
ICANN73 | Virtual Community Forum - Joint Meeting: ICANN Board and SSAC
Tuesday, March 8, 2022 - 16:30 to 17:30 AST

WENDY PROFIT: I'm seeing that we are half past the hour. We will continue to promote board members and other executives to the panel as they enter the room, but I would like to hand it over to my colleague Lisa Saulino to do the opening remarks and start the session.

[Recording in process]

LISA SAULINO: Thank you, Wendy, and thank you, MTS for starting the record. Hello, everyone. My name is Lisa Saulino. Welcome to the joint session with the ICANN Board and the Security and Stability Advisory Committee. Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.

To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multistakeholder model, we ask that you sign into the Zoom session using your full name. For example, first name, last name, or surname. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name.

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.

Interpretation for this session will include six U.N. languages: Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian, Spanish, and English. Click on the "Interpretation" icon in Zoom and select the language you will listen to during the session.

For our panelists, please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English. Before speaking, ensure you have selected the language you will speak from the interpretation menu. Also, please be sure to mute all audible notifications and speak clearly and slowly for our wonderful interpreters.

This discussion is between the ICANN Board and the SSAC. Therefore, we will not be taking questions from the audience. However, all participants may make comments in the chat. Please use the drop-down menu in the chat pod and select "Respond to all panelists and attendees." This will allow everyone to view your comments.

To view the real-time transcription, click on the "Closed Caption" button in the Zoom toolbar.

With that, I will hand it off to our ICANN Board Chair, Maarten Botterman.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you, Lisa. Thank you very much for welcoming us all. And welcome to our SSAC colleagues. Really appreciate your being here. We are now two years online, and one thing we can say is that basically the Internet works we seem to be reasonably stable, reasonably secure, and, yes, we're never done. There's always more to do, and challenges come while we move along. So really looking forward to the discussion. As always, it will be an open discussion, really an opportunity for not only your SSAC member, Jim, but also for us all to engage more with you guys and hear what's on your mind, make sure that we understand well what you expect from us, and together contribute to doing the job.

So with that, I would like to ask Jim to take the honors and guide us through this session. Jim, please.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Maarten. Thank you very much for the warm welcome on behalf of myself and the SSAC, to the board members that are here and staff, Göran and the rest of the team. And of course a special thank you to my SSAC members for their confidence in putting me in this place. And extra special thank you -- this is my first opportunity to be on this side of the Zoom table, I guess is the way to phrase it, with my Zoom colleagues. So I would -- with my SSAC colleagues. So we'll see how it goes.

Let me first just reach out to Rod and see if he has any opening remarks that he wants to make. And as part of that, Rod, let me specifically ask you two questions. Do you want to stick to the agenda as listed here in the order that's there? Do you have a preferred order for the topics? And of course not all SSAC members, I don't think, have been promoted here, but I assume anyone can raise their hand to speak if they want. If you could speak to that, too.

So over to you, Rod.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Thank you, Jim, Maarten, and the Board. Always appreciate the opportunity to have a good discussion. These usually are really good, interesting discussions where you have kind of the heart of the matter of what I think ICANN is all about, the security and stability of the naming systems. And our committee is obviously very focused on that. So it's -- I love having these opportunities to talk some more.

As far as the questions, Jim, yeah, I think we can stick on the agenda. If there are some other things that the Board would like to add on or talk about, I'd be happy to add those in, but I don't think we have anything more from the SSAC side to add. We wanted to concentrate today on a couple things. One is kind of

the discussion, it was listed on the agenda up front, in thinking through the eventual disposition of how our advice and really, for that matter, other AC's advice will be handled in the future as we're going through this prioritization pilot and with an eye towards working with the community at large to prioritize efforts. Kind of put some things to think about as far as our process that we've established with the Board goes. So that's what we wanted to bring up.

And then discuss the priorities we have and how those fit in -- how we, being the SSAC, has, and how those fit into the overall ICANN strategic objectives, et cetera. I think that's a good discussion to have. And so it's an hour so that will take most of the time, but if there are some other topics of, you know -- very topical interest, I'll be happy to take those on.

So I'll get back over to you, Jim, to run the meeting, and go from there.

JIM GALVIN:

Thank you, Rod. Appreciate it.

You did touch on the first item on the agenda here. Let's just dig in. And SSAC did have a question for the Board.

You kind of gave a brief introduction, Rod. Did you want to say any more about that before we offer some discussion from the Board side?

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Yeah, and I think this slide and the next two slides basically kind of iterate over the same concept. But, you know, the journalist of this is that we've had an established process where the SSAC provides advice, oftentimes directed at the Board or other parts of the ICANN community or organization. That advice is considered, and there's a back-and-forth process to understand that advice, tear it apart a bit, rephrase it to actual chunks, and then assign that off to whoever is going to work on it. And that's how we've done that for the last many years.

Now that we're -- we've been having these discussions with the SO/AC leadership along with the Board on prioritization across the full ICANN community of all kinds of work efforts, it strikes us that we should be thinking about how, you know, in particular the SSAC but probably all ACs advice is taken on and worked with. I know the GAC has its own particular flavor because of the bylaws, but beyond that, there is other advisory committees and then other work coming out of the various other parts of the community that provide advice, et cetera.

And how do we envision that? And this is more of a question to kind of have a discussion around it, not trying to set any concrete plans or what have you, but it does strike us that this is a good time to be thinking about how to integrate the work we've been doing and transition that to whatever the future looks like. And that's what all those questions look like.

And some of the particulars that come up there is when, you know, advice from the SSAC aligns with other advice, when it's -- it's distinct and different and nobody else is talking about it, which happens quite often in the technical space. And then on those occasions when it differs from other parts that is provided by other parts of the community. And that's I think where the Board really comes in on that one, but I'd love to have that discussion for a few minutes here, and see what people are thinking, especially if the Board's been contemplating this.

Thanks.

JIM GALVIN:

Thank you, Rod. Let me add a little bit of this. I think you wanted to go to the next slide. Didn't you say there were more slides here with more details? And even the next one again. Yeah. I think that's where you wanted to be, correct? I'll just look for a nod or something from you unless you want to go back.

Okay. Thank you.

And I just also wanted to add that there is a pilot coming up with respect to this prioritization framework. And I'm sure that SSAC would appreciate some additional clarity about how these questions relate to that pilot and what can be said about that. So may just add that to the discussion here.

And then let me look to my colleague, Matt Thomas -- sorry, Matthew Shears from the Board who I believe is going to speak to this issue.

My apologies. Matt Thomas, you know, SSAC member. I speak about him all the time, so I got wrapped up in the Matt, so...

But, please, go ahead, Matthew.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Yeah, thanks, Jim. And hi, everybody.

So let me say from the outset, these are great questions, and they certainly give you pause, give one pause for thought. I'm not sure that I can actually necessarily answer them, but I'll give some of it a shot, if I can.

So obviously, as a board, I've been following this process of the development of the prioritization framework very closely and appreciate SSAC's and everybody else's engagement in that process and the consultation process, et cetera, et cetera.

This is something that's -- we see as a particularly important development. It's part of the broad effort to move things forward and to address the many pieces of work that yet -- have been adopted but are yet to be implemented, and it's important in that context.

So there are a couple of pieces here, one of which is the framework overall, which was published -- I think the first draft was published last week, and then there is the pilot as well. So let me just talk about the pilot first.

And obviously SSAC's been involved in this all along, so you know the parameters of these, and that's specifically because it's a pilot and because it's running over a period of approximately a month or so, the scope of work which it will be addressing is limited. So obviously it's limited to the Board-approved specific review recommendations. And so that does not include other pieces of work.

So in terms of the immediate term, and we know that SSAC has nominated somebody to the pilot and an alternative, what we're doing is we're going to be observing that process, watching how it develops, looking forward to some constructive outcomes from that process, and then learnings as well that will inform the larger framework as it -- as it evolves from the draft that we've just seen.

In terms of -- If we can just go back to the first slide, just where your initial question was.

Yeah, so let me take this -- let me take the second question. And then I would welcome thoughts on the second bullet, and I would welcome thoughts on the first one because I'm not sure that I can answer that. Maybe there's somebody from org who might.

But will all SSAC recommendations accepted by the Board be considered under the new prioritization framework? My understanding is that that would be the case. From my discussions and from my read of the draft framework, that's my understanding. So I don't think that they would be considered separately.

Now, when they're aligned with recommendations from other ACs and specific reviews, when they are unique, when they conflict with other recommendations, how would they fit in the

picture? That's not clear to me. I don't think that we have -- or I don't think that that is at all addressed in the framework, but they're great questions, and I -- I can't give you an immediate answer, I'm afraid to say, on bullet 1, if you will.

I think that's pretty much all I can say on this at this point in time. But maybe you have follow-up or maybe there's -- somebody from Xavier's team who might be able to help us out here.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

I'll definitely defer to Xavier. I think that we were fairly well expecting that any recommendations the Board approves et cetera and doles out would be moved into the prioritization pretty much just because that's work to do and needs to be prioritized. That makes sense. And I think on the first bullet point what we thought interesting there is when, on the point when they are aligned with other groups, does that add into the prioritization consideration? So in other words, if ALAC and GAC and SSAC and GNSO all kind of come to some sort of agreement on something, whatever that something is, and they all have a similar recommendation, does that affect the prioritization? I don't know. That's part of what the pilot probably will identify. But the interesting question becomes, when the Board accepts advice that maybe -- I wouldn't imagine it would accept the advice as contradictory, but it could certainly be orthogonal

enough that it provides a bit of a dilemma for how to prioritize it. I just bring it up here because I think it would be good to bring this as part of the process and discussion. We don't have any expected outcomes right now. Not surprising we don't have an answer. This is just part of a discussion. Thanks.

JIM GALVIN:

Thank you, Matthew, and thank you, Rod. Do want to encourage anyone else who might want to ask some questions or comments about this to raise their hands. Maarten, I see you have your hand up. Go ahead, please.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Yeah, no, just to take maybe one misunderstanding out of the way. I don't think the prioritization framework will resolve the issue of contradicting advice. We have to find other means for that, and we do that all the time because it's really about different opinions from the ICANN community that we need to resolve and need to make sense of. From that way, yes, those SSAC recommendations we listen to all the time. They will be weighed against other recommendations, and if they conflict, it's up to us to make a measured decision and an argued decision. Even if there is in the bylaws a special rule for the GAC, it doesn't mean that the other advice is not considered by the Board. We do take this very, very seriously.

But again, I don't think it's a framework priority question. For the framework priority it's really like so what needs to be done? How does it scale on the list of things? And in our current thinking, we feel that in particular the strategic framework also offers some perspective to that, the five-year strategic plan. So which things do need to be done now. There's urgency, there's necessity, and there is contribution to a better future and to take that into account.

But it's not from a reason -- a pilot. We're really trying to find a way together, and we also look forward, no doubt, to input from you on how you experience it. Not only input to the process itself, like this is more important because, but also in this way it works better or hey, did you think about that.

So hope -- hope that helps. And yes, as both Jim and Matthew say, we don't have the silver bullet yet, but maybe we'll find it.

JIM GALVIN:

Thank you, Maarten, and thank you all. I think the most important takeaway from all of this is that the dialogue is now open. You know, we've identified something which we do want to consider as we progress this pilot and prioritization in general.

One last call for any more comments? Yes, please, Matthew.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Just to reinforce what Maarten was saying, I think this is a -- you know, the pilot itself gives us a wonderful opportunity to really see how we can move this challenge of prioritization and implementation forward. So we're really looking forward to seeing how this works. We're really -- we will be, as I said, we will be observing. We're looking forward to the learnings from this. And that will be great because it will inform the actual framework as it evolves. So hopefully this will be a fascinating and kind of in-depth look over the next month, and it may -- I'm sure will probably raise other questions as well, similarly challenging or gnarly as these. But it's a process, you know, that we think is just happening at the right time. Thanks.

JIM GALVIN:

Thank you, Matthew. Good point for us all to keep in mind. Okay. I think with that, let's move on to the next set of questions. That was the only request for a topic from SSAC. So let's move to the Board questions. And this was the first Board question topic. And over to you, Rod. I think you have some points on the next slide, right?

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Yes. Thank you, Jim. If we can move to the next slide, these the key priorities and how they fit in. So being the engineer types we are, we put the key priorities into a matrix and connected them up to the various strategic goals.

So just to run through those really quickly, we're completing the work on the NCAP project which is coming along. We're in a public comment period right now on that. We're going to take that input and some more research is being done and be placed - - putting that out later this summer. Summer in the northern hemisphere, I will point out. The -- as Julie will get on me if I don't grade that out properly. Obviously this gets some ties to various security goals, as do most of the work the SSAC is partaking on, as you would imagine.

We have a publication about to come out, routing security and its implications on the DNS infrastructure. So that definitely affects many community members here. And will hopefully be informative for the community in helping to define and provide background on the threats space and some of the things that can be done to mitigate issues where routing and the DNS interact.

We have just fired off a new work party that's forward looking, looking at how DNS resolution is likely to evolve going forward.

And also another work party on automation of DS records and a bit of a gap in the way that's handled. This gets into the unique identifier systems and some of the goals within that -- within that strategic thrust of -- that ICANN has. And both of those work parties should be informative there, and we're looking for that evolutionary -- looking -- that forward look to help as well as inform some of the risk assessments that the Board has to do over time, how different parts of the ecosystem may be impacted by trends in things like applications or protocol development, et cetera.

Fourth, we have DNS abuse. We had a SAC115 made comments on DNS abuse and the -- and response and were a bunch of various topics from evidence to messaging, et cetera around abuse issues. We're continuing to participate, I'll be on the community panel tomorrow, for instance, and that work has been picked up and has shown up in other efforts that are ongoing in this area, and we continue to look forward to working there. We have an ongoing discussion with the contracted party house to do some work on -- together on malicious forces, compromised domains as far as looking at those issues and a whole bunch of other things that are tied up with that. So we're working on that as well, which obviously is a security objective.

And finally, we have our continued work on access to domain registration data, which basically everybody in the community has been involved in since GDPR came out and was put in force. We've all been trying to find solutions in that space, and we will continue to be very active in our efforts to help there.

So those are the areas that we're working on. Pretty much all of our active work parties are covered here and where they tie back into the strategic goals. Any questions on that?

JIM GALVIN: Questions or comments from Board members on the activities in the coming year from the SSAC?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Let me put a question back. Does this -- do these seem to align well and is this the kind of information we're looking for from -- in other words, did we answer the question to your satisfaction here?

[Laughter]

JIM GALVIN: I would say, you know, from my point of view as Board liaison, I have tried to emphasize these things carried forward the

emphasis on these topics and added the new ones that came up, you know, sort of late last fall when we had our -- in SSAC, the strategic discussion, I have certainly mentioned these topics insider the BTC as upcoming topics from SSAC. So the full Board hasn't necessarily seen all of these things, but, you know -- so this is the first opportunity in this discussion to see the new items that have come up and will be progressing through this year.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Yep. And I would also say that I know some members may have seen our public -- well, actually, I don't think the Board was available for the public SSAC meeting because I hear that it conflicted. But we do have -- we did have a session earlier today where we went in depth as to what are actually behind these various work parties and have far more information about that available. So if you have anything you want to dig in on any of that, that recording and transcripts, et cetera, will be available as always from the public SSAC session. So you can catch up there, too, if you have some questions. And, of course, we're always happy to take questions, and Jim will do his best to get those answered. I do see Harald has his hand up, though.

HARALD ALVESTRAND:

Yeah, Harald Alvestrand, liaison to the Board. Just wondering, when you say 2022 SSAC priorities, you have two items with

completing in them. Does that mean you think you can finish working on those, things, those two things?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yes. The NCAP work is scheduled to be finished around the AGM, thereabouts. Jim may have a more fine point on the date there. Obviously depending on input, et cetera. And then we have the routing security work. We're actually in final review in the SSAC on the work that their work party has done there, and that should be coming out in the next -- hopefully in the next month or so.

HARALD ALVESTRAND: Well the other three, I suppose, they expect to continue to the next year?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yes. While the new work -- we have two new work parties in number 3. Those will probably be -- we might get one of those done before the end of the year, but, you know, we're hedging our bets and saying that we'll probably be about a year or so on those, maybe a bit more on the evolution one. And then the other two are just kind of ongoing collaborations. So that's work that I imagine will be ongoing for beyond 2022. And, you know, when it comes to abuse, that may never go away, but it's something we're going to be participating in, that's for sure.

HARALD ALVESTRAND: Thank you.

JIM GALVIN: So on the abuse topic, this might be a good opportunity, Göran has been presenting a slide deck that the OCTO team had prepared, and I wouldn't want to miss an opportunity to put this in front of SSAC since other groups have seen it. And Göran, if you're ready and you've got your background set up, we'd be pleased to have you come forward and show your -- show the graph and speak to it for a moment. I know that SSAC would appreciate seeing that.

GÖRAN MARBY: How fun we can be with backgrounds.

So especially you and SSAC really appreciate when we start talking about facts and how we do things.

So not because of the European Commission study but we decided to do something a little bit different. We took -- as you know, the study as we understand it is using primarily the same methodology as we do in DAAR. So we decided actually to take -- and you know you can show graphs depending on where in time you look. So decided to go back and look after GDPR was enacted

just to put a time frame and look at the -- according to the DAAR principles looking into the DNS abuse from that time. And the trend is quite interesting.

And we would love to share this with you, of course, more formally. We can go through what it is because I think it puts a little bit of -- we all agree there's a lot of things that need to be done when it comes to fighting DNS abuse. But the trend is quite interesting to see what -- because I asked my questions, why has it gone down? It does contradict some notions that the new Gs are legacies, but that's not the important thing.

The important thing I think is that this is a data set that can be used and discussed going forward. And as you know, if you know JC and his team well enough, we have no influence on the actual data because they will just tell me to go somewhere and stuff it, if I actually did it. And you know you can do this by yourselves because we are completely open and transparent in a way we do it. And we also did it and checked with academia.

It's kind of interesting. Why are there spikes? What happened with the spikes? Why is the trend going down? Is that a result that users have gone to platforms and perpetrators then go to platforms? Is it because the ICANN contracted parties after we initiated the discussion about DNSSEC started to do things by

themselves? Or is there any other technical reason because of the way potential blocklists are using data, et cetera, et cetera. A lot of this is, of course, spam. That's natural. I have (indiscernible) there as well.

And it was not my intention to throw in fireworks in a conversation, just that we -- as Jim pointed out, it's good to have a discussion about the similar effects we're providing. And we can discuss the merits of them. So I guess that's what you -- and another thing that might be interesting to know is that, as you know, we have done the DNSTICR, which we started working on when COVID came around.

And I know JC is on the call and he can speak more about it. We have now decided to add a search string to the relationship to the war in Ukraine as well, also Ukrainian, to see -- because we're getting reports, more anecdotal reports than anything else, that bad actors has been trying to utilize that situation as well. So we are now together with the contracted parties tracking those domains to see if there's anything we can do to take down.

And in relationship to what you talked about as well is that the Board made a statement to the GAC as well which has to do with the accuracy scoping group that we think is needed now for us to go together and ask questions to the data protection board about

some of the legal things that seems to be on the table discussed in the accuracy group. There are beliefs, we think, that -- an agreement between ICANN Org and the contracted parties doesn't change how we can share information with each other. It has to be something that we have to get -- we have to get more legal guidance.

And in GDPR, the Data Protection Board has an obligation to give guidance. So it's not like we just go and ask random. We actually have to do it. And remember, we have received that guidance before. And we're asking for help from the GAC and the European Commission to receive that guidance.

So there is a lot of progress in the works when it comes to data protection -- when it comes to data protection.

And I say this, we will publish this graph and some other graphs with documentation as well. It's just that the last week -- last two weeks, as you might imagine, has been fairly intense also for the OCTO team. And I don't want to push them anything more.

I don't know, JC, if you want to add.

JOHN CRAIN:

I guess that means I have to go on -- I guess that means I have to go on video, doesn't it?

On the DAAR thing itself, much of this data should not be a surprise to people if they have been meeting the DAAR reports because it's just an accumulation of a longer time frame. It's reputation data, reported abuse. We do people coming out and saying the abuse situation looks a lot different, but often they are reporting different things than what we're looking at. So just putting it in context of what it is.

I know Jim from the Board knows precisely this because we have had lots of discussions around DAAR and DAAR data and we have with SSAC.

On the DNSTICR, we are not really doing anything new there from a science standpoint. We are just going to pick different strings for our inputs and then what we will be doing is using the same methodology of looking for evidentiary data, the same kind of evidentiary data. And where we find evidence of a phish or a malware dropper or something like that, on those names, we will report them with the evidence to the contracted party and then they can make a determination.

So there's really nothing new here. We're just focusing -- we're still doing the COVID stuff. We're just adding more strings. It will be the six U.N. languages. We will add Polish, Ukrainian, and a couple of others, and we will be using strings both in ASCII and Cyrillic. So that's where we are on it.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

I mentioned in the chat it was very cool that you guys are on top of the latest nexus for fraud and other abuse that goes on with these major world events.

And just one thing I'd like to add on to this discussion, looking at this data and all that reminds me that we are -- we've had discussions off and on the last few years around what kind of data ICANN has, OCTO has, what they don't have but might be able to get access to, et cetera. We've been talking about that from prior SAC advice.

We have in our own internal to-do list as a work party to look into that. In the meantime, we have -- and thank you to ICANN Org for providing some staff time. There has been some work going on researching what exists out there in the world that might be able to be obtained and brought in to look at SSR issues when it comes to the DNS and the identifier system. So that work is ongoing.

From that, we will take a look at what is both available and where there might be gaps where we might provide some recommendations. And ICANN Org or others may take those on and say, hey, can someone go over and track this data. That will be valuable for measuring things like this. So that's work that I know John and I have talked a bit about this. At least hopefully we'll be collaborating on in the near future as part of the work we do in the SSAC and hopefully in conjunction with OCTO. So thanks.

GÖRAN MARBY:

I know that JC is working with you. And as you know, we are finalizing the arrangement with the registries about getting access to more data, the same kind of data we got access to from the new contract with VeriSign and Nu DotCo. I think that's very positive. And I think the registries and registrars have been very positive and proactive in the discussion. We can always do better.

As you know, we are looking into the next sort of DAAR as well. And I'm also getting more and more DAAR is becoming -- because I think it should be -- the neutral arbitrator between different -- because you know as well as I do, depending how you use the data, you can prove whatever you want. And I hope that DAAR more and more -- since we've been doing this for a while, is now

more and more seen as something that is actually quite impartial. And the stats you see behind me is definitely not something I expected to see.

So looking forward to future discussions.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Göran. Thank you, Rod.

Rod, I wanted to do a quick time check with you. I know that you have a few more slides to go through. Do you want to move on or keep -- or open -- continue with this topic here?

ROD RASMUSSEN: I think we can move on. I think it's just one or two. It would be good to have anything else.

Yeah, because this is the second question here, right? The other question is: How do you see community moving forward together in a way to achieve these? I guess there is one more question after that.

And I think the points on the slide here kind of speak to themselves. There are -- there's a lot of work going on. Obviously, we have the pilot going on and the prioritization work. We've

been having a lot of discussions. Unfortunately, we got started just before COVID hit on really doing a better job coordinating across the community. And it's been a lot more difficult since we've all been remote.

But as we get back towards some sort of new normal, I'm hoping that we'll be able to interact a lot more readily with our other SO/ACs and people in the community.

But, you know, using the strategic plan as a baseline and providing input to that, there's a normal update process which we're about to participate in, I think, later this month ourselves.

And then for us in SSAC, that last bullet point there is kind of important of trying to balance kind of the strategic stuff that's related to ICANN organizational work, the regular work from us looking at SSR issues and the like, how do we get a good balance of that so that we're both participating and moving the work the broader community is working on, as well as looking at new things and bringing things to the attention that the community may not be focused on.

So from our perspective, you know, it's maintaining that balance, is probably at least for the leadership in SSAC is one of our biggest

goals and challenges to do and not get stuck too far one way or the other.

But in general, we want to be responsive to the community and major issues that are affecting it from an SSR perspective at least and questions that the Board has to wrestle with where our expertise may be helpful in at least providing some background and ability to better answer questions and make policy decisions or decisions about policies going forward.

So one way -- long way of saying, keep trying to do what we normally do while participating in community and even more so than we have.

JIM GALVIN:

Thank you.

Any additional comments or questions from any Board members?

ROD RASMUSSEN:

So the next slide here, which Jim had put up, actually provides some concrete examples of various publications we've done throughout our history and the ways those are used by the Board, the community, and outside of ICANN even to get a further understanding and provide the kind of input and advice to drive

policy work forward that we've been trying to do from our perspective, an SSR perspective.

And I think the points there speak to themselves largely. With the particular emphasis, I think, from where we want to make sure we're contributing beyond the -- what's obvious, is we're looking at emerging issues and making sure that the community understands those issues. That's a challenge in that a lot of these very technical aspects of how the, you know, the systems work, the interplay between networks and technology, et cetera, kind of -- it's a difficult thing to bring into a policy-making forum and make that digestible and bring the salient points forward so that when you're talking about policies that could affect operations, security, et cetera, that you understand those and have the background for those issues as you're making policy decisions which can affect them. So that's an area that we definitely want to try and do our best to inform the community on these things and get ahead of things as they're emerging. Hence some of the work we've just undertaken.

JIM GALVIN:

Thank you, rod. Very much appreciate, you know, capturing SSAC's long history and contribution to ICANN and its processes and policies and what goes on in this community. Certainly we do want that to continue and look forward to all the work that SSAC

does. And as you've already detailed the priorities, you know, the work to come here in this immediate year and going forward.

Sarah, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

SARAH DEUTSCH:

Thanks, Jim. And, Rod, thank you. I find the slide really helpful and interesting to the issue you raised earlier about how to make sure that SSAC's contribution, and especially where you're giving a message that others in the community may not be giving, how to make sure that those details are brought to everyone's attention. And since everyone kind of gives comments at the same time, it's not always clear when you're drafting it where you add that value. So I just wondered if you had any thoughts about that, especially with regard to these five bullets.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Yeah, I think there's two touchpoints that we end up with there. One is an issue that's -- that isn't being discussed actively in the community, where -- so, for example, we're about to publish something on routing, we published on IoT a couple of years ago, When DoH and DoT was maybe a topic of conversation, but these are all things that we've brought our perspectives and hopefully the ability for people to better understand the issues involved and how they might impact them, the community, and the ecosystem.

And so those kind of end up getting -- they're almost an education thing or an awareness-building thing where there's not any particular action to be taken from it, but from our perspective, it's informing the community. And it may inspire some action as well. So that's one touchpoint.

The other touch point is when there's an active issue going on, you know, whether it's something that, you know, we've all been working on, the domain registration data questions and quandaries the last few years, or there are particular things that people are asking about, whether that -- say emojis as domain names, right? There are things that you're actually having to deal with, and the community is thinking about where we could come in and provide some -- at least a technical and security perspectives for those things. Those typically tend to get listened to when there's a direct impact that we can spell out and provide options and maybe advice on.

I guess, you know -- so that's part of that touchpoint. The other part of that is when we're just part of the process. And then you have to weigh our advice against other considerations: risks, financial, community, diversity. There's all these other things that you, as a board, have to take into consideration.

I will advocate, though, that SSR is kind of like the primary mission (laughing) of ICANN, so please do not ignore our advice (laughing). And I'm not sure that we've ever thought that we've been ignored. So we're not -- there's no complaining going on here, because we do have a very good process, I think, for you guys to take on our advice, understand it, and work with it. So in general, I think we're in pretty good shape.

JIM GALVIN:

Thank you, Rod. Excellent points.

Akinori, please, go ahead.

AKINORI MAEMURA:

Thank you very much, Jim. Thank you very much for raising your question. And this slide is really good slide to, you know, overview what kind of contribution the SSAC has made to the ICANN. And then as Rod said, SSR is one of the primary mandates for the ICANN, for the Internet community.

Then the prior- -- otherwise, on the prioritization, question is quite fundamental question from my view. And maybe, you know, the SSAC's advice or some other advisory committees otherwise have a quite various line-up of advice. And then something is quite substantial and essential, something is more

detailed. And then that's quite similar for the recommendations which the supporting organization comes up with to the board.

So maybe we need to be -- we need to -- what say? Determine the essence of that advice to -- into the -- into the work item, and then prioritization should be done according to such kind of the consideration.

So that's really good input for us. Still need to consider. Thank you very much.

JIM GALVIN:

Thank you, Akinori.

I think that it is fair to say that, you know, SSAC has always and certainly we would expect continue to make some important contributions to the board's as well as the communities' at large understanding of issues and the challenges that we face, and sometimes pointing out things we hadn't noticed in advance, and we have to come back to and look at more carefully.

So, you know, I appreciate this slide and wanted to make sure that you got a chance to get to that, capturing the long, and the opportunities to come.

So with that, you know, we certainly still have plenty of time here. Is there any new topics that anyone would like to get to?

ROD RASMUSSEN: We did have two more slides.

JIM GALVIN: Oh, you have another slide. That's right. I'm sorry. Please, go ahead, Rod.

ROD RASMUSSEN: This is pretty quick because we pretty much covered this already. So the other topic was effectiveness and efficiency. You can go to the next slide, please. This is the last slide in the deck.

So from our perspective, you know, and we talked about this a bit already, deconfliction of inputs for various parts of the community, which we already talked about is a challenge. But prioritization needs to be improved. And, you know, we're doing that. There's a pilot. And I think that we're looking very much forward to seeing how that works, what we can learn from it. And hopefully that will help all of us put into perspective and understand that there's all these other things going on in the community. Only the Board has that real perspective. Everybody else contributing has their own kind of inputs to it. And maybe,

to some extent, paying attention. But I think if we're putting our heads together and working together to prioritize things, we'll have a better understanding and appreciation of all the things and all the challenges that the Board faces in dealing with these things. So I think that will be very useful.

But that is -- you know, our contribution on that right now is to be active participants in the pilot program and provide feedback and implement how that works.

And that was all we had (laughing).

JIM GALVIN:

Thank you, Rod. And I'll just say knowing that the SSAC reps will be Barry Leiba and Chris Roosenraad, certainly we welcome their contribution in this pilot. They have a significant contribution to make, especially considering the questions that we've now opened with respect to SSAC advice in the fuller process and what it looks like.

So we're all here to learn and see how it works and what's going to happen going forward. So an excellent opportunity, and we look forward to it.

Maarten, you unmuted. Please go ahead.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yeah, no. Just when -- it seems we come to the end of our session, and I just wanted to express my appreciation also on behalf of the Board of all the work you do and the advice you're working on proactively. As you said, security, stability, and resiliency is core to our mission. And with you importantly fulfilling that, your task and advising us on that aspect is really well appreciated.

So thanks a lot, and really looking forward to see what's coming in the time to come because together we need to make it work. And it's not only the Board listening to your advice but also the SOs who are eventually the ones who are responsible for making the policies that we are to implement together.

So thank you. Thanks a lot. And looking forward to see you later this week.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Maarten.

Any closing comments, Rod?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Just as -- as always, we're very thankful for the opportunity to have a discussion. And there have been a lot of interesting events

in our space in recent days. And we've been tracking that along. And while we have no official position on things, the members were impressed with the way that ICANN Board and organization have handled some of the challenges things that have come their way in the last week or two.

And also, we are really looking forward to getting back together in person sometime soon. And, Göran, I'll be following up with you at some point about, you know, the (laughing) -- the normal things that we used to do back in the day. But getting -- getting active, you know, interpersonal communication going again I think is going to help us get past a lot of the frustrations we've had in the past two years in trying to do a lot of work without being able to coordinate well.

JIM GALVIN:

Thank you, Rod. We're all looking forward to moving past Zoom meetings and getting back together physically. And we're on track for the date. So, you know, we can only hope that the world holds out in confidence for us and keeps us on that track. But so far, all of the (indiscernible) have been pretty good.

I think with that, unless there are any last comments, any other business from anyone, last-minute hands, this would be a good

opportunity to say thank you to all, and we'll see you at the next Zoom picture. Have a good night. Zoo thanks a lot, guys.

Bye.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]