
ICANN69 | Community Days Sessions – Joint Meeting: ICANN Board and SSAC
Tuesday, October 13, 2020 - 14:00 to 15:00 CEST

MERIKE KAEO: All right. We're at the top of the hour. So welcome, everyone.

And I'm going to actually use my German, because I was very excited to finally be able to practice my German.

So (Speaking German).

That's about the extent of my German for this morning.

So if we can put the first slide up, please.

[This meeting is being recorded]

MERIKE KAEO: Welcome to the session of the SSAC and the board.

And if we can have the first slide up.

AARON JIMENEZ: One second. I believe we lost connection.

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.

MERIKE KAEO:

Okay.

I'll give it about another minute. Otherwise, I'll just start talking from the paper set that I have.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

And it might be good to remind people the standards of behavior as posted in the chat. And in addition, please state your name and affiliation when you're taking the mic.

My name is Maarten Botterman. I'm chair of the board.

MERIKE KAEO:

Yes, thank you for that, Maarten.

For the record, this is Merike Kaeo, SSAC liaison to the board. And I'll be chairing this session.

So any luck getting the slides up?

AARON JIMENEZ:

No. We're working on it. We'll get it as soon as possible.

MERIKE KAEO:

Okay. Well, I can just start.

So the SSAC had two topics that it wanted to discuss. One was SAC113, the SSAC advisory on private-use TLDs. And the other one was SAC112, minority statement on the final report of the temporary specification for the gTLD registration, Phase 2 EPDP.

And then the board topic was enhancing the effectiveness of the multistakeholder model, key issues and opportunities for acceleration.

And I don't know, is there any other business that anybody else wanted to bring up?

Okay. I don't hear anything at this time.

So, Rod, we don't have the slides available for sharing. And Board Ops is working on that.

Do you feel comfortable just talking without having the slides in the background?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah. I'm fine with that.

MERIKE KAE0: Okay.

So why don't we get right to it and start talking about the SAC113.

So, Rod.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thank you, Merike. And good morning, good afternoon, good evening, good whatever time of the day it is wherever you are.

So thanks for being able to meet with us today. We do appreciate the time. We'd obviously like to be meeting face to face and look forward to doing it again sometime in the future.

We have a couple of publications we put out since we last got together, and wanted to take this opportunity to have discussion with board -- the board members as to the nature of those and get any questions or concerns taken care of directly, since we have a good section of our membership here, and obviously the board as well.

So it's a good opportunity to dig into any issues that have come up in the publications we've put out.

We are -- we initially tabbed this as SSAC work, recent publications. We were hoping to have some work done on DNS abuse, which we are near completion to. We're on the last SAC

review on that, and, unfortunately, we're not done with that, it is not final yet.

But it's -- it is on the way, and if there are some questions about where we are with that and the like, we'll be happy to -- I'll be happy to take those as well. But at the moment, we're not done, so that's why we're focused on these two.

So I will focus on the first -- the most recent publication first, which is SAC113, which is our recommendations -- well, our discussion of and recommendation around private-use TLDs.

So on the slide that you don't have up in front of you yet, I'll just tick off some of the main points. We have a couple slides on this.

The concept here that you have sort of seen in SAC113 is the reservation of a specific TLD that -- for use in internal or private use that would -- that is not currently a TLD for anything else. It's not in the zone at the moment. And it goes into the rationales and reasons therefor.

It's important to note that our advice for most usages would be for somebody to use a TLD already in the zone or domain name that they control within a TLD that's already in the zone for these kinds of private uses. So if you had, for example, a network that you had on your enterprise, you use your name .COM as the

domain name and then use subdomains of that internally for that.

Just to give you an example of how -- what we still consider to be the best practice for that.

However, some enterprises, and you might think of the example of dot corp as an alternative to that that don't want to use a public domain, for whatever reason, and they use something like a -- like .CORP is what Microsoft had suggested for many years to do this private networking. And there are other uses that private companies come up with, manufacturers have oftentimes, if you think of some of the IOT devices or other customer presence equipment type things that people will use for a lot of different reasons, but oftentimes for provisioning and initial kind of setup things, .belkin comes to mind for those of you who follow what names appear at the root zone that haven't been delegated. That's an example of a device manufacturer doing the same kind of thing.

And those are -- many reasons for doing that. We'll get into that in the paper.

But the current practice is they just pick a name that they feel like and they start using it, which doesn't quite work well when somebody's -- some later time, as we've discovered in the first

round, and we have a whole project looking at various strings like this that show up in traffic within the DNS space, traffic that largely goes unanswered, because it's sent to -- it hasn't actually been delegated to the root. But that does cause problems for, you know, folks who might want to use that name later for actual DNS operations, and hence, you know, the work we're doing on name collisions, for that and many other reasons. But that's a good example of where that traffic comes up.

DNS doesn't have, really, an explosive provision of this in it. And you can -- think of it as analogous to the RFC1918 space that we have for addresses where it's been designated by the work of the IETF, saying an I.P. address, if you've played with your own home router or something like that, you may have noticed it typically uses 192.168.0 addressing, and there's a couple others as well. And those are recognized everywhere as private address spaces in the IP address ranges.

The -- This is an analogous type of thing where you would be able to say anything that appears under this TLD is considered private, or private use.

So a rationale for all of these, an explanation for this in the paper, and then a recommendation to the Board to ensure that such a string is reserved and not placed within the root zone ever. So that way the behavior is consistent.

We don't say specifically which string, but we do provide some criteria for that string.

And I see -- we've got -- oh, yeah. I see that the slide deck is up and running now. I'm on the next slide, if you want to move along to the next slide.

And the criteria for that is obviously that it's valid, no emojis, but -- or anything on the -- follows the right rules. I already mentioned it's not already delegated. avoiding something that's confusingly similar, but also trying to make it relatively short, memorable and meaningful so that people will pick it up and use it. One of the challenges on something like this is whether or not people would actually start using it if they knew it existed and getting that information out there and into public use is part of what we're trying to get done here. And the reason for that, main reasons are to cut down on this kind of free-for-all that ends up leaking into the DNS ecosystem and to allow, with the, you know, forever requirement on this provisioning that it -- or nonprovisioning, reservation, I guess you would call it, that folks could rely on that not ever resolving and then being able to build that predictability into whatever software, hardware or root service that they need that would require that.

One of the side benefits is that we think over time that will reduce some of the background radiation that's showing up in

root servers. Not that this is causing an operational difficulty for root server operators, but it does create a lot of noise and questions around what's going on. And obviously as we're doing things like analyzing potential name collisions or trying to identify perhaps some sort of a malfeasance going on that's using the DNS, those kinds of things disguise other things that are happening. So it would be useful to cut down on that.

So those are the primary things there. We don't think this is going to solve all the problems in the world when it comes to these things, but it certainly, from the conversations that have been had with some of the service providers and IoT manufacturers, et cetera, that some of our people and others have had, there is a -- you know, if this was to be provisioned such that it was -- you know, people were confident it would be there and this was the state of reasons, rationale for it, that many of these people who are looking for space like this would actually use it. And it's not going to take care of it all but it certainly would limit that down a fair amount and would hopefully become like, for us, the 1918 space, something that would be standardized and people would be able to rely on and be coded in, so to speak.

So I will stop there and entertain questions as to where we're at with this.

And Harald, I see your --

MERIKE KAEO: I --

ROD RASMUSSEN: Merike, you're in charge.

MERIKE KAEO: Thank you, Rod.

Thank you very much for the introduction to SAC 113. And, Harald, please. I see your hand is up.

HARALD ALVESTRAND: So thanks, Rod, for taking another kick at this tar baby. And I mean, at first I had been following the whole discussion list about dot loc- (indiscernible), the top-level domain that must not be named. There are really only two questions. Who is going to take the decision to allocate it, and who is going to take the decision on which string it is going to be.

Now, you have -- SSAC seems to have said that ICANN, or some aspect of ICANN, should be the answer to the former, but who do you think should be the answer to the latter?

ROD RASMUSSEN:

So that's a great question, and we -- and part of -- part of the answer to that may be the meeting we've already had as part of ICANN69 a mere five hours or so ago was with the GNSO Council, and there was a -- because we briefed them on this as well, and they had the question of, okay, who all is going to be involved in any decision around this. And you had, in our conversation there, three parties identified. One is the -- one was us, having, you know, put it out there. A second was the IETF, and the third was ICANN Board. Well, actually, I guess there's four, technically, the fourth being the GNSO itself as the policy-making body where I think that -- that the latter part of your question might be, though. The -- at least if not the place at least a part of the process there, because you have some questions around the second two bullet points into the criteria that may be of interest. You know, kind of a policy perspective.

There are also questions which we did not answer as to whether or not you would designate potentially more than one string, and there are multiple reasons for potentially doing that, because meaningful in one language may not be meaningful in another, for example, and there may be different ways you want to treat strings. I note that this SSAC was not able to come to consensus on some other ways you could deal with delegation of a string or strings, but what we have our consensus on is what

we've presented here and creating a reserved string that does not delegate it.

So there are still some open questions and there's obviously conversation going on within the IETF around this and DNS ops working group on how to deal with this. And I think you called it a tar baby (laughing), and --

HARALD ALVESTRAND: (Indiscernible).

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah, and it certainly has been. I personally have not been involved, but we definitely have our own members of the SSAC who are intimately involved. So there is some cross-over. And one of the other questions that came up in the GNSO conversation is how that is going to get coordinated, which is really the important question. I think that coordination probably comes through the ICANN Board and liaison relationship that it has with the IETF along with the relationship it has with the GNSO as a policy-making body. But there's still some work to do here, but we figured if nothing else, we can put this out here, get the conversation started, and see where this can go and also help -- I know there's active work going on at the

IETF on this right now. Help that conversation along with our thoughts on this.

MERIKE KAE0:

There's a couple of more people that have wanted to chime in, so in the order that I saw them is Goran and then Warren and then also Nigel.

So, Goran, please.

GORAN MARBY:

Thank you. And thank you, everybody. And then I have to say I really smiled when I saw Steve Crocker's name popping up in front of me. From a personal note, it was almost to the day -- or to the month five years ago when I met Steve the first time in Washington, and here I am. So blame him.

Anyway, so this triggered -- Remember that first of all, I think that the SSAC advice is a very timely one and it's also a very important discussion. And I have -- what I'm saying now has nothing to do with sort of the matter at hand. It's more of when I started looking into this, I started looking it from sort of a principle one, going back to reading the Memorandum of Understanding that ICANN has with the IETF.

And so -- And it created some sort of constitutional questions for me, and I engaged in a conversation with Merike and Harald about it as well. And I think it's one thing I think that we all agree upon, that we sort of don't like forum shopping or we create forum shopping by making not sure that the rules are set.

I mean, in the ecosystem, we have different roles. And IETF has a very important role, ICANN has a very important role, and they should be different. So what we plan to do now is actually to write a letter to the Internet Architecture Board/IETF and ask questions about how they see this because we know that they have done decisions in this space sort of before, and I just want to have a clarification before we go to the Board and tell them how to handle with this so we know who has the particular roles in this ecosystem. And that is where I am right now in this discussion, because I think I just need -- and I want that clarity is it IETF or is it ICANN, because that will have an impact on decisions like this going forward. And as sort of general principle, sort of loosely based on the discussion from the MoU is that ICANN handles the public part of the DNS.

So I'm not going into what is -- I'm not going into the substance of all of the importance of it all. I just think for everybody, it's good to have a clarification of the roles within this ecosystem so

we don't end up making mistakes because it feels good to go somewhere.

So the -- that is -- that fundamental discussion is something that needs to happen.

We will, of course, copy the SSAC on any communication we have about this as well, because we would like to have the SSAC input on it as well.

Thank you very much.

MERIKE KAEQ:

Thank you for that, Goran.

For those that may not be familiar, ICANN does have a memorandum of understanding with the IETF. And so this advisory really brought forth a conversation of, well, you know, do we all understand and interpret the memorandum correctly. And so I also feel that it's probably in the best interests of everyone to really get the clarification of who has what responsibility and make sure that the IETF and IAB and ICANN both agree. So then there can't be any finger-pointing later.

But, Warren, did you have something to add to this?

WARREN KUMARI:

Yes, please. So thank you. Warren Kumari, for the record.

So, yes, thank you, Goran, I think we would all really, really like to have a much better understanding of where the division is, who does what.

When you are looking into this, just for background, there was actually a liaison from the IAB in 2014 very closely related to this, liaison statement from the IAB to the ICANN board on technical use of domain names. That might be a good place to stop and follow on from.

But to provide a little bit of additional background, this idea was largely discussed in the IETF in the DNS Op Working Group back in I think it was 2016 or so, but I actually can't remember the date. Around then. And at the time, it was called dot internal. And my understanding of what the working group said at the time was that this was much too much policy, not stuff that the IETF wanted to be working on, and that the right place for it to be discussed was ICANN. And that's kind of how it ended up in the SSAC.

So that's just a little bit of background.

But, yeah, I think we would all really like to have a little bit more clarity around sort of the understanding of the MOU, who does what, how we better coordinate, et cetera.

MERIKE KAEO: Great. Thank you, Warren.

And, Nigel, did you have something that you wanted to add?

NIGEL ROBERTS: Well, I wanted to make a comment about the -- SSAC proposing the string must meet the criteria of being relatively short, memorable, and meaningful.

I agree with the first two, it should be relatively short and memorable.

I really kind of strongly disagree with the fact that it should be meaningful, because meaningful is relative to a culture, it's relative to a language, it's relative to a script. I think it should be something that becomes well-known but should initially be as unmeaningful as possible.

Thanks.

MERIKE KAEO: All right. Thank you for that.

Does anybody have anything more to add, noting that we are almost halfway through and still have one more SSAC topic, and then the board topic?

I see -- do I see old hands? Harald, a new one?

HARALD ALVESTRAND: Sorry. Old hand.

MERIKE KAE0: Okay.

So with that, let's go on to the other topic, which is SAC112.

ROD RASMUSSEN: And as we move on to that, those slides, I just want to point out that one of the interesting things, I think, from our perspective as the SSAC is that while we are an official ICANN advisory committee, we do have the luxury, I guess, of being able to provide commentary on things that are outside of ICANN's direct remit, org, and/or community. So we do -- will comment on things from time to time that, you know, are -- we look at this as our issues that have impacts within our community but are also somewhere else as far as responsibilities go, and being able to say some of these things is often useful for creating

conversations that need to happen. So I look forward to continuing this conversation, and, if nothing else, having gotten the discussion going again. And hopefully we can put together something to move forward with to help take on those issues that we'd identified.

So the other thing I wanted to just give an opportunity for folks to ask questions on was our response on the EPDP.

Next slide, please.

I'm sure you've all seen this work we did. And it aligns with several of the things that were brought up by other ACs, ALAC and the GAC in particular, but wanted to -- we had our own spin on things, obviously. I believe some of the other groups that had various issues had combined some of their thinking or whatever. SSAC will always be kind of independent on that. We look at things pretty -- try and stay pretty strictly within the technical lanes so to speak. And wanted to make sure that if you had any questions about some of the issues that we were focused on here, we get a chance to ask for any clarifications on that.

The good news on this, on one of the areas that we had concerned on is that third bullet point there, on the unaddressed charter items, which, those unaddressed items were particularly irksome -- I will put it that way -- because the SSAC had been

concentrating on those particular ones from day one and had, you know, kind of conditioned our full participation in this kind of odd process that nobody had ever done before on making sure that we had actually addressed those. And they didn't get addressed. So that was a particular kind of thorn in the side.

But the good news is that GNSO is moving forward. We had that meeting, as I mentioned, a few hours ago with the GNSO Council, and they're recommending moving forward on a couple of tracks on dealing with the natural versus legal person questions, some things around pseudonymized issues, and then the other track around data accuracy. Those moving forward is really important.

There were four recommendations where we had brought up particular issues. This actually leads into the topic with the board around some of the things we want to do or we're looking at as far as coordination across things.

But the process that the EPDP went through is a GNSO process, and it has its -- we -- I think we're all pretty familiar with it. And as we take a look at things from an SSAC perspective -- yes, we had folks trying to keep up with the work there and provide input and things like that. But at the end of the day, SSAC, we are set up to take a look at things as finished products, if you will, to provide inputs on those. And when you take a look at

what finally came out of the policy-making sausage, the EPDP, and there's a lot of kinds of things that once you put the whole picture together, you say, huh, there's a few things that didn't quite get to where we need it, or were kind of put together as compromise at the last minute, which, when you step back and take a more thorough look at it from using our process, it just didn't meet up to where we needed them to be from our perspective.

So -- and some of those were, you know, things that you -- as you inevitably do, you find out after the fact kind of thing that were not even discussed. Our thoughts on recommendation 12, the disclosure requirements, this is something we're very concerned about. And that particular one was on the potentiality for there to be the revelation of people who are either law enforcement or more likely to be cybersecurity responders of some sort that are trying to determine what the background of any particular suspect set of domain names might be, and that might expose them to the bad actors that are creating those.

So that's just an example.

But I wanted to put this -- put these in front of you here to make sure that if you had any questions about our input there -- and I know the GNSO has pushed this over. The hot potato is in your court. If you had questions on where the SSAC stood on any of

these particular issues, this would be the opportunity to bring some of them here.

So with that, I will turn it over to Merike to run the queue.

MERIKE KAEAO:

Thank you very much for that, Rod.

And, yeah, it was kind of fortuitous, because the SSAC had a meeting with GNSO, and the board has had a meeting with GNSO right after that.

And I do see that Chris has his hand up.

So, Chris, if you want to have -- if you have any questions or comments.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks, Merike. And thanks, Rod, for running through that.

I do have a -- I apologize, I wasn't at the GNSO meeting with the SSAC, and I also -- (indiscernible). I was chairing a ccNSO session.

So, hopefully, that's not going to make any difference to my question. Because what I'm going to ask you, Rod, is given the circumstances, given what you've said, given your statement,

and caveated with the knowledge that the board needs to -- we know -- you know that there needs to be some kind of design phase that we go through in order to figure out what we would need to do in order to do what the recommendations are, does the SSAC have a position on whether or not it's worth proceeding with the current recommendations? There's been talk in various different environments about it not being worth bothering with. And I make no comment about whether it is or it isn't. But I wonder whether the SSAC has reached a view on whether it is worth doing that or whether it would only be worth doing it in certain circumstances, and if so, what those circumstances might be.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Right.

Thank you, Chris.

I think that -- and there's a conversation around -- I just want to get a clarification on this, because from various conversations I've had and inputs I've heard, there are some who are thinking that this concept of an SSAD in accreditation and doing all these things is just not worth the bother, because nobody will use it, quote, unquote. I'm quoting others there, not saying that myself.

Is that kind of where you're talking about? Or is it just -- or is that --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah. That plus anything else that you wanted -- anything else that you want to address. I'm not seeking to narrow your reply.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Right. And I think that's important, because I think that kind of gets lost in the noise of the kind of rhetoric around some of this.

My impression, from the SSAC perspective, we did endorse the -- the rest of the work. Some of it a little more tepidly. It's actually in the document there and pointed out some things we have reservations about. The overall concept, the SSAC is supportive of, having the kind of universal and uniform -- the uniform access and being able to manage that and all the goodness that comes along with that, including accreditation, you know, with the implementation to be determined, to some extent, is all supported.

So I can say that.

We don't have a formal position on, quote, unquote, is it worth it. As it stands, we had some concerns that really do need to be addressed. They may be able to be addressed -- let me take a

look at our particular issues -- in better implementation. So if you take a look at things we've objected to, the priority levels, the SLAs, this disclosure requirement, those three in particular. And then the other one was financial sustainability.

Those are all things that largely, I would posit -- and this is me personally speaking here, just kind of based on taking the measure of things that have been said internally and externally. Those are all things that (indiscernible) quite a bit more on the policy implementation side of things that the policy folk felt it necessary to get into. And I think a lot of us know why the policy folks wanted to understand and speak to how things are going to get done, because there was a lot of questions about, you know, what's going to happen once you get into the implementation phase and the policy can get overrun by the implementation.

So I -- I think there are ways forward here where you can address the issues that have been brought up by us and by others that will overcome some of these issues that people have brought up.

So I still think it's worth the pursuit of doing this, and it just may need a little bit more cooking in order to get past these areas. And I would concentrate on those areas where you have commonality of the message coming in, that there are still inadequacies or concerns that we may be heading in the wrong

direction with some of this, and that a lot of that may be because we were trying to be over prescriptive on the policy side.

MERIKE KAEQ: All right. Thank you for that.

I do see that Goran's hand is up.

So, Goran, do you have a comment?

GORAN MARBY: Not -- not really a comment on what Rod was saying. Just to give you a little bit of insight of where we are right now.

Yes, so one of the things we're doing right now, and I spoke about that in the ccNSO as well, is that we are thinking about how to do this in a transparent way until the board makes its decision. And that's why we came up with this notion we call the operational design phase. And the operational design phase is really about something we've already done. But something as complex as this or Sub-Pro, we think that we need to address that phase a little bit more transparent, because there are many questions that need to be answered, and especially since the GNSO Council came up with this notion that it wanted to have the interaction with the board about the costs and things. And for the board to be able to have that conversation, we need to do the sort of design.

When we talk about design, it's not only -- we're getting proposals from people how to build the system from a technical perspective, which I'm really grateful, by the way. We run several, and I would say too many, ticketing systems inside ICANN already. So we know about that.

But it's also -- there's another problem attached to it. And one of them is what I would call the legality of it. And a simple one is, for instance, how do you identify the requestor of information in such a way it fulfills GDPR. And the other one is, of course, the very famous international data transfers.

We're working on the assumption that we can make this legal, but we have to make sure it doesn't create more liabilities or unknown liabilities for the actors, the requestors of the information, when they get the information, to know that GDPR is like.

When you get this information, you're on the GDPR. They are also for the contracted party.

Because the thing to forget is that SSAD doesn't change the underlying responsibility, according to the law, which is that the contracted parties has the responsibility for the balancing test. And if you want to learn more about that, actually, the European data protection authorities a couple of weeks ago issued a paper

which they called, I think, recommendations about the role of the data process and data controllers. I can highly recommend you to look at that paper, because it's been -- they sort of confirmed the stance that we've had for a long time about who is responsible and who has the legal responsibilities, according to GDPR.

So there are some unknowns still when it comes to the interpretation of this law. And you might have seen that I just a couple of weeks ago or last week send a director to the three directors general that I had the pleasure of having contact with during the process that led up to the temp spec when we discussed the issues of WHOIS.

And one of those things that might be good to know that the European Commission has the legal right to actually ask formal questions to the data protection authorities. And we are trying to convince the European Commission to do that for us.

A second thing that might be interesting is that the European Commission a couple of months ago issued what they call a sort of -- they looked into how well they think this law works. And in that, the European Commission also promised to make standardized contractual arrangement for the role of the data controllers and the data processes.

So what we're trying to do now is to figure out more of those unknowns in the laws, as well as we're going to look into how, actually, to design this. But we're going to do that according to the operational design phase in a slightly more transparent way than we've done before, also sort of checking in with the community that we have understood the recommendations the best way.

But I want to caution that the underlying principle that SSAD doesn't change the legal liabilities of the contracted parties still remains until we get the full answers from the data protection authorities about what we call the Strawberry model or the UIM, which is about making sure that ICANN gets legal responsibility for the balancing -- for the balancing test, which will give the ICANN community, which includes SSAC, a possibility to write policies about disclosures, which, unfortunately, as you all know, community cannot do today.

Thank you very much.

MERIKE KAEAO:

Great. Thank you for that, Goran.

I don't see any hands up. Anybody else want to make a comment on this particular topic?

Okay. I don't see any hands, so let's move over to the last topic of the day. Next slide, please.

Next slide.

So -- everybody at ICANN, and the community overall shall has been really busy trying to enhance the multistakeholder model. And there's been a lot of work that's been ongoing in October where the Board is looking at several interdependent topics, which include the ATRT3 recommendations, the Board work on streamlining of abuse, and also prioritization on planning needs. And so from the SSAC perspective there are three questions that we would like to have -- we'd like to discuss. One of them is what is the progress for developing a process for determining the overall prioritization of activities across the community?

The second one is when reading the operational design assessment document, the SSAC is thinking about the potential benefits or incorporating some of the aspects and wants to have a discussion with the Board on some of these recommendations.

And then the third question has to deal with what are the status of streamlining the reviews for the ICANN community.

So, Rod, do you want to add any added context to the first question?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Sure. Thanks, Merike. Yeah, this is a follow-on to the discussion we had as community leaders back in January in Los Angeles when we all thought it would be really useful for us to put our list of lists together and come up -- a list of lists of priorities for each of the SO/ACs together and the ICANN organization and the board, and try and develop some sort of way to bubble up cross-community priorities and coordinate on that.

And then wanted to have just further discussion on where things hand vis-a-vis that. It's been difficult, obviously, since (indiscernible) to move this along but wanted to provide some time to think about or talk about where things may stand with this.

Thanks.

MERIKE KAE0: All right. Thank you, Rod.

Matthew, I think you want to comment on this?

MATTHEW SHEARS: Yeah, thanks, Merike. Thanks, Rod, and hi, everybody.

It's a great question, and it's top of mind for the Board, and I think it's top of mind for the community as a whole.

One of the things that myself and Mandla have been shepherding along, as you know, is the evolution of the multistakeholder model and there are a couple of specific recommendations in that work that deal with the issue of prioritization.

So it's coming -- I think what you'll find is this focus on prioritization is coming from a number of different angles. So that's one piece.

Obviously, there's the ATRT3 recommendation that there be some process for prioritization of community work. So that's another piece that's coming in.

The Board also -- and perhaps Becky and Avri may speak to this - - back in last year or so published a paper on the prioritization, that was the OEC and Board Caucus on (indiscernible) and prioritization of community recommendations published a paper also on prioritization.

So we're coming at this from a number of different dimensions. And I think the realization is further pronounced by the formation of a new planning function in org as well. And the same issue is also rising in importance in the Board.

So there's no -- that's the progress. I think it's coming from a number of different angles. There's no one silver bullet, I don't think, for this, but it is becoming a more -- an ever-greater pressing challenge for all of us. So I just wanted to kind of put that out there as a first comment.

Thanks.

MERIKE KAEQ: Yeah, thank you.

Does anybody from the Board have anything additionally to add?

Becky, I see your hand is up.

BECKY BURR: Yeah, this is a really difficult issue. We have had some progress, I think, in terms of figuring out how to plan for and prioritize work on community recommendations, input on community recommendations. And that is the work that is ongoing coming out of ATRT3 recommendations and work that OEC and the Board Caucus are doing in terms of figuring out how, you know, once you have hundreds of recommendations, how you figure out how to prioritize and plan for those, and then how to make

sure that things are not overtaken by events and that prioritization gets looked for. That's on the one hand.

On the other hand, the prioritization of the work on volunteers' plates and sort of making sure that we are making appropriate but not overly burdensome calls on time. It's something that's going to have to be done in part by work Matthew is talking about with the evolution of the multistakeholder model. And I believe that as Matthew said, that activities prioritization was one of the areas that the community highlighted as a critical work path.

So I believe we're going to see some focus both on prioritization funding and implementation of community input and prioritization in terms of workload.

MERIKE KAE0:

Thank you for that, Becky.

Are there any more comments from anybody regarding the first question on prioritization?

Okay. Let's go to the second question which really deals with the design phase concept paper that just came out a little bit over a week ago.

So, Rod or Julie, do you want to add some added context here before we start asking the Board to chime in?

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Yeah, so just -- This is Rod speaking.

The -- When the ODP paper came out a week or two ago, took a look at that and kind of resonated from our own perspective as the SSAC in that we, too, have had some things that have come to the Board as recommendations that ended up being quite a bit of work. We're all familiar with the NCAP project which has now been going on for a matter of years and took a lot of kind of us trying to take a stab at doing things that were really kind of beyond the SSAC's capability, and ICANN org was able to come in and assist us thanks to the Board providing those resources and properly scope out that work and how that might be actually accomplished to a level where you could actually understand the cost and resources, et cetera, whereas we put together an outline on that.

But that ended up being a lot of time spent where if you had something wrong along the lines of a recommendation set that we came up with that came in that involved quite a bit of work, there's been other examples where there have been quite a bit

of potential impacts and costs, that would make sense to do something along these lines.

We do have the Action Request Register and as a process that we think has been refined over time. It's been quite useful understanding where visits, et cetera, but this -- something -- incorporating some of the concepts that were in the ODP into our own process with the Board may be useful in kind of having that dialogue before a lot of work or -- gets done or things get assigned off to somebody to handle, where we can actually think about the impacts of our recommendations and may be able to refine those so they're not -- if there's some deeper and more burdensome tasks or costs associated with some of our work, maybe we'll take a step back and either course correct or clarify to make sure we're actually on the same page before moving on with other things.

So that was the thought here. And this is more of just a -- as you're kicking this around the GNSO process, is there something we might be able to do.

And the other -- other SO/AC (indiscernible) may fall into this as well. Obviously the GNSO work is going to be the most important because that's most -- you know, the biggest impact you have. But they're not the only ones.

So I'd like to get maybe a conversation started around that. There's no requirement to do anything right away, but we want to get this thought out there and, you know, this isn't a formal thing that the SSAC is requesting something like. This we just want to have a conversation around the concept.

So I'll see if there's any folks that wanted to take a stab at that.

MERIKE KAE0: Okay. Anybody? Okay. I see Goran's hand is up. So, Goran, you want to comment?

GORAN MARBY: Thank you. Thank you very much. We talked about the operational design.

So I want -- When we start thinking about processes and we talked about also what Matthew talked about before when it comes to, you know, trying to figure out some of the -- how does the different processes work, where should we engage, and how do we make it better as a cooperation between the multistakeholder model who produces something, gives it to the Board, and then org goes and implements it.

I think that one of the things that we see -- there's two things happen right now. First of all, we have sort of a catch-up effect

when it comes to the amount of work that the community are engaged or are producing. When we have PDP, expedited PDP, we have the sub pro, we have still implementation Work Stream 2, we have CCT, we have SSR2 when it came out, auction proceeds. I'm probably forgetting something now, but we have an enormous -- enormous amount of work that we're doing and ahead of us.

And I think that -- So when we start looking at how this is going to work, some things comes out, and the operational design thing was really about, okay, it's a complicated issue, it's going to be complicated. Not from a policy standpoint, because when the GNSO Council has decided on a policy, the Board's responsibility and org is really to make that happen. That's the thesis of the bottom-up multistakeholder model. I mean, we all go into gear to make the community decisions into happening.

But when it becomes complex, we have to build systems. And if I take sub pro for a second, which we were talking about in investments of about maybe 30, \$40 million and a fairly long time before we can get it happen, of course there are questions to be addressed and asked back to the community if ICANN org has understood it correctly before we go to the Board and the Board makes a decision.

And the Board of course as an entity wants to know -- I mean, they also want to know things like, okay, so if we now build an SSAD, where in ICANN org are you going to place it, Goran? What place in the organization is going to be responsible for it? Who is going to be the boss? All those things the Board wants to balance.

So the operational design thing is less about policy and more about how to make it happen.

But it is really starting with the recommendations from the GNSO Council. And we should not see the ODP as a position to renegotiate or do anything with the recommendations themselves because they are sacred. They are what the GNSO Council has decided upon. It's their job to validate whether if we should do this or not.

So I just want to put into the caveat that I think that this is really happening after the PDP. It doesn't change the PDP; it doesn't re-recommend anything because that belongs in a conversation ultimately with the Board and GNSO Council.

But what you're saying, Rod, is also interesting because I think with the complexities of the work we're now doing, the ICANN community are engaged in, we need to further develop the processes. Because if we don't do that, I think we're going to be

less transparent, and transparency, for me, is also accountability. So for me and my team, we are constantly looking into be efficient, to be transparent, to be accountable so you, in any shape or form, as a -- in all the roles you have can engage and actually know what's happening. And disagree or maybe sometimes even agree with us.

But the disagreement is actually more important.

So I hope that clears out a little bit more about the role of the operational design. And as I said before, we have done this work all along. Now we just want to make it more transparent because it can be more complex.

Thank you.

MERIKE KAEQ: Thank you for that, Goran.

Rod, do you have any other points regarding the second bullet point?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thank you, Goran, for your -- your thoughts on where the ODP is. It's -- obviously, it was just introduced to the community, so it's good to get some further bits of the thinking behind that.

I do think there is an opportunity for policy-makers to better understand the implications of what their policies are.

Let me just give an example from my own background.

My first job out of college was working for the Congressional budget office. And if you're familiar -- most U.S. citizens are familiar with it. Every bill that goes before the U.S. Congress that gets a chance to be passed has to go through the Congressional budget office to get costed, what's the impact on the economy, what's the impact on the federal budget, what's the impact on various resources before it can be voted on.

And I was -- you know, when I saw the ODP, that kind of reminded me of that past life I had on, you know, estimating impacts of legislation, which is policy.

And that would be taken into account before people really voting on it, which is really useful to know how much things might cost or what impacts they might have.

So it sounds like the ODP is a little different concept than that. But that concept of understanding where impacts are and how they might have collateral damage, so to speak, is really useful in complex policy-making arenas. And that might be -- I just offer that as a suggestion to think about as well on this. And certainly if you take a look at the EPDP and the work that goes

into impacts and costs and how to support an SSAD and things like that, having kind of that independent review. And I know there was work done by the ICANN Org to do exactly that. But that was kind of one of those that was asked of them in a way that, when people are contemplating policy, might be useful. So while it is something that does get done, I'm not sure that it's always considered as much as it should be, at least. And from our perspective, some of the things that we're working on may have those kind of impacts that would be useful to engage on, where we don't have a kind of a tool to do that right now.

So that's to give you a little more thinking about the background of what brought this up.

MERIKE KAEAO:

Okay. So we are at the top of the hour.

Avri, could you do a quick 30-second update on the process of streamlining reviews for the ICANN community. So I do want to give her that opportunity. And then we can close the meeting.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

We are scheduled for another 30 minutes?

MERIKE KAEO: Oh, we are. I must have missed that. Okay.

Well, that's good.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thank you for hustling us along.

MERIKE KAEO: It's been a long night.

All righty, then. Then we can be on for another 30 minutes.

AVRI DORIA: Perhaps it's best if they set up the question before I try to answer it.

MERIKE KAEO: Yeah. So, Rod, do you want to give added context to the third question here?

ROD RASMUSSEN: I will pass the buck over to Julie for this one. If she's still awake.

JULIE HAMMER: Sure. Yeah, no, I am, I am. This is Julie Hammer, SSAC vice-chair.

We're just interested in having a little bit better understanding of where the board might be thinking with regard to the various inputs that it's had regarding streamlining of reviews. So certainly this is something that's been discussed for a couple of years with the couple of proposals for both the short-term approach and a long-term approach that ICANN Org circulated. And then, of course, ATRT3 basically surveyed the SO/ACs and got a lot of input. And they had some proposals in their draft report. And there was quite a bit of evolution between what was mentioned in their draft report and what came out in their final report with regard to specific reviews and the organizational reviews.

So just interested to know where the board is thinking on those issues and if they have yet had an opportunity to discuss what's been proposed by ATRT3.

Thanks, Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Yeah, thanks.

This is Avri speaking.

So we've certainly started discussing -- I mean, we had been working on the streamlining project for a while, but then basically paused ourselves while the ATRT3 was going on. Now that the ATRT3 results have come through and the various other comments and questionnaires and such, we're now very much in the process of trying to put it together. There's an ATRT3 caucus that's going through, the (indiscernible) recommendations, not just the streamlining, and trying to make sure they understand them, having conversations with the -- with the implementation shepherds from ATRT3, and basically getting ourselves well -- to the point where we actually make -- understand and are sure that we do understand.

In terms of the streamlining content for that, one of the things we've done is that the OEC has basically started looking at that model and say, okay, if we were to apply this model -- and this is more, you know, in the -- let's see what happens, and does it answer the various issues that we had. What are the gaps in it? In what way does it agree or disagree with the other comments that have been received, you know, with what questionnaires tell us. And then basically trying to get our full picture of would it work, can it work, you know. And then beyond that, looking at all of that and realizing that it would involve a great deal of bylaw manipulation and discussion. Now, the bylaw changes

and things like that are only things that happen after the decision (dropped audio) process with --

[This meeting is being recorded]

AVRI DORIA: -- with the OEC and all that. So we're early in the process to respond to ATRT3. We do have to respond by the beginning of December. So we have a limited amount of time and are trying to very much work to that schedule.

And more than that, I can't really say what the board thinks on it yet, because we're really still in the chewing and thinking stage.

JULIE HAMMER: That's great.

MERIKE KAEAO: Yeah, thank you very much for that.

And I don't know if anybody else has any comments. The meeting was, actually, just an hour. So thank you very much everybody that stayed the extra five minutes.

I'll just see whether or not anybody has an extra comment before I close up the meeting.

I don't see any hands.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Maarten.

MERIKE KAEO: Maarten, please.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Sorry for -- I couldn't find my hand. I was thrown out, and I got back in.

[Laughter]

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: So that was an interesting experience. But, indeed, thanks for the very interesting -- the good discussion and the interesting session. Really appreciate all the work done by SSAC and the dialogue. And please allow me to say that you've seconded the stellar representative to the board. Very good thanks for your excellent liaising and chairing of the session.

MERIKE KAEO: Thank you for that.

And, again, thank you, everybody, for participating.

So enjoy the rest of the ICANN month.

All right. I will close this meeting.

Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]