume. I mean, the absolute volume was a popular item that was discussed during the 2012 round. That was often looked at as something of concern. So a name with a lot of queries that were not resolving, if it had a lot of queries, was deemed to be a problem or should be considered a problem by itself. It's really what caused corp, home, and mail to kind of be set aside for the moment because we just didn't know how to deal with them. But we're adding the characteristic of diversity.

A critical thing that we want to bring to all of this is it's not just about the query volume in and of itself. It's about where those queries are coming from. Are they coming from one particular source, one

particular ID address, one particular ASN, for example? It is one particular type of query? It's about volume and diversity and looking at the impact of all of that that's going to determine what to do. And we're creating that methodology to evaluate those things.

So that's the update on NCAP. A lot of really good stuff going on right now. A good time to come around and join it. It is an open group. You do have to answer the usual ICANN conflict/disclosure of interest. You have to expose all of that. There's some extra questions for you to answer. But you're welcome to join the group and contribute to the dialogue and help us get to this process.

We are currently on target at the moment to finish in time for ICANN74, as I said, next June. It's dependent on where our discussions go. So I have to be very careful about that. We have a project manager, project plan. As long as our discussions stay under control, we'll hit that target. But it is a community. You never know what's going to come out of discussions. So we'll see how that goes and we'll manage as we go.

That's it. Thanks.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Thank you very much, Jim. Making good progress at this point. Really delved into the technical details and we're really looking forward to getting this hopefully released before ICANN74 and answer a bunch of those questions that the Board and community have had for us. And we've had excellent support from ICANN Org on this as well and acknowledge all the great work that the staff has done and provided

the resources to bring in some outside expertise as well to really dig into a lot of the data, etc. That's really helped us move this forward.

We'll move on to the next set of topics. And this is current work that we're doing. Thank you. We're already to the next slide. So these are the things that we're currently work party meetings on within the SSAC that are taking up the time of our members and staff, etc.

The first one we obviously just covered: name collisions. We'll talk a little bit about the Routing Security Work Party that we have here in just a minute and also work we're doing in reviewing some feedback we've got on SAC 114, which is our comments on SubPro. Steve talked about SAC 119, which refers to the registration transfer policy review. We'll have just a little bit of potentially more flavor on that. And then ongoing, which we always have going, are the DNSSEC workshops and the quick plug for that. The DNSSEC workshops are tomorrow, starting at the same time (the first of three sessions) as this meeting did today tomorrow for whatever your local time zone is, unless you're changing your time zones on a Tuesday or Wednesday, wherever you are. I doubt that's happening. So it should be the same time tomorrow. And then we have our Membership Committee, which Julie will talk about as our last topic area here.

Next slide, please—whoops. There we go. Routing security. Russ Mundy, are you available just to give a quick overview of that?

RUSS MUNDY:

Sure. I can do that, Rod.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thank you.

RUSS MUNDY: So the objective of this work party is to develop a document that is hopefully going to provide helpful information to the broader community with particular emphasis on DNS and DNS operators and how the routing system of the Internet will and does impact them and things they should be thinking about with respect to the routing system and how they should maybe take it more into consideration, possibly, than what they've been doing now or looking at gaining or having available to them the resources to think about solving routing security problems in case they come and impact them.

And it really is intended to be a first attempt at providing this educational type of material. And so it's been a challenge to move it forward. We continue to work on it, and I think we're making some good progress. And it is a technically complex topic space that we want to be able to give enough description on so that it's understandable to folks who aren't deeply engaged in this technical space and yet be technical accurate enough for them to think about how the security of the routing system can and does impact them or might in the future.

So it is an effort that we do not think we will have anything resembling recommendations on, but it is possible that they might come out with some. But so far, it doesn't look like that's where we're headed, but it's trying to develop a body of work that will be helpful to both the ICANN

community and beyond the community for those that know a little bit about or have heard about the routing system and want to know and understand a little bit more.

So that really, I think, summarizes our effort now. I'm not sure if Tim is on (my Co-Chair), but please feel free to add something in I've missed anything.

ROD RASMUSSEN: I think Tim was not going to be able to join us via audio today.

RUSS MUNDY: Okay. Thanks.

ROD RASMUSSEN: But I think you did a good job of covering it, so thank you for doing that. I appreciate it.

Could I have the next slide, please? Right. So thank you. So we have the work party that put together most of the work for SAC 14, which is reviewing comments which we received since then. We published that way back in February. And we received some really substantive feedback from the Board and a formal request from the RySG for reconsideration and various interesting comments from various community members at ICANN70 and since then.

And we've been taking that on board to listen to those comments and what they reveal about how people have interpreted sections of what

we presented, where folks were asking for more references, background, etc., on some of the items that were discussed, etc., and trying to determine the best way to take those on board and ensure that the intent of what we were trying to get across in 114 was actually what the community received and understood and to address the questions that we actually put 114 on hold for consideration for. We want to get out of that state because, largely, 114 was actually not all that ... We didn't receive a whole lot of feedback that I would label as controversial. There's a lot of pertinent advice that's directed at some of the particulars. There was some overall questions around the approach we took towards describing our concerns with namespace expansion in general. So we're working on that internally still. We're trying to get through that process now where we understand where our members stand vis-à-vis how and whether to provide additional clarity on what we've outlined in 114.

So that is an ongoing internal process that we look forward to sharing with the full community hopefully in the very near future. We're trying to wrap this up because, as I mentioned, there's a lot of advice in there that we'd like to make sure is onboarded, especially with the ODP process going on.

Just to try and answer Maxim's question he put into there, I think that the ... Well, I'm certainly still not sure that's clear, but as far as SSAC's participation in anything like that kind of falls into our general bucket of participation in any of these non-SSAC activities throughout the ICANN community. And that really just depends on interest and availability, etc., and how that process is actually formally done in that

it's very difficult for the SSAC to provide a single or even multiple members to participate in any other community work that may officially represent the SSAC consensus since we speak through our documents rather than typically through individual members. That's an important distinction.

I'll actually address that here on the next slide, but we have done that, for example, the GNSO EPDP on domain registration data. In order to do that, we have to stand up a work party to support that, those representatives, etc. Very time-consuming, etc., and keeps us from working on some of the other things where we're trying to provide predictive advice and other things around SSR issues. So we take those types of things on very rarely and only when it really is on something that directly affects SSR and in a way where we can have enough members to support that. So I would seriously doubt there would be any form of participation on any SubPro PDP.

However, that doesn't mean we may not comment on things as they go along. We often do that if there's scenarios where we think we can add some clarity, add some background, etc., to things that folks are either considering from a policy or implementation perspective. It really just depends on what's being done and whether we have the time and expertise and interest amongst those folks with that expertise to be able to make those comments.

So hopefully that answers that. And feel free to update your question in the chat if that didn't.

Can I have the next slide, please? I think that gets to—yes—the TPR. I want to talk to this first bullet point. And, Steve, if you have anything else to add after I do that, feel free. I think you've covered most of it in your 119 review.

The SSAC in this regard is actually ... Steve's participation is as an invited subject matter expert. If you recall how that was formed, the GNSO asked for formal representation from each of the SO/ACs. And this has been a topic of conversation among the SO/AC chairs: how do we actually do these kind of things with that kind of formal representation? And as I just pointed out, it's very difficult for a group like ours with a small number of members to be formally represented by a single person with a group. So in order to provide some input from the SSAC, we worked out with the GNSO Council the ability to have them invite Steve on as a subject matter expert. So that way, he's not formally speaking for the SSAC. However, he's able to kind of liaise with other members who are interested in this and be able to provide some really useful input to the process without it being a formal process.

And we've seen, subsequently to that, that some other work has been proposed using more of not a formal representation model. And this continues to be a point of discussion amongst the various SO/AC leaders and the community to try and figure out how we can best provide inputs for consideration in these processes, into the policy work, without having to create this formal process which makes it very difficult because of the governance of the various advisory committees, etc., for them to be able to do that.

So it's an important thing. And as the ICANN community and Empowered Community is moving forward and trying to develop processes, these are the kinds of things we're figuring out as we go. It's all part of trying to do a better job at governance and policy creation. And we look forward to providing input, especially obviously in our remit of SSR issues.

So, Steve, after that long thing of sort of process stuff, is there anything you'd like to add further that you didn't cover earlier?

STEVE CROCKER:

No, I think you covered the bureaucratic aspects in great detail. And I think I said what I wanted to say about the substantive issues before. I was just reflecting on how pleased I am that I don't have to deal with the bureaucratic aspects anymore.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Yes, it's a lot of fun.

So let's move on to the next slide, please. Right. So this is, looking towards the future here, what SSAC is considering working on in 2022 and beyond.

We've been percolating this together for a bit now. We're actually going through a process at the end of the year where we bring together various proposed charters of work parties and what their scoping looks like and then see what the availability and interest levels of our membership are, etc. And then we'll have put together a workplan

going forward. So just to give you kind of a little inside view of how we do this.

These are the topics where we've brought together some things that we think we'll probably be working on in one way or another. So we're looking at kind of a long-term evolution of DNS resolution itself, various things that are affecting how the DNS works, particularly around the resolving side of the equation, and what impacts that may have on the authoritative side and just general Internet usage, etc., and the flows, etc., of data when it comes to name resolution because there's just a lot going on when it comes to protocols and a lot of things going around privacy and a lot of concentration on resolving infrastructure, etc. Those have long-term impacts. And what does that mean? So that's what that's [inaudible] general for what that's looking at.

Also, kicked off by some of the things that have come up in the past, we're taking a look at datasets that ICANN collects and makes available or maybe not makes available but at least collects that could be used in investigating SSR-related issues. We've had the ability to tap into some of that data through experts and contractors, etc., to take a look at things. But what are the things we can do? And where are the gaps? Where are things that may need somebody in the outside world is collecting and would be pertinent to DNS operations and the ICANN community that ICANN doesn't directly have control over but somebody else might? What are some things out there that nobody is looking at? So that's what that's taking away: how can we get better data so we can make better decisions, etc.?

Some very particular things around DNS DNSSEC key management and how that is done between registries and registrars and some of the implications of the current operational models that are being used and some proposals around how to make that better.

And then there's a particular subject area where some recent academic papers have been done around lame delegations and how that can expose domain registrations to hijacking inadvertently and some recommendations around that.

And then there's potentially taking a look at what the impacts from a technical perspective are, staying away from politics, if there's a forced removal or a transfer of a TLD at some point.

So those are areas where we're considering doing work. We have other ideas in the hopper as well, but those are the ones that have kind of risen to the top at the moment. And then I will be querying ... The fun part of this process is getting other ideas in from the public because we've taken those in the past and turned them into work. So we'll do that towards the end.

Can I have the next slide, please? Julie, I'm going to hand it over to you to talk about the membership side of things.

JULIE HAMMER:

Great. Thanks, Rod. And great to see so many people on the call. The SSAC is always looking for new members with relevant technical skills in a number of areas that we've defined. You can see our skills areas listed on this slide.

Unfortunately, our outreach efforts have really been stymied by 18 months of COVID and not being able meet either at ICANN meetings or in other meetings around the globe. So we're relying on these sorts of meetings online to reach prospective new members.

The SSAC has a Membership Committee which compromises five members of the SSAC. And that is reconstituted each year. And any applications for membership are processed by that committee.

So despite COVID, we did have three new members come into the SSAC this year, and they were all welcome additions to our group.

So our skills survey is a fairly detailed document and it's available as a link through the main SSAC page on the public website. And so if anyone is interested in thinking about applying for SSAC membership, that's a good place to start. And we also point out where in our operational procedures we talk about the process of applying for membership.

Next slide, please. So each year we try to define some of the areas where we're particularly looking for skills. We're about to reconsider this list of this year, taking into account the skills of our new members that have been added during the year. But a lot of these areas that are defined on this slide are still areas where we're seeking skills where we think we could supplement our existing skills. Of course, a lot of the work that is SSAC is focused on does tend to be in some areas where we already have skills, and frequently we're interested in supplementing those skills with people who come with those existing skills but might come with a different perspective that reflects on either a different region or

view or come from a different infrastructure background or something like that.

So please do have a look at our website. Have a look at the skill survey. And if you believe you might be interested in joining the SSAC and putting in an application—next slide, Kathy—please do reach out to us. We are still actively seeking membership from the Africa, Latin America, and Asia-Pacific regions, where don't have as many members as we would like from those regions.

Thank you very much, Rod.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thank you, Julie. And would you like to just give a quick update on what happened in 2021 for SSAC membership?

JULIE HAMMER: Yeah. Well, we did what we call a batching of member applications. What we've introduced is, rather than just process applications as they come in, we've moved to an approach where we want to consider new applicants in a batch. And we do that in the April-May timeframe. So we will accept applications at any time during the year, but preferably we aim to get our outreach efforts more actively happening in the latter part of the calendar year and the early months of the calendar yet and solicit applications to be received by April for the Membership Committee to consider them as a batch so that, if we have similar candidates with almost identical skills and don't necessarily need to

have multiple new members with those skills, we're in a better position to make some judgements there. So that happened this year.

We did admit three new members: Russ Housley, Jiankang Yao, and Jonathan Spring. And all of those have settled into the SSAC really well and are contributing right from the beginning, which is great to see.

Having said that about the batching, should a member apply at some other point in the calendar year, and should the Membership Committee consider that, we don't want to wait for the period of time until April/May to process this application. The person might have skills that are particularly valuable and needed. Then the Membership Committee can determine to process that application immediately. So there is flexibility in the guidelines that we've put in place. So if anyone is interested, please reach out.

Anything else, Rod?

ROD RASMUSSEN: No. I think that covers it.

JULIE HAMMER: [Great].

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thanks for the explanation there. Looking forward to getting some more folks involved next year. It's been tough with the pandemic and lack of travel, of course, but it was really good to be able to get a few

new members on this past year. I don't believe we added any in 2020. So we've gone done a little bit in our overall membership, and it's good to have a few more hands to help with all the various things that we're trying to work on and get those different perspectives. So I really encourage folks, especially representing different experiences with Internet connectivity, from around the world to join because it's very informative to look at problems from a different perspective to be able to provide better advice.

Okay. I think, if we move on to the next slide, we are—year—basically done with the prepared section and the update section, as it were, where we've been working on what's come out as of late. So now is kind of the open forum Q&A for all those of you have come along to hear from us. We'd like to hear from you in particular on any areas where, if you took a look at the new work that I said we were considering, you think the SSAC should be taking a lot at in the SSR (Security, Stability, Resiliency) areas that we didn't see there and you think are important. We'd love to hear about that.

And, also, I mentioned we have a limited number of folks and we had a little discussion about participating in various things. That also comes to public comments as well. What are some of the areas that you would like to see the SSAC commenting on? Not that we're not necessarily going to be able to, but it is good to hear from the community on where our input would be more useful because, without input, we kind of have to guess. And some of these we can figure out pretty straightforward, but other times it's surprising where people say, "Hey, you didn't comment on that." And it's like, "Well, we didn't know you wanted us

to.” So those are the kinds of things it’s good to hear from the community on.

Then, Kathy, do we have any outstanding questions that were put into the chat that haven’t been addressed yet?

KATHY SCHNITT: No, they have been answered.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay. And I believe that anybody on this has the ability to raise their hand and ask a question now, right?

KATHY SCHNITT: That is correct.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah. So I will turn that over to the attendees or even, I guess, SSAC members if they wanted to bring up something that we didn’t cover that you thought we should provide an update on to chime on that as well. But hopefully we’ve got all of our things covered. So, please, if there are any other—oh, I see a question has come in here on the list.

KATHY SCHNITT: This is from Yoshiro. “Question. Does SSAC consider caucus membership to support work party as well as RSSAC Caucus?”

ROD RASMUSSEN: Ah, okay. So for those of you not familiar with the way the RSSAC works, the RSSAC is the Registry Security, Stability Advisory Committee or ...

JULIE HAMMER: Root Server.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah. Root Server. I'm sorry. I'll get the right acronym here. Root server operators basically. And they have their formal membership. They also have what's called the caucus. Anybody can join that that's got an interest in that. And that caucus provides input, etc., to the RSSAC. We do not have an equivalent type of caucus for the SSAC.

That said, what we have done in the past, several times actually, is, on a particular topic area where there is a particular level of expertise that may not be fully represented within the SSAC membership itself or could benefit from that really deep subject matter expertise, we have brought on members that are not SSAC members to participate in that work party. And typically that'll be done via outreach from the work party itself. We go through a process internally to approve external membership to those work parties. That's not a very onerous thing. It's just making sure that the proposed inclusion makes sense by the full membership. That's usually pro forma. But that allows us to tap into additional experts. And sometimes those people end up becoming involved in the SSAC as full members eventually. So it's kind of a backend way to do a little recruiting as well. We then call those invited

guests to the work party as a formality of how we do that. So it is possible to participate.

So if there's an area where there is a keen interest to somebody out there who is an expert in something that is SSR-related, and SSAC takes it on, that would be certainly possible to participate in that.

“Is it possible to join in an observatory capacity?” was the next question that came in. And the answer to that unfortunately is no. The SSAC does a lot of work with sensitive information that's shared on security issues, etc., so we don't have a public or observational-type capacity on that in order that we can deal with some of those security topics [inaudible] operational things that got brought to our attention from a security perspective. But we do try and obviously hold sessions like this so that folks can understand what we're working on and provide input.

Any further questions?

Did I miss anything, Kathy, or are we caught up?

KATHY SCHNITT: No, Rod, we've got everything so far.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay. All right. We do have quite a bit of work going on. For those of who are interested, we are, later, meeting with the Board in just under three hours' time today to go over a lot of the same stuff you just saw in this meeting. And then there's some questions the Board is asking all of the SO/ACs to answer. So we'll be going over our responses to that as well.

That will be obviously a public session as well. So you're welcome to attend that.

I mentioned early that the DNSSEC Workshop is tomorrow. And I really encourage all of you who have an interest in not just DNSSEC but all things security-related to go because it's going to be a good session. Or there's three sessions tomorrow on that. Kathy pasted those into the chat already.

Kathy, do we have any other meetings? I'm just looking through my thing here.

KATHY SCHNITT: The only other meeting we have is the joint meeting with the ICANN Board.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay. There's that. And then for those of you in the RSSAC, we're meeting next week.

So that is the activities for the SSAC at this particular ICANN meeting. Again, if you have any thoughts on topics for us to cover, etc., we're always very willing to hear those and get input on what we've done.

One of the questions that has come up several times in various forums to me lately is, does the SSAC ever review over work and update it? And the short answer is, yes, we do actually do that on occasion. We went through a formal exercise I think almost two years ago now, when the Admin Committee of the SSAC looked through all the old publications

and flagged a few that might, at some point, be updated or incorporated into future work. Some of that I know got translated into stuff that the NCAP Project is working on.

And then there's the, of course, formal tracking of advice between the SSAC and the Board, where, oftentimes, the back and forth there ends up creating updates to how things are eventually implemented or referred for policy.

So there is an occasional lookback on things. Most of our advice is still pretty good as far as how it was written up, but we certainly are cognizant that things change over time. Security threats arise and morph a lot and it's good to keep tabs on where you've been and to make sure your advice is still solid.

Any other ... I'm just looking out for any questions, any hands. This is a great opportunity.

But if not, I think we can go on to the last slide, which is the thank you. And I really do appreciate you all showing up and getting the update. And, again, please feel free to send us any questions and thoughts you have on security, stability, and resiliency-related topics so we can potentially take those on in the future.

Thank you very much. And with that, I think we'll bring the meeting to a close.

Kathy, do you want to talk us out here?

KATHY SCHNITT: Thank you, Rod. This meeting is now concluded. Please stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]