LOS ANGELES – SSAC Public Meeting
Thursday, October 16, 2014 – 08:00 to 09:00
ICANN – Los Angeles, USA

[CROSSTALK]

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: There. It's 8:00. We have to start the open session for SSAC in two minutes.

I didn't say you should leave, we're just changing the topic of the meeting.

FADI CHEHADÉ: We were arguing if the Swedes are more punctual than the Swiss. And I think you win the prize today.

Have a great meeting guys. Sorry we took your room in the morning. We'll leave you in peace.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: So welcome everyone. This is the meeting of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee at ICANN 51 in Los Angeles. Next slide please.

So we're going to concentrate on the IANA function stewardship transition, which are two of the documents that we have released lately, but of course, also talk about what other action, what other things we are working on. Next slide please.

So an overview of SSAC. Next slide.

We were initiated in 2001, began operation in 2002.

You have to bring a chair with you. Okay, sit there.

So we should actually do things the other way around. People in SSAC, they should sit here at the table in reverse order in what they're coming to the room. I think that's the way of doing things, because this meeting actually starts at 8 AM. Okay?

So, our charter is to advise the ICANN community and Board on various matters related to security and to the Internet's naming address allocation systems. We have myself as the Chair, and Jim Galvin as Vice-Chair. We just reelected for another three year term, beginning in 2015.

We also have a liaison to the Board that is separate from the two of us, which is Ram Mohan, and his term ends December 2015. Members of SSAC at the moment are 40, and there are appointed by ICANN Board for three year terms. We are reviewing the membership of SSAC members, approximately one-third every year.

We're just at the end of the review of 2014. Next slide please.

So is there any questions on SSAC and how we operate? If it is the case, I would say most people in the room, I know, actually do know what SSAC knows, but if there is someone, my apologies, try to find one of us afterwards and we can explain in more detail. Next slide please.

So, the achievements 2014, since ICANN 50, we published a report on the IANA functions contract that was released last weekend. We also released SSAC 67, an overview and history of the IANA functions in August 2014. Both of the documents are at the moment, only released

in English, but we request a translation and as soon as that translation is ready, we will really stand in all six UN languages.

Between London and Singapore, we release SSAC 66, which is the SSAC comment on the JS phase one report, mitigating the risk of DNS namespace collisions. And between Singapore and Buenos Aries, we released an advice on DDOS attack leveraging DNS infrastructure, and also advice from DNS search processing, which of course, is related to various namespace collision issues.

Next slide please. Regarding IANA functions stewardship transition, we in SSAC have been working on three documents, and where two of them are now released. Next slide please. So, the background to all of this is, of course, like many people know, that on the 14th of March 2014, the NTIA announced the intention [inaudible] out we can roll with the respect to the IANA functions.

This is something that was mentioned already in the first contract that NTIA wrote with ICANN, so to some degree, it was not a surprise that would happen, but now it actually did. So NTIA called ICANN to convene with global stakeholders, convened global stakeholders to develop a proposal for transition, the current role played by NTIA in the coordination of the Internet's domain name systems. Next slide please.

So, both the announcement and also the contract, and if you look at what the group at ICANN that provide IANA functions are doing, we see that, we saw in SSAC that the name of IANA is actually used for many different things. And both functions, and for the group, and for what is in the contract. So what we decided to do in SSAC is to try to describe

what various different kind of definitions of IANA there is. Next slide please.

So, the IANA functions, according to the contract between ICANN and NTIA, on a very high level, consists of the root zone management, Internet numbers registry management, protocol parameter register management, including management of the [inaudible] TLD, and management of the INT top level domain. And note that this is a high level description of what IANA group is doing based on the contract.

The group is doing other things as well. Next slide please. So, the first document that we made available is SSAC 67. It was published on 15th of August, 2014. And the report is trying to establish a baseline of understanding for those that are interested in knowing what IANA is doing. And you here it yourself, that I'm using, during the years I've been using the word IANA for the, for sort of the functions that are operated by the [tag?] this group by, at ICANN.

That among other things, that are dealing with what is listed in the contract. So I'm sort of talking to myself, just because I've been using the term IANA that way for so many years. So, we are also trying to describe that activities that are included in the IANA functions contract, and the functions performed under the MOU with the ITF. We are trying to focus in this report on the IANA functions contract, and describe the various functions described in that one, but we are also trying to describe all the activities related to the IANA functions as they are currently performed, because in some cases, the contracts are describing sort of an old version of what is supposed to happen, and exactly what IANA is doing, is something that has evolved over time.

And we're trying to describe those activities, including those that lie outside of the IANA functions contract. Next slide please. The second document that we released, was released last weekend, and in that report, we are providing an overview of the key elements of the IANA functions contract. And the first one, we were looking at the tasks that were performed by the group at ICANN, going under the name IANA.

And in SSAC 68, we are going through the contract to see what the contract describes. This document is, as I said, is providing, it is giving an overview over the various things that the contract covers, but it's also the case that we have been looking at specifically, according to the contract, what role NTIA has in the actual operation. And what we have seen is that, NTIA…

Next slide. Okay. So this is good. So for each one of the functions, we have been looking at who the various parties are, and then look at what the NTIA roll is, and what we have discovered is that the only place where NTIA do have some kind of active role, has to do with the, is when it is part of the authorization chain of DNS root zone management. Next slide please.

So we have a look at the root zone management. We have the three involved parties, the IANA functions operator, the root zone maintainer, and the administrator, which is the terminology that is used in the contract, where the IANA functions operator is the group at ICANN, and administrator is NTIA.

And then you have the root zone maintainer, which currently is VeriSign. And these three parties have a triangular relationship, where the administrator, NTIAA, is part of the authorization chain for the

changes. Next slide please. The third document that we are working on, or looking at, is something that we do believe will be published in the four quarter, if it is the case that we find that we have something to publish, and the reason why we are requesting that, and we also sort of, we don't really know until we publish that we are going to publish something, is specifically because we actually were thinking about writing the principles document first, and then a description of IANA, and then finally the contract.

So it's a little bit like the *Star Wars*, that we're doing things in reverse order here. Like first, the second document, then the third, and then the first. So we have to go back, so we don't really know at the moment, actually, if there is anything more we have to say. On the other hand, the first two documents do not include any recommendations from SSAC at all. No findings or recommendations.

The two documents are in an objective way, trying to describe the contract and the current functions. So what SSAC is looking at, at the moment, is whether SSAC does have anything to say, that could be something like recommendations or findings from the current situation, and also not only the current situation, but also the current situation after the, during and after the transition of the IANA function stewardship.

Next slide please. Are there any questions on that? Okay.

So we look at what we currently are doing and what we want to do in the future, or think we're going to do. Next slide please.

The various, the work that we do in SSAC, is known as something called work parties. And we have a couple of groups like this that have charters, and work items, and are trying to move forward to try to look at these issues, that we are looking at various issues, doesn't mean that we will write a report, but only that we are looking into the topic area. So we are looking at the IANA functions stewardship transition as you just heard, that is checking whether we have something more to say than these first two documents.

We also have a work part related to public suffix lists, that one could say is slightly related to the various acceptance programs and processes going on here in ICANN. But, we have been looking at the public [inaudible] from slightly different angle, so we, let's see what's happening with that. We also had a workshop at the Internet Governance Forum 2014 in Istanbul, a month ago or two.

And at that workshop, we were looking to the role and the implications of private sector management of various different kinds of systems that can be used for blocking, or authorization of, for example, things like sending email blacklists, and those kind of things. So we had a discussion at the workshop that, around this topic. We had a paper that was sort of a start of the discussion, that was input to the meeting itself.

We got extremely good feedback during the workshop itself, and around the workshop, and also based on the paper. So we are looking at two different things that we can possibly do. First of all, of course, update the document that we're doing, but it also might be the case, of course, that we might do some recommendations. We will see.

We have an ongoing work party that is looking at the membership, we call it the membership committee. And it's Jim Galvin, to my left, vice-chair of SSAC, that is the chair of the membership committee. They are, as I said, just ending their review of 2014 of approximately one-third of the SSAC members. And what that really was done, looking at Jim, we're going to appoint a new membership committee that consists of members from SSAC, and then [inaudible] and the liaison to the Board, myself as the Chair, and Jim as Vice-Chair, as three non-voting members.

So this is something that is really important for me as the Chair, that we do have official positions since SSAC. We are not part of the actual decision making process or review of the members. We are looking over the process, and helping, steering it, as good as we can. And then we have also, as always, for an ICANN spent quite a lot of work on the DNSSEC sessions, both the DNSSEC for newcomers, on the Monday, and also a DNSSEC Wednesday that we are organizing.

And I would like, I see Daniel [inaudible] is in the room, I would like to thank you very much the help that you're doing, and I also think that it actually has been brought up at a couple of meetings here, at the ICANN, that the cooperation between Dan [York?] and Julie, our support staff, which means the cooperation between ICANN, ISOC in this case, is actually a good example of activity and a way of working that we should try to do much, much more in specifically the technical community, to be able to find new ways to actually move forward and involving deployment of, specifically deployment of various technologies where, even though organizations like ICANN and ISOC are large, it's still the case that you have stumbling blocks.

You don't know how to move forward. So why not work more together? So thank you very much Dan. Next please, next slide.

So the, if you look at the milestones that we have, that we started to talk about at the last ICANN meeting I think, or maybe at two meetings ago, even we had this goal to publish the document, the report on IANA functions contract, third quarter, 2014, which we did because we published it last weekend.

In the fourth quarter, we hope that they work on the transition of stewardship on IANA functions, should be ready. It's quite important that it is ready because the various operational groups are supposed to report to the IANA coordination group early 2015. We hope that we are ready from advice of public suffix lists, and we hope that we are ready with the work related on the, that everything around the Internet Forum. Next slide please.

Go back one slide, by the way, sorry. So regarding the public suffix list and the ITF workshop, let me just point out that we just happen to have those SSAC members here, for the public suffix list, that Rod [inaudible]… Rod, could you just raise your hand? Rod is the one, he is the key person there, and the IGF workshop, it's Robert. So if you have more questions, talk with them around the room, but specifically these two. Thank you. Next slide.

So we look at new work parties. This is, next slide please. So, what we have been doing the last couple of weeks, is to look at the long list of various different kind of issues that we think is important, that maybe we should actually do something about. So we have a long list of topic areas that we are sort of keeping our eyes on, but then we sort of how

to prioritize based on the input from other SO and ACs, and at the end of the day, we need to decide what we're actually going to work on.

So there are two work parties that we are very close to forming. So one could say that we actually have formed them, even though we formally have not. The first one has to do with new gTLDs. We see at this ICANN meeting, quite a lot of discussion about the next round. And I must say that we in SSAC here some positive feedback that there are quite large portions of the ICANN community which talk about actually looking seriously about what happened with the first round in ALAC. Was the applicant guidebook good?

What did we do? What kind of corrections did we do during the round that we're currently in? Etc. So also we in SSAC have given recommendations during the round that we're in, which has resulted in some actions in some cases, and then the actions in some cases have also resulted in some kind of effect.

And what we are trying to look at is to see whether there are any of these actions. Can we draw any conclusions? Is something we recommend based on what we have done, or maybe something new, that actually should be said, that we can recommend to be done before we are starting the next round.

The second thing that we are looking into has to do with registrant protection [inaudible] management. This is an area that we have been, already written a couple of advisories, but we do see that there is an enormous increase in attacks and hijacks on domain names, which are based on simply not good enough credential management.

The frustration that we have, and many with us, is of course, that the… Much of this is just because people have sort of not followed the various best current practices and recommendations that are out. So the question is then, what can be done? Is the case, how can we get people to start using a seatbelt or whatever?

There are a lot of… There is quite a big step from talking about and agreeing on what is bad, what is good, what is the best current practices that actually get people to do something. So this is something, this is an area where we are trying to talk with as many people as possible, and getting outreach, and then [inaudible]….

She is the one that is like sending me an email every second week, and it's like… We must do something about this, which I completely agree with, so if you have any ideas on how to try to make the world better, even though, of course, we already know what should be done, but the question is then, how do we get it done? Please talk to [inaudible] or anyone else of course. We need some good ideas there.

Next slide please. So, at various meetings like this one, and in the corridors, we do get various questions. And common questions are, for example, how do SSAC prioritize new work? And also, we are prioritizing ourselves. We're choosing ourselves, what issues we are going to work on and in what order. That said, we are doing the prioritization based on input from the community, because we develop our reports, and we check how valuable the reports have been for the community.

We are measuring how many downloads there are, how many links there are, how many broader solutions the report resulted in. How

much have the other SO and ACs referred to our reports? So because of this, we have an interest in knowing that in our reports, when they are done, are actually interesting for people. So because of that, of course, we should listen to people before we prioritize. One group that we specifically had to listen to, of course, is the ICANN Board that we [inaudible] charter, has to respond to questions from.

So when it is the case that we get questions from the Board, or from other SO and ACs, we tend to prioritize those items much higher than items that we sort of invent on our own. But the prioritization is sort of similar analysis. We also get questions how we communicate our work. And we do it at meetings like this and other briefings. We're meeting various SOs and ACs on their request at ICANN meetings.

We also publish our reports, and we also… This week, we have been talking about starting to do more sort of community outreach and communication ourselves. And this week, we started together with the communication team at ICANN, do some video recordings and otherwise that you will see popping up. The first one, will of course, only be about the SSAC and what we are, and basically what you have heard during this presentation.

But the idea is that we will also start to also explain and have SSAC members explain what is actually behind various reports and why are they important, and if I remember correctly, there will be regarding SSAC 67, SSAC 68 there will be some recordings made tomorrow. So are moving forward, yes. Next slide please.

So, when trying to have that communication with the community, it is of course, very important for us to get some feedback. Next slide please.

And one thing that we are interested in knowing, over time, is of course, whether our publications are understandable and accessible. Are they too long? Too short? Just right? What is the level of detail? We are very often, of course, writing the document itself targeted to whoever the document targets, but let's say that it is a very technical document, then of course, the document itself cannot be easily digestible for everyone.

But on the other hand, we are trying to then write an executive summary, which is much easier to digest, so that everyone can at least the executive summary and know what the document is interesting for their community, whatever. And then the document can be passed over to someone that can digest the rest of the document.

Another thing, of course, is to know whether the document is reaching the audience, whether we have done the right conclusions and come with the right suggestions. But we would like to get more feedback on that. We also like to get more feedback on not only what we should look at, but also on how we should do our work. We had a quite good discussion with the At-Large advisory committee, on how we're going to participate a little bit more, which of course, is a little bit different given the way we are working, which leads us to the next question that we also would like to ask.

What can we do to do things differently? We have all of these meetings with the various SO and ACs, and then we have this open meeting as

well. So there is, of course, quite a lot of overlap, and I do see some people in the room that probably have heard of these words a couple of times before. So the question is whether we can have a dialogue with other groups in a more effective way?

We also, always, would like to get some feedback on topics that are missing from the list of work parties, that I just mentioned. Both the existing one and also the upcoming one. Next slide please. So with that, I would like to open the floor for discussions on any of these topics and others. Please.

BRENDAN: Good morning. Thanks for the report. This is Brendan [inaudible] with the Internet Governance Project, Syracuse University, NCUC member as well.

So I had a question about the principles, the work that the SSAC will be doing shortly. Will these be dealing exclusively with the names area?

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: No, we are looking at anything that is related to the IANA functions contract.

BRENDAN: Okay. And a follow up. You talked a little bit about interaction with the community. And generally, it was interaction after a publication exists. I'm curious, will the SSAC be taken on board any external work that has explored principles around the transition?

If so, what's the best way to feed that into your process?

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Let me first talk in general terms on how we are doing our work in the work party. So when a work party is doing work, it's up to the SSAC members that is part of that work party to come up with a document using whatever kind of methods they want. Quite often, that includes an outreach. It also, for example, the public suffix list.

We do have members of the work party that are not members of SSAC. So during the creation of a document, yes, the document is created by SSAC members, but at the same time, it's up to them to do whatever they feel is needed to be able to actually sort of come up with a good document.

Lately, it has been quite common, for example, that the work parties have chosen to have someone, at least having the document read and consulted with other external parties that, before it's published. Just to not create any surprises, if nothing else. But as I said, in the public suffix list, has it been external members all of the time, all the way through.

Regarding the IANA… The last document on the IANA transition, I think the best way is just to talk to us SSAC members and try to feed the information, and feed some ideas to us. So we actually are very laid back and we are happy to receive input, if you have it. So just send it to us, or through Julie, the Secretariat that we have, or any one of us in the core group. Thank you.

DANIEL YORK:
Thanks Patrik. Could I suggest to, if you want to back up a slide so we can see the questions you're seeking to ask for us. This is Daniel York from the Internet Society. I guess I would just say, in general, I found the SSAC documents personally quite useful.

I think you're doing a great job in the interactions you do to reach out to the groups. I don't know how much, I don't know how you can do it differently, because I do think you do need to go out to those other groups. Yes, you have this public forum, but let's look around, and most of it is the people who are here, who are the security people, who like to go to these things and talk about this.

And we do that. But I think you do have to bring security to the other places, so that then they hear about it in those kind of spaces and otherwise. So I think you're doing the right things. I think you're doing the right pieces to go out there. Go ahead.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM:
So, yes, we agree with you that we need to find a different way, because the people that are here in this room, except for like a few exceptions, and really happy that you are here, that I don't recognize, but otherwise as you say, there are friendly faces. So what we are trying now, that's why we are working with the ICANN communication team and trying to, first of all, with them, create material that they are used to work with, for example videos, and then we have them to use their machinery to do outreach, or whatever they are doing. I don't know.

I mean, I'm in security and stability, not in outreach. But, what we do have is that we do have a way of measuring the results by doing all different kind of metrics that we have been matching for a while, so what we will do is that we'll use exactly the same kind of metrics, and see whether it actually gives some effect. And then go back and re-plan and see what has happened.

DANIEL YORK: I guess, I think, yes. SSAC needs to do all of that to raise its profile and have people better understand what it does. I guess I would say, I still think you need to be going out to the different groups. I guess a question I would have is, do you have any chance of not being 8 AM, on the last day of the session…

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Well, given that [inaudible] is one of the days I myself, personally manage to go out and have really good dinners, I completely agree with you.

DANIEL YORK: So, here is a funny story, which you may or may not care about, but I'll tell you this quickly. I had a friend of mine who used to say, from Australia. And he said, "Dan, the problem that you have is you're the last car on the sushi train. You and all of your security guys, you're that car at the sushi restaurant where the train goes around and around and nobody wants to take the sushi off the car."

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Well, okay. There are several parts here, so I would like to respond to it. But as all of us know, just to start with, you know that there have been this work going on in ICANN on how to do an overscheduling for the ICANN meetings that are like to like make it better. All of us. So many people are shaking their heads, like it's…

It's not a sushi train. It's a sushi train wreck, the whole scheduling at ICANN. In SSAC, we have, and specific in myself, I have participated really, really hard in that group. And we think the output from that group was really, really good and useful to do a sort of a top down of the sign. So we can have these meetings that are important, that are from the SOs and ACs, at time slots that actually, the community knew about.

So I'm hoping personally that we could one day in ICANN maybe start to use the outcome of that group, but that's not really happened yet. That said, let me hand it over to Julie, and she could explain how it really works at the moment.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you Patrik. This is Julie Hedlund. Just very briefly, this is essentially the only non-conflicted time that I could find for this meeting. There are no times available today, because there is the ICG, there is accountability, there is the public forum. You can't schedule against that.

On Monday, you have the welcome ceremony, you have the high interest topics, you have other things you can't schedule against. On

Tuesday, SSAC has private meetings all day. And as Dan knows, on Wednesday we have the DNSSEC workshop that takes up six hours.

So that doesn't leave us too many options. I agree with Patrik that once we switch to whatever this new system, maybe it will be easier. I don't know. Thank you.

DANIEL YORK: So I don't minimize, Patrik I just, I don't minimize… I was just more being as a comment. I guess the final thing I'll just mention is, the final thing for the topics, I'm going to channel your colleague for, with the funny hat over there, and just say that, I would say that one of the things SSAC ought to be, having on a longer range radar is all the DNS privacy work that the IETF is currently undertaking, and what impacts they may have on ICANN operations, because, I think as we heard some a bit yesterday, that could have some.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Thank you very much. Regarding work that other groups are doing, it's also the case, of course, is that if another group is working on it, why should we work on it? We need to find our role as well, but yes. That's a good topic that we keep our eyes on. We also got questions about RPKI and which have confirmed that is one of the lists that we are keeping our eyes on the radar, etc. Ron, you wanted to add something.

RON: I just wanted to add, going back from 2001 when the committee was formed, we've tried to look at different times for the committee

meetings, and for… Over time, this has actually been a good time to get uninterrupted ability to present. Having said that, I think Patrik, you do go to various constituencies and you present what SSAC is doing.

So I thought that might be valuable to share. The interaction from the community and into SSAC is not only at this 8 AM early morning session.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: That is correct. And I'm looking at Julie a little bit. I think this time we met with the GNSO Council, we met with ALAC, and we met with the business constituency.

JULIE HEDLUND: Commercial stakeholder group.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Commercial stakeholder group, thank you very much.

JULIE HEDLUND: And we did have invites out to the registrars and the registries, but we just couldn't get a time on their schedule, otherwise we would have.

WENDY SELTZER: Thanks. Wendy Seltzer here with W3C, thinking about other areas of work with other organizations, particularly in the new work that you're proposing. I hear things that the public suffix list work, that interacts with a lot of our web security and same origin policy, for what application security. It could be interesting.

And with regards to the registrant protection and credential management, we're just starting up work on secure authentication for the web, and so to the extent that some of these credentials are managed through web browsers, and then we can be helpful in discussing that work. I would be very interested to follow up.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Thank you very much, thank you. That's really good input. That's the kind of input that we really would like to have. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Inaudible] from Estonia. And I would like to ask a question regarding your earlier mentioning the NTIA contract. And did I read you correct, that you said function NTIA has today is not substantial, it's just part of trust chain that actually manages the root zone? But the concern is obviously that when this contract goes away, or goes to separate organization, or what the issue is, or outcome, does it contribute to segmentation of Internet?   Or various controls that various governments are already imposing on the Internet, that's filtering and content filtering and DNS filtering. Thank you.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: [Inaudible], did you want to say anything there?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's a very good question, and that is precisely what we're hoping to do with the third document.

That's precisely what we want to do in the third document, is to identify, what are the things that contribute to the IANA functions being successfully performed today, that are a result of what NTIA does or what the contract does?

And what would happen, or what might happen, if you take both of those away, or replace them with something different? And we're going to look at the security and stability implications of doing that. So you're absolutely right. It's not as, on the one hand, it's simple because if you look at what happens on a day to day basis, the only thing that NTIA does, as an active activity, if you will, is that it gives the greenlight to a change to the root zone.

And that's a very small part, if you look at all the machinery that has to operate, that's a very small part. But I think we all know and recognize, we wouldn't be having the kinds of discussions we've been having about this transition, if that were literally the only issue. Because you could replace that with a robot, you could replace that almost anything.

But clearly, there is a lot of things standing behind that. We're going to look very carefully at what the security and stability implications are, changing that apparatus.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: If I may, just a comment on this. This is very important because, after all, root zone is the center of it all, and validation process of how changes are made in that zone, is very, very important. And I would go as far as to say that the NTIA is perhaps the wrong subject we're talking about.

It's actually the US Department of Commerce. And I know having been in the Internet business since '92, I know how difficult some people feel that, okay, if it's US Department of Commerce, you better not even try anything, because you are never going to get near to them.

But if that goes away, or this kind of weakness is felt, that's a big concern. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Absolutely, and that's very much one of the things that's on our radar screen, and you'll see that in the third document, among many others, but that's a very important one.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Julie.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you Patrik, this is Julie Hedlund. I have two questions from the chatroom. These are both from Tarek. The first question is, "Does the SSAC plan to provide recommendations on improving the universal acceptance of domain names? This is an important topic and it does not look like ICANN's plan is advised by technical reality." And if you want to address that one then I can read the next one.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: At the moment, we do not have a work part that is looking into acceptance. That said, we are doing, we have issued a number of reports related to internationalized domain names, and variance, which

for example, are related to trademark clearinghouse and other issues. And also the WHOIS, the internationalization and transliteration and translation of data.

It's also the case that the public suffix list is touching upon this issue, but more as a… In all of these cases, acceptance is a secondary issue that we are keeping in mind while writing these advisories, but it's not a main topic. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: The second question, and this is Julie Hedlund again. Tarek asks, "In my country, Bangladesh, the SSAC document sometimes get read in the government ministry. It would be important to translate important reports such as the registrant protection, or the IANA principles. Second, please blog and do videos of every SSAC report to make them more understandable."

And I did actually indicate in the chatroom that the IANA documents, SSAC 67 and SSAC 68, are being translated into the six UN languages. And I should also note that, I think it was SSAC 40 and 44 have both, I think, been translated as well.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: And I also think SSAC 50 on blocking is also, using DNS for blocking was also translated. But it's absolutely correct that it's very good feedback. And of course, it's easy to get that kind of feedback, because those are the sort of the things that, at the moment, are actually trying to improve, as I said earlier, including videos and blogging.

So we are trying now to do this. And regarding translation, of course, everything is a budget issue. But if it is the case that you have documents that you feel, that you think, should be translated to one or more languages except English, please let us know, because we don't have anything [inaudible]…

But here, for example, was a good example of your request for one specific document, whether it should be translated. We have to look into that and see whether that is something that we can do. Thank you. Anything else? Any SSAC member that would like to bring something up? What have I not said?

I'm sorry, we only have 17 minutes, so we cannot go through that. Russ.

RUSS: Since we do still have some time, I would like to go back a little back a little bit to the gentleman from Estonia. And point out that what is actually available, there is a lot of public information that is available, but it is spread across a large volume of information relative to both what the IANA functions do now, what the contracts have been over the years, because there have been multiple contracts.

And so, there certainly is a lot of information that's present. And the two documents we've published so far, have really been intended to help people in the community understand with a clearer point of view, what the IANA functions are, what they aren't, and what NTIA engagement is and it is not. But that's only from the information that's out there and publically available.

There are a number of people that are, that believe that there are a number of other things that the NTIA does, that are not readily visible on the surface. And so we encourage the community to think about those things also. But the first two documents were sort of the reference points, and if you have ideas and thoughts with respect to security and stability implications, that is the set of things that we'll be dealing with in document three.

So we would love to hear what people have to say about what should be done, what shouldn't be done, and we'll include that in our discussions and deliberations in the creation of the third document.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: May I comment? One of the concerns, or the reason why I was asking this question was very simply that this information, and there is an abundance of it, I know most of it because I've been managing a dot E for 20 years. So I know what pre-dates ICANN and then what has been happening during ICANN existence.

This is highly technical information and very few people understand, especially in the governments, understand what the root zone means, and the root zone management means, and what Internet stability means. Now, given that misunderstanding, and if governments, for example, are not happy with how Internet works, and influences that particular country, and we know how much more governments depend on the Internet nowadays, then they start to regulate.

And then they don't bother to read all of the technical documents and don't understand that that particular regulation actually leads to

segmentation of the Internet, which nobody wants. So that's my concern that this has to come across really, really clearly what's going to happen with the root zone. Thank you.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Thank you for the encouragement. And I heard many SSAC members saying that when they decide to actually spend time on writing this, I've heard words very similar to yours, but different. So thank you for that.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. I was going to say, thank you very much for that input, and it's an area that SSAC has dealt with somewhat, the blocking through the use of DNS. So it's a somewhat different sense, but in a related sense. So it's something that we'll certainly think about as we put the third report together. Thank you.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Julie?

JULIE HEDLUND: This is Julie Hedlund. Another question from the chatroom. This one is also from Tarek. He says, "The SSAC asked in an earlier report that the trademark clearinghouse should have better access to internationalized names. Has this been done? What does the SSAC do to ensure accountability for important recommendations like these?"

EN

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: What we recommended was that the trademark clearing house, and the work that is done on variants in internationalized domain names, in the ICANN context, should use the same algorithms and rules, for example matching and calculation of variance. Our finding was that, at the moment, trademark clearinghouse have sort of invented their own transliteration of internationalized domain names, before matching is taken place.

And they have special matching algorithms. We saw that being a risk, and our recommendation was that there should be some harmonization between the two, just to make clear what the recommendation was. What we're doing is that for this specific, we are following up. We have a tracker that everyone can see on the ICANN webpage, where the Board is tracking all advice recommendations from specifically SSAC and ALAC.

For this specific recommendation, we do have communication with the people in the trademark clearinghouse, that people working with trademark clearinghouse, and for this specific item we're asking for a report at every, approximately every ICANN meeting, so about three times a year, we are asking for a status. This item is not resolved yet, and the way we do in SSAC is that, if it is the case that we feel that has sort of taken too long of a time, whatever that means, and we still think that the recommendation is important, then we write a follow-up document that might be a slightly different recommendation just because there might be some reasons why the first document recommendation was not resolved or acted upon.

Maybe we wrote it sloppy. Maybe we wrote the wrong things. So the methods we have is to write a new document. Thank you.

Anything else? If there isn't anything else, I would like to give back 10 minutes of your life, and we can all have coffee before the next meeting. So thank you very much for coming and I call the meeting adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]