EN

BARCELONA – ALAC and Regional Leaders Working Session (6 of 13)
Sunday, October 21, 2018 – 10:30 to 12:00 CEST
ICANN63 | Barcelona, Spain

HEIDI ULLRICH: Excuse me. Before we get started, yesterday evening we found a man's sport coat over in this section. It was a larger size man's blue-checked sports coat. Did anyone leave that here?

ALAN GREENBERG: Maybe you'd better ask when they're [inaudible] people.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Well, we have a lot of people here.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. If I can call everyone's attention. The first part of the session is to review the changes to the ALAC rules of procedure and the associated adjunct document, the ALAC e-mail guide. If we could have everyone's attention around the table, please.

This is largely a clean-up set of changes. That is, they're clarifications, updates. For instance, this rules of procedure refers to [inaudible] that I believe in 2013. We have a bunch of URLs in them. Of course, all the URLs [inaudible] had changed. Things like expected standards of behavior had changed and moved. A lot of little clean-up like that. There were a number of issues that people had, for one reason or another, expressed some concern with that they were not clear. In the

---

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.

review that I and a number of other people did, we identified a few other places where things were less than clear.

So, part of what we're talking about is just a clean-up. No substantive changes. There are a few substantive areas that are essentially mandated by the new bylaws and they needed to be changed because technically we were in violation of our own rules by obeying the ICANN bylaws. So, we've made a number of adjustments there.

There have been a significant number of comments during the process of looking at these on things that people believed should change. In general, the decision was this is not the time to do that, but I'm recommending to Maureen that if there's a will to make any substantive changes in how we do our business that it should be considered sooner rather than later if people think it's important. There's one in particular – or one or two in particular – in relation to the selection of the board member. And although we think of Leon as our new board member, we're just about to embark on a new selection process next year. Next calendar year. After ATLAS … No, we're going to have to start before ATLAS. Sorry. We built a procedure which takes a long time to do, so it will have to start before ATLAS, but we'll get into the really high gear until a little bit later.

In any case, I'm happy to say we don't need any discussion. We'll have a vote on Wednesday, but I think at this point, both to make sure that everyone around the table is familiar on what we're voting for, this was reviewed on a recent ALAC meeting, but there was no … Not everyone was there.

So, I'd like to very briefly go through it, and if at any point people have any concern, then let's raise them one by one as we're going through it. I don't think there's going to be a lot, but there are a few issues that people have already suggested that they are uneasy about for one reason or another and I think we're going to review them.

We're going to start with the e-mail guide because there is a substantive change in this that has not been discussed yet and we will talk about that. It's one of Maureen's items, and therefore we'll do it before she has to leave to go off to a newcomers meeting.

If we can just look at the document to start with, however, the changes in the e-mail guide are partially clean-up. For instance, about a year or so ago, we invented a new term. The term is Advisors to the At-Large Leadership Team. We used to enumerate them before and they're essentially the liaisons to other ACs and SOs within ICANN and the chair has the right to add advisors to the ALT, and specifically the advisors that I have added are the past two chairs. Cheryl was there anyway because she happens to be liaison to the GNSO and Olivier has been there as what I consider one of my advisors. Maureen has the discretion to add whoever she wants as advisors. So, instead of trying to enumerate them, we've simply replaced the references to liaisons in all of the mailing lists to advisors of the ALT.

We have had a practice for the last several years of key working group chairs – Jonathan is an example of that – to add to the public ALAC list. It's a list that's not secret anyway. It's publicly viewable, but we felt it's important to be able to deliver these messages to the people who we're

relying on to do a lot of our work, put them onto the mailing list and allow them to contribute.

The process has been we could ask the ALAC for permission to do that. Since it has never been refused, we're adding a line here saying that the leadership team can recommend that chairs be added and it's subject to ALAC oversight. So, ALAC can say no, but doesn't need approval. Again, just trying to remove administrative steps that are somewhat rubberstamping.

I don't think there are any other really substantive changes here, but let me look through it quickly. There will be a change that is not in the current document you have. When we started with the leadership team, it was called the executive committee, the ExCom. We changed the name about five or six years ago. The mailing list did not change its name because we wanted to maintain the archives, and with the mailing list tool we use, if you change the name, the archives disappear and you have to look in two different places.

Maureen has requested that we actually change the name at this point and create a new list, so the list called the ExCom will now be called the ALT, the At-Large Leadership Team. If you want to find the old things, you'll have to look into the archive for the old messages. Not a lot of other changes there.

Lastly, we have inserted under all of the RALO lists that individual members should be parts of the RALO list, which didn't exist for most of the RALOs before.

The only other change that we are recommending is Maureen is requesting that a new list be created, and for a new list to be created, it needs the approval of the ALAC for this kind of list and she is asking for a mailing list for ALAC members only. That is, the 15 ALAC members and staff, but none of the other people who are on our normal mailing list. That is, not the liaisons, not the RALO leaders. Just the ALAC itself.

It will be a public list, I believe. So, anyone can view it. I'll let Maureen talk about the other details of it, who can send to it and things like that, but if you can go over that because, at this point, it seems simpler to include it in this revision of the rules than to have to do a second pass a week from now to do that. So, Maureen, if you'd like to talk a little bit about your rationale and who can use that list, then we'll go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. I didn't realize that there wasn't one. I just assumed that there was a list that was specifically for the ALAC members. I think that occasionally we've actually called meetings of the members when we've had to make a decision online through a mailing. I can't see that it would be used a lot, but I wanted it to be open access as well. So, if anybody wanted to ask the ALAC specifically questions, they should be able to send to it, so all ALAC members get to see whatever concerns are specifically for the ALAC. It's nothing fantastic at all, I don't think. But, it is an opportunity for the ALAC members to get an e-mail that says we've all been asked to make a call on a particular issue by a certain date, can we have some sort of consensus? Alan has sent out lots of messages out to us and asked us for responses in regards to a decision

we've had to make online. It's just making it a little bit tidier, I think. But I do think it's important that it's an open comment thing that anyone can. Alan thinks I'm opening myself up to a whole lot of issues, but that doesn't matter. It's something we can work out. I'm sure it will be of value to us.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's be clear. If it turns out this mailing list has no need and no use, then it can disappear afterwards. If Maureen feels that there's some merit in it, then I don't see any cost in doing it. Honestly, I'm not sure I see the merit, because for instance, when I have sent out consensus calls which is asking, "Does the ALAC agree?" I tend to send them out to a very wide list and let other people comment on it or voice their support or disapproval. Each of us has our own style. I have no problem with creating a list like this and the future will tell whether it has merit or not.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. We do have other lists that are more inclusive. I'm just talking about the decision-making list. There is also the ALT-plus list which is, again, looking at before we had the ALT list which was the ALAC leadership team, plus the liaisons. The ALT-plus list is the one that actually includes the regional chairs, the ALAC leadership team and the liaisons. That's another e-mail list.

ALAN GREENBERG:	That's one I'm referring to as a rename from the list we call the ALT list, the ALAC Leadership Team, which actually has – its proper name is ExCom. For historic reasons, we are renaming to be the ALT-plus list. It doesn't require any changes in the description of the list because the ALT list includes the ability of the chair to add whoever he or she wants to that list. In fact, the description doesn't change other than our routine updates we're doing. Any questions or comments on this e-mail guide? I have someone with the sun behind him, but I think he's Eduardo.
EDUARDO DIAZ:	Thank you. Is there a place in the Wiki or on a page where all these mailing lists are described? Because I'm going to get confused very fast with them. A place in the Wiki or page where these mailing lists are described. We're talking about various changes in lists and I'm not sure which one is what.
ALAN GREENBERG:	There is a page on the Wiki for ALAC rules of procedure. It has been there for a half a decade now and it's still there. It will have the revised version when they're approved. Sarah?
SARAH KIDEN:	I know that all of us here know these acronyms, but if someone finds this document as it is on its own, they may not be able to know all the acronyms. So, I would like to request that we spell them out the first time and then use the acronyms after. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: This is an adjunct document to the rules of procedure and the rules of procedure does to that in full and there's a glossary at the front of it. We could certainly put them here also, but if there's strong will, I don't think there's any controversy over it. I'm not sure I'm going to be able to take the time to do that over the next two days, but certainly it could be done. Sergio?

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: I'm going to speak in Spanish. Thank you, Alan, for giving me the floor. Just one comment. This is a follow-up comment for the comment of Sarah and Eduardo. I believe that we need to have public access and quick access because so people can participate in a better way and we need to explain very shortly the description of the mailing list. We need to have a description on the Wiki page so that many people might be able to understand where they should be included, because one of the main problems that we had is the many e-mails that we have. This, in some way, is problematic for participation. So, we can have something particular, something specific, so that they can identify their interests. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thanks, Sergio. Two things. This document, which is pointed to on the Wiki, and I believe it's pointed to from the ALAC homepage on the Wiki and on the web I think – it should be. And there is a description of each list. That doesn't address the issue you just raised of we have many lists

and they are very confusing. That doesn't quite state it well enough. We have many lists and they are very, very, very confusing and we often send things to multiple lists and sometimes you get multiple copies and sometimes you don't.

One of the tasks the chair has accepted that I take on after I cease to be chair is a review of the mailing lists and try to rationalize them to make sense out of them. I'm not convinced we're going to be able to do that, but we will try and we will present the confusion to you, so perhaps someone will have a bright idea of how to fix it. It's an understood problem. It's been with us for a decade. It probably won't go away, but we'll try. Do we have anyone else? Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alan. In following what you are saying, I suggest that if it's possible, to try to use [inaudible] example about the mailing list. That means that if one group is [inaudible] another group, then you don't send the mail to both lists because it's not useful, and if it's because there are [one] people not being in one place, maybe it's better to add him and not to duplicate mailing lists. But, that's just an idea.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's an idea that I have already shared. One of the problems when you have nested lists is you end up having nested tags on the subject line and you end up with the real subject disappearing off the right. But that is one of the opinions.

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

The problem is, right now, none of our lists are subsets of others. They are overlapping membership. I did this analysis about six years ago. I'll do it again and I will bring it to the ALAC and we'll have some discussions.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just one point. Everybody must be, if they are on another list in ALAC Announce. If we sent to ALAC Announce, we don't send to any other list. It will be a first small step, but it could be not so difficult to implement, I think. But maybe I'm wrong. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't want to spend a lot of time on this right now. Certainly, last time we did the review, there were many really interesting surprises about ALAC members not being on critical lists because they had unsubscribed themselves or various other things. Anyway, it's not today's subject. It's something we need to address. Satish?

SATISH BABU: Thank you, Alan. I have a question relating to mailing lists, but I'm not sure if this is the right time to take it up. It's to do with the lot of people who are inactive but still on our list. At what point do you consider weeding them out the way you've been weeding out ALSes which do not function properly?

ALAN GREENBERG: Which list are you talking about?

SATISH BABU:　　　　　　　Maybe the RALO list, but I'm sure the [inaudible] ALAC list also might be having a lot of people. [Open] lists, that is. Not the members-only list.

ALAN GREENBERG:　　　　The RALO lists are open to anyone who wants to subscribe to them. The RALO can change that rule, but that's been the rule that we've used to date. So, you don't have to be active to become a member of the list. Again, that's not an ALAC decision. Or it could be an ALAC decision, but it's not today's decision.

The ALAC list, our practice has been that past ALAC members and past regional leaders at their choice may stay on the list. In theory, we periodically ask them. In practice, if they don't want to be on them, they get off and the rest stay on. That's a rule that can be revisited. I think that's a substantive change and if we want to make that, it shouldn't be part of this set of revisions. It's a conscious decision to keep people involved if they are interested.

SATISH BABU:　　　　　　　Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:　　　　Any further questions? I'd like to go on to the rules of procedure then, which are the substantive, somewhat more substantive anyway. If we can start on page two. We're still on the ALAC, on the e-mail guide. We

need the rules of procedure. Looking for item 1.1 on page 2. That's the one. Is there any way we could make that any larger?

You've all received … Most of you, I hope, have received this in e-mail. Yesim, did you add the link to the agenda? If you go into the agenda page, there are links to the documents. So, if you can't read what's on the screen, there are other opinions available to you.

This is the introduction to the ALAC and At-Large. The previous version was largely silent on unaffiliated individual members. It was clear that, given our direction we're going in, we had to include them.

The first version I did was somewhat garbled and received significant comment that it was not done properly. I've revised that and I've received no comments other than it's clearer now. So, I'm hoping that the wording is clear. Essentially, is there a desire for me to read this? Okay.

The At-Large community within ICANN is made up of accredited organizations referred to as At-Large Structures representing the interests of individual Internet users, as well as individual users unaffiliated with an ALS. There are five Regional At-Large Organizations, one corresponding to each of the five geographic regions defined by ICANN. An ALS, once accredited by the ALAC, is a member of its region's RALO. Similarly, unaffiliated members, once accredited by a RALO in accordance with its own rules, is a member of that RALO. Each of the regions is represented on the ALAC with three members of whom two are appointed by the RALO and one by the ICANN Nominating Committee.

So, I think it reads pretty clearly. It doesn't go into great details about how they're accredited. That's documented in another relatively exhausted document and one that will likely be revised significantly in the At-Large review work, nor does it refer to the details of individual users but says they exist. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Not sure that my question is relevant, but I just want to be sure that we don't get into trouble with European individual user unaffiliated who become affiliated with ALSes specially set up for that. I don't think, but I just want to be sure about that.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's a good point. For those who don't know, in Europe they chose to say that there is an ALS – it is an accredited ALS – which are the individual members. In North America, for instance, we will always refer to the individual members as a group, as a virtual ALS. The decision of Europe is a little bit unfortunate in a couple of ways, one of which is the ICANN bylaws say ICANN cannot put any resources into an ALS, and yet we do support the individual members by holding votes for them and a number of things like that.

I would have preferred if European members were not a formal ALS, but they are. I think Sebastien's point is well taken and I think that warrants a footnote here. I don't want to try to cover it, but we can note it in Europe they have chosen to technically be an ALS but act as a group of unaffiliated users. So, the unaffiliated users in Europe are all affiliated.

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

That's … I don't think it warrants more than a footnote, but it should be covered. You're right. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. For the ALS, we have common criteria to be accredited. Any ALS from any region of the world should satisfy those criteria. For the individual members, you are saying, Alan, that they are accepted according to the RALO group, which I find not normal. We have to have the same rules for the individual members as we have the same rules for the ALSes.

ALAN GREENBERG: This was a significant subject in the At-Large Review because the reviewers recommended that we must have a uniform set of rules and the thought at that point is we can do it, but it will probably take another two years. As I think many of us around the table know, in NARALO and EURALO, the individual members may participate in a vote. In other regions, they have said no. Let me finish.

I am an individual member in NARALO. I am an ALAC member. Other regions have said, "No. Individual members can't be ALAC members." So, although I completely agree we should go in that direction, it's not something the ALAC can simply say without significant discussion, and therefore it's not being discussed now. I hope it will be discussed significantly during the At-Large review. But all we're here is trying to document reality today, not change it to what we think it should be or what some of us think it should be and others may disagree.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, I am not speaking about the duty and the rights of the individual members. I am speaking about the criteria for recruitment, for accepting individual members. Those criteria should be common for all the regions.

ALAN GREENBERG: I agree, but that isn't the case today and I don't believe, as ALAC chair, I can tell the RALOs that they have to change the rules or which set of rules are the preferred ones. It's a discussion I believe the ALAC should take. I believe it's a direction you should move in. Won't be me doing that, but I believe that should be the case. But that's a discussion that has to be held. Not today.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: May I ask you please to at least to remove the mention that it should be according to their rules [inaudible]?

ALAN GREENBERG: I was asked to add that from the first version to reflect the fact that there were different rules. I'm happy to remove that paragraph if the ALAC desires. Could we have a straw poll of the ALAC? Remove the reference to each according to their own rules. The last revision we said since we say how ALSes are accredited, we must say how individual members are accredited which is why that phrase got added. We have a speaker queue, but let's try to address that issue. Again, we can't

spend the whole hour talking about that one issue. All this was trying to is reflect what is happening today. If we change the rules … Sergio, please.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you very much, Alan. In the first paragraph, Alan, there's a mention of individual users, Internet users, and I need to say that those of us coming from the organizations, non-governmental organizations, and working within the At-Large world, we feel excluded. I say this because we are in a group and we have a mandate to discuss certain issues and when you refer to individual users, we are not there as individual users. We are there as collective users. I think it is important to mention both types of users, the collective users and individual users in any case. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: The words we're using here come out of the ICANN bylaws. Now, as part of the review, we can change that. But right now, we are here to represent the collective individual users, the four billion. We can't change the bylaws right now. If that needs to be changed, that needs to be reflected in the discussions from the At-Large Review.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Alan, we are end users. End users and then we will be collective users, but we first are end users. I believe we first should say end users and then we can discuss the collective users.

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. If you have particular wording you would like to change, then please suggest it. But the ALAC has to vote on this this Wednesday and it's really important that we be very precise. So, I'm not sure exactly what you are asking for. If you would like to contribute something within the next hour or so, we'll make sure it's discussed. Ricardo?

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Yes. I'm the one who asked for this change, Tijani. At the beginning, they didn't say anything. My concern was that there was not approval of the individual users or not by ALAC or the RALOs. What's happening now, it's in the RALOs that the individual users. I agree with you that this must be changed, that individual users at the end should be accepted [inaudible] whatever we want by ALAC in the same way as the ALSes. I agreed with that.

But, to do that, we need to change the rules of procedure not only for ALAC, we need to go and change the rules of procedure of all the RALOs. That will take time. What we can do is approve this, and in the meantime, have a to-do list that we need all the changes in the RALOs in order to change this. Then, in ALAC, in two years' time, one year time, six months' time, whatever the time, we decide that we need [inaudible]. I guess it will not be six months. We have more than a year discussing this in LACRALO. It takes time. But, if we don't change it [out], it goes in the air. What said before, it's in the air. You don't know who approved it [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Right now, we have a speaker queue of Bartlett, Humberto, and Tijani.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm sorry, I put this before [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. We have a speaker queue of Humberto, Bartlett, and Tijani who will not be speaking now because our guests from SSAC have arrived. We will find a place somewhere in this agenda to resume the discussion, but really, this cannot be a discussion on how to handle end users. This is a discussion on documenting what it is today. So, please. This session is now adjourned. I have been informed adjourned means it not ended, but will resume sometime later. It will resume sometime later and I would like to welcome Rod and Julie who I'm told are somewhere behind us.

For those who really want to speak on the last subject, I really feel that if we invite people, we should try to keep on the schedule that we set when we invited them. I know it's a funny quirk of mine.

On my right, we have Rod Rasmussen who is the chair of SSAC and a newcomer we've never met before, Julie Hammer, who says she's the vice chair of SSAC. For those who don't know, Julie has been our liaison to the SSAC and a full SSAC member for the last bunch of years. We were very sad that she decided she wanted to take on other duties in SSAC and leave us. I cry every time I think about it. And we're delighted to

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

have Andrei Kolesnikov who is our new, former ALAC – well, still an ALAC member for another few days and now our new liaison to the SSAC, and as normal a full SSAC member. I will turn … I'm sorry. No one tells me what's going on here. I'm on my way out and they don't really bother telling me anything anymore. Andrei?

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Yeah. Well, we do have a few SSAC members here [inaudible], so please, raise your hand. [applause]. So, let's begin. We don't have a lot of time, so Rod, please.

ROD MASMUSSEN: Thank you. I must say – and we do thank you for sending [Alexi] our way. He has been …

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: I'm Andrei. That's okay.

ROD MASMUSSEN: Yeah. Andrei.

ALAN GREENBERG: Andrei, Alexia, whatever.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Well, it's good you're not calling me [Kollectniko].

ROD MASMUSSEN:

This is going to be the theme for me at this meeting because this morning I was meeting with the Board Technical Committee and I took three names to [inaudible] properly. I'll try and get the acronyms correct. Thanks for having us, Alexi. We're now going to call you Alexi.

Andrei has been doing some really valuable work for us already and jumped in wholeheartedly and has really been quite busy, so we appreciate that.

So, we're going to run through the standard information that we have. I know there's particular questions and issues, so I want to try and get through just the normal update stuff really quickly and then we can dig in on some of the other things that are of interest to ALAC in particular. I know that, over time, things change within ALAC and within SSAC, so that we do need to keep people up to date on what's happening and just some basic facts.

We have a few publications we've done since our last time together which we want to talk about those. We have our review that is about to finish up and then just some general things that are going on. So, we'll cover that.

We're at 39 members right now, 103 publications. That's what that number is supposed to say there. And doing our normal bit on SSR and that includes lots of different topic areas which we will dig into some of those today. But you can see on the list there and you can take a look at the deck that should be available to you. If not, we'll work that out through Andrei. Get it right.

The standard process for us, which actually is one of the things we're going to be talking about internally is how we respond to some of the more interesting and short-term requests we've been getting. But our standard process is we have a topic, we form a work party, we do a lot of research, use staff and potentially even bring in outside experts. We review and approve that within the working party. Then that goes to the full SSAC and that gets published.

So, anything that comes out of SSAC has had a full review of the entire SSAC. Then, if there's any withdrawals or [inaudible] and you can see those are transparent about that part of the process. But you can take SSAC documents as the consensus of the full SSAC.

So, we've had these publications recently. We're going to have all these covered within a presentation here and we can dig in on any of these in particular.

One of the big items from our perspective and it affects the ICANN board is that Ram Mohan is now stepping down in his liaison role. He's been on for a long time. Honestly. I think he's the longest-standing board member. He's not voting, of course, as a liaison but he is stepping down and [Merica Kayow] is stepping … I don't know if [Merica] is in the room. No. But many of you know her. If you don't, you will see her running around now working on obviously the SSR issues that SSAC is interested in within the board and the Board Technical Committee, in particular.

So, here's the current work we have going on. The Name Collisions Analysis Project which I know, Alan, you wanted to dig into a little bit.

We have our own review. We've got an Internet of Things work party and emerging security topics that we're actually giving a presentation tomorrow at Tech Day on IDN homographic attacks. We've been seeing actual activity in this ramping up, so if that's of interest, it's been a theoretical thing for a while.

And of course the DNSSEC workshops we're involved with and obviously we continue to do outreach for new members and we do appreciate, as I said, getting Andrei involved but I know that we are looking for members from more diverse geographic regions and the like. So, if you know somebody who might be a strong person in security and has an interest, please forward recommendations to us or recommend that they go and get some information. We are happy to provide membership materials and the link to prospective members.

Okay, going forward. We just completed our annual workshop in LA last month. We went over many things, including what are the things we're going to try and concentrate on working on going forward. So, some of these are new and may be of interest to many folks here.

Our own working process we're taking a look at because we've been getting a lot of requests for quick turnaround on opinions on particular topics which is not a normal SSAC type of thing. We typically form these work parties around technical areas or security issues and threats and dig into it and take months to crank something out and may not even put out an output. And we've had several work parties that haven't ended up publishing anything. But we are getting requests, so we're taking a look at how we can be more responsive and interactive with

the community and provide more ability to respond to issues that are of concern in real time – quasi real time, that is.

We also are taking a look at various issues around DNS privacy, DOH which is DNS Over HTTP, various things that are fairly hot topics. [The hyper local] root is another thing where we may be taking on some issues around. DNSSEC key management. When it comes to how these things are managed through the registry/registrar process for people who have, say, multiple DNS providers or want to make changes and things like that. There's some impediments there that we want to take a look at. We still have on our dockets taking a look at take-down procedures. There are some interesting things that people are doing in some of the new TLDs are very specialized that bring up their own security issues.

Then, taking a look at abuse in new TLDs and understanding why we've seen some of the patterns that we've seen, especially if you've had an opportunity to take a look at what the DAR that ICANN has put together that did domain abuse reporting tool has shown some interesting trends there. We want to take a look at why and get into the details of why we're seeing abuse in some TLDs and none at all on others, for example. So, that's an area we want to take a look at into 2019.

So, let's talk about the publications we put out so far. Russ, if you have a couple minutes, just to run … Russ Mundy was one of the co-chairs of the work party. If you want to just run through the KSK roll. It happened. The world didn't end. We all know that. Apparently, there was a little dust up in Ireland but hopefully they were all out having a pint of

Guinness at the time and didn't notice. So, Russ, do you want to run through that real quick?

RUSS MUNDY:

Thanks. Yeah. I was one of the co-chairs for this work party in the SSAC. The board … The background on it, this is one of the events that, as Rod mentioned earlier, that we were asked to look at, certainly for an SSAC perspective, on a very short-term basis. The question was discussed formally before it was actually issued as a board resolution, so when it came out in May and had a specific deadline in August, that's for us a very short turnaround on something of this nature.

So, when we were asked to look at it, the actual resolution that came to us was maybe a little different than what was expected, so we hadn't been able to really start heavily in advance. But what they were really asking for was an evaluation and advice on the plan for resuming the KSK roll, so that was in fact what we and the other two advisory committees responded to.

So, the board did approve the going forward with the plan in mid-September and the actual key roll occurred. So, from a timing perspective, and again, from other things SSAC has worked on, it's really quite unusual for us to get a request, issue a response, and then actually occur and be completed in such a short timeframe. And that's the case for this. Okay, next.

So, what we issued in SSAC 102 was indeed a document that contained the consensus view of SSAC which was that there was nothing that was

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

within the SSAC scope of review that indicated any reason to not proceed forward with the key roll itself. We also, in our advice, suggested that ICANN address quickly in the future the framework for what will be used for future KSK rollovers. So, don't just do it once and forget about it. Start talking now about what should be done next and the timeframe for it.

Third, an assessment that basically said this is a risk-based decision that really does remain with the board, so this is the position that the SSAC issued here. Next.

So, in the report itself, in SSAC 102, there's a dissent section and we have in SSAC discussed this a fair bit, and indeed we generally have come to the conclusion within SSAC that it's very good, very useful to have dissent sections for a particular topic and this was one where, especially since it was a risk-judgment type of thing where some of the members of SSAC had a different assessment of the tradeoffs between the risks of going forward and the risks of delaying further.

So, before we actually published it, some of us had gone back through and there have been other SSAC documents that had dissents in it. We think that it's probably a very good and useful result to include both sides of the picture when there are some views that aren't totally consistent as far as what action should be taken next. Next. Okay, so that's it.

ROD MASMUSSEN: Thank you, Russ. I'm going to pause here for any questions on the KSK roll. Go ahead, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much. During that KSK rollover, I actually happened to be in India which was one of the countries that has some multiplication of number of ISPs and very diverse levels of Internet connectivity. It's interesting. Immediately after the KSK rollover started, there were reports in the press about the Internet actually having to shut down for 48 hours which, interestingly so, made the front pages of course, because Internet shut down for 48 hours is no small news. Yet, the events were more informational war than actual fact-based events. Fact-based facts. Yes, exactly. There could be un-fact-based facts. Or fact-based fibs.

The thing, though, is the SSAC in general has not been one that involves much politics and having to push for things and so on. Have you found this to be a limit as to the work practices or have you found that the ICANN communication and the work between SSAC and ICANN communications department has been good enough to actually dispel all these fibs that were sent out there?

I note that a spokesperson from ICANN was immediately available to answer the questions and the follow-up article the next day was like, "Don't worry. The Internet is not going to shut down and everything is fine." Any thoughts on this?

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

ROD MASMUSSEN:

Let me just speak at that from an SSAC perspective because I think that's more of a general SSAC question. And it's an interesting question, too, because we weren't really involved once we provided advice with the actual work that OCTO did and the like. We now have a new communications director and we are meeting with her shortly over this week.

It's an area that I think could actually stand for some improvement around making … And it's not that SSAC is going to be [pining] on something in real-time, necessarily. Our processes aren't set up to do that, necessarily. However, I as chair can probably weigh in on some things when it comes to something like what you just mentioned there. That's kind of a no-brainer as far as being able to answer. Does the Internet really need to shut down? Of course not. Those are the kinds of things where it might be useful, but we typically don't act in that fashion as part of the standard ICANN communications process, but there are some areas where we're looking at how we can do a better job of communicating what is contained within our recommendations and opinions, etc., to the greater community.

A lot of the times, the papers come out and we may do a video about it or we may have something that goes on, but there isn't really much of a follow-up. Thank you for the question, though. That's interesting.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET:

I just want to say congratulations for it worked out. Nothing went wrong. I just want to express that I'm very happy of the process that happened, that eventually we all start talking about this and

everybody's concerns were voiced and none of our fears came true, thank God or thank you or thank tech.

I guess I have a question. What was the worst thing that happened, percentage-wise? Do you know that already? Did it cause any real problem at all or anything you could say?

RUSS MUNDY: Let me do a little bit of promotion for our DNSSEC workshop on Wednesday, because in fact, one of the sessions that we have I believe it's at about 11:30. I don't remember the precise time. It's around then. We will be getting from the OCTO group their feedback and perception on how things went. And as Rod mentioned earlier, with respect to the communications, we issue our reports and that represents the SSAC view, but there are also many of us on SSAC that individually are very active in participating in the community and were indeed watching multiple channels of chat and discussions that were going on at the time.

For the most part, it looks like the biggest problem was there were some places that did not have the proper configuration set. As soon as they were identified, people worked with them. They responded.

Personally – this is just Russ Mundy now – I think the biggest problem that occurred was the misinformation that came out in the press.

ALAN GREENBERG:	But to Olivier's original question, it shows how inaccurate the press can be. Ireland demonstrated it was only a 12-hour shutdown that it was going to cause.
ROD MASMUSSEN:	Okay. Let's move on to SSAC 103 – thank you, Russ – and that is a response to the Subsequent Procedures PDP. In general, we had – just as a general comment, we had concerns that the PDP is moving a little too quickly. We have the NCP project itself that was commissioned. Not commissioned. It was requested from the board to take a look at name collisions which is a part of any kind of input to moving forward with the next round on how to handle those items. Then, of course, the CCT review came out with some pretty important recommendations around SSR that touches on our bailiwick. We had some concerns around that.

Then, of course, there's still some outstanding issues from 2012, including some of the things that we're going to be doing on NCAP that need to be resolved. So, that was a concern.

We provided direct comments on several areas where we had previously done work so that we could reiterate those. I must say that the subsequent procedures team did really do a good job of going through and looking at prior SSAC work, so we were very happy about that and I believe we commented on that. In general, they paid a lot of attention to the things that had been said before. Some of the things we had were more [knits] than anything else in there. But in general, they did a pretty good job of looking at things.

One thing that they did miss, though – and this is where this ties into the discussion about work party we had was around domain name abuse that occurred within some … It was a minority, but some very significant rates of abuse within some of the new TLDs. When I say significant, I mean over half of some of the new TLDs were highly abusive on the registrations. That's a problem. That's an area we strongly believe needs to be looked at and understood, so that any subsequent procedures can try and tamp that down. You're never going to squeeze all the abuse out of the system, but we certainly shouldn't be seeing a large number of TLDs operating with a majority of abusive registrations within them. That's our slide on this. I'll take questions about SSAC 103 in our response there. Do you want to run the queue, Alan?

Okay. To make it clear, for those who didn't hear me, half of a particular TLD was bad. Most new gTLDs were not problematic at all. [inaudible] [brands], a lot of restricted things, and a lot of people did it right which also the DAR showed that quite nicely. The problem comes from some TLDs, a majority of them, was used for abuse. Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Information. How much more do you have after this?

ROD MASMUSSEN: Some minor stuff. Then I want to talk about NCAP.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Okay. We have 20 minutes left in the session and we already have a speaker queue of about five people, so I ask people to try to keep it as short and concise as possible. I have no idea what order they went around, so we're going to go in clockwise order, starting with Satish.
SATISH BABU:	Thank you very much. Satish Babu for the record. I come from India and I have two questions. One is on the IDNs. Indian communities [are very] excited by the fact that IDNs are going to come in a big way, but there have been some questions raised on the security aspects, especially when it comes to variants at the top level. So, I'd like to know your very brief take on the risks and the advantages of having the IDN TLDs. And if I may take you to the previous discussion, there was a fair amount of panic in India about the rollover. One question that came to me from the field is that when is this likely to occur again? The next rollover. Just for clarification. Thank you.
ROD MASMUSSEN:	Okay. So, on the latter question, that's one of the discussion points we want to have is what's the plan going to be. It's probably going to be a matter of, I would imagine, years, but we don't know yet. But that's one of the things we put on a recommendation is talk about the planning [now].

As far as IDNs, I think we've said several things about that. Alexi … Gosh dang it. Now I'm going to have that stuck in my head. Andrei, would you |

like to … Since you're sitting right here, would you like to talk about that a little bit?

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Yes, Satish. Just to respond quickly, if we talk about the IDN security issues, there is good news and bad news. The good news is that the IDN domain names environment is much more secured because there is no e-mail carrier to deliver some bad things over the e-mail.

So, if you compare traditional ASCII and IDN, IDN is in the safe zone, definitely. But, the bad news is that we don't have e-mail working. That's my quick response.

ROD MASMUSSEN: And I would say, in general, the SSAC is very supportive of the IDN initiative. There are many … And we spend time in Tech Day and all that going into the esoteric details of where this becomes a risk and all the [inaudible] and there are a lot of different parts of work, not just here but IETF and other places, where those issues are always looked at, but there's always going to be challenges. The thing we [inaudible] Tech Day is one of the risk areas. So, if you're interested in that space, take a look at that. Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm going to skip over myself to start with. Olivier?

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I think Hadia was before me.

ALAN GREENBERG: Clockwise.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Clockwise. Just kidding. Thank you. Quick one. You mentioned here you're concerned that the PDP is moving too quickly on the subsequent procedures. Mentioning here that all of the recommendations, CCT review final report has just come out and all the recommendations need to be implemented. Issues from 2012 round need to be implemented. Are you planning on writing SSAC advice on this or what are your plans for communicating?

Just before you answer, reminding you – and I'm not sure whether there's a bit of a memory on this – but I think it was in Durbin where the ALAC and the SSAC wrote a common statement regarding dot-home and dot-corp, these things, where the ALAC is able to actually write statements. I think it was back … It was Durbin. It was a long time ago. Okay, so then there was something from the ALAC asking for the SSAC advice to be looked at a second time because the SSAC advice had been overlooked by the board. We did do that, sorry. My mind is a piece of cheese these days. Was then as well, but it's just gotten worse. The holes are getting bigger.

So, the question was whether this might be something to consider as well or not. I do hear some worrying things from some members of that PDP that say, "Oh, if we don't find consensus on some of these issues,

we'll just revert to the 2007 AGB, Applicant Guidebook, findings," which is very scary for some of us.

ROD MASMUSSEN: Yeah. So, we made our public comment. We used the public comment process to make the statement. If there's further questions or issues or we don't see something particular like the domain name abuse issue being addressed, we'll probably put something out at that point. We have no plans at the moment to follow-up on this particular one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So, you've talked about the abuses in some of the top-level domains and that you've been looking at that and looking for the reasons behind that. My question is how are you attempting to do this from a technical?

ROD MASMUSSEN: Right. To be clear, this is proposed work. We aren't doing the work yet. But, to answer your question, taking a look at the analysis that the DAR project has put out is a place you can look for actual data. Many of the SSAC members are involved in anti-abuse efforts and the like and are very familiar with the space, so there are a lot of different organizations that have been publishing data around this, whether it's an industry organization like Anti-Phishing Working group or the M3AAWG, the Messaging, Malware, and Mobile Anti-Abuse Working Group or private

companies like [Cerbil] or folks like that that provide data around that. There are lots of places where you can go. Even academic papers have been published in the space. So, there's a lot of material to work with. The question is collating that and understanding the reasons.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So, basically, you're depending on material or publications made by others, but you're not attempting to do your own collection or whatever it takes to track those abuses.

ROD MASMUSSEN: Okay. To be clear, I was just providing some examples of where we might go for data. We have not formed the work party to do this yet. As part of that, we will explore where can we get data, who can we talk to, what are the … For example, one of the hypotheses that's out there – and don't take me as saying this is the problem, okay? One of the hypotheses out there is that a very low cost leads to abuse. There have been some studies around this. We can actually go and get some data around that, most likely, but that is not necessarily in existence today. That's just one example. Now that's putting more [inaudible] up here, but I just wanted to make it clear. If we do a study like this, we're going to make it fairly comprehensive and try and get to data that may not be actually published somewhere else already.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Javier, we're going to have to move on at this point. Most of what I was going to raised has already been raised. I was just going to

point out that, as a very active member of the Subsequent Procedures PDP, I personally have received flack on a semi-regular basis because the ALAC has made a very strong statement saying wait for the SSAC to do its work. And there are lots of people who say, well, that's fine if you'd finish in the next six months. I know you're looking at your overall work plan and it's next on or later on your agenda, so I want to allow a few minutes for you to actually talk about that.

The CCT Review that has finally come out has some pretty strong stuff in it, and together with what you're saying, I'm hoping they're going to have to address it. How is difficult. As you point out, I think it's more than a mere hypothesis that if you give away domains, people will use them for things that they wouldn't if they had to pay for them. But we don't set prices here normally. So, interesting challenges. I'm going to turn it back to you to keep on going because I really do want to get to where you are in NCAP before we kick you out and before we leave.

ROD MASMUSSEN: Let me just do that because I realize that as I was reviewing things this morning we didn't actually put a slide for NCAP up here. So, let me just talk to that right now because that is actually something that we, as of this morning, things have progressed on that.

So, to give you an idea of what happened, where we're at and what's going on with NCAP. So, the Name Collision Analysis Project is what NCAP is. We came out with an initial proposal before the Panama meeting. We were asked to work with OCTO and develop or fine-tune that plan because it was, we'll call it, a first draft that was done all

internally by SSAC without … Well, we had a little bit of organizational help from ICANN Org, but without really digging into it, so we were provided some resources by OCTO and by ICANN in general to go through and we've done basically a full triage of the plan and we find that we have presented that back now to the Board Technical Committee. It still has the same main phases of reviewing the current research that's out there, commissioning new studies to understand why or what kind of collisions are actually occurring after providing a very fine-pointed definition of collision because one of the things we found is that there's a very broad definition, depending on who you talk to out there of what a collision entails.

Then, bringing that information in, understanding it, understanding why these things are happening and then a final phase of taking a look at mitigation methods around dealing with particular types of collisions and how they might be handled technically or from policy, etc. So, that basic plan is still in place.

There's a couple of items of actually how to manage the project itself, who does some of the work on it. OCTO is going to take on, depending on approvals from the board and all that. But the plan is that OCTO would take on a couple of roles. One is part of the technical and management of actual contractors and stuff that would need to be done for some of these studies. SSAC as an organization has no actual standing to hire anybody or do anything like that, nor do we want it. That's not really an advisory committee's role, especially as all volunteers.

We are also looking for OCTO … OCTO is the Office of the CTO, by the way. I'm using the acronyms without explaining them. It's within ICANN. Dave Conrad is the ICANN CTO.

OCTO would take on basically the responsibility for making sure the project is driven to a schedule. Having a volunteer organization like SSAC, and I'm sure you can relate, trying to deliver a set of complex deliverables on time, on budget, and on schedule while not getting paid and being asked to do lots and lots of hours of work is probably not going to happen. So, that has been … We've worked out a proposed management structure for that where the work and the management of that is being done by OCTO, but we are the technical experts and the architect of the plan and making sure that the data, etc., that's coming out of that is what we need to make the analysis, to make the recommendations. So, that's how the plan is coming together.

The good news for the board was that we were able to do that and really reduce the cost substantially from what we had originally proposed out there.

Given that we've just given that to the board, we're not going to get into the details of what that looks like because we still need to make sure to … This literally just happened this morning. We had a meeting with the Board Technical Committee. It was a very positive meeting. We had a really good discussion about both the structure and how we've refined the plan and all that. So, they've got that in their hand and we're going to be obviously working back and forth with them to finetune a few things that have come up. Hopefully, that will turn into an action by the

Board Technical Committee to the full board to then approve a project moving forward with the authorities and the budget and all that attached to it.

All those mechanics will be kicked off as soon as we finalize this, but that should happen over the next few weeks at the most, I would say based on where we are today. Julie, do you want to add something there?

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks. Just to add that on Wednesday at 3:15 PM in room 111-112, it's the NCAP public session which we'll be briefing on the status in a bit more detail.

ROD MASMUSSEN: And we may be able to get into a little bit more of the details there. Because we literally had just had that meeting this morning, I'm not quite ready to go into full details. I've given you a pretty good idea of where we're at with that, so I'll take questions on NCAP and where that is and what you think or any concerns or questions you have. Okay. Alan, I bet you have a question.

ALAN GREENBERG: No.

ROD MASMUSSEN: Alright. Terrific. So, that gives us five minutes. Let me just see. We've got a few more. I don't know if it's still working here. Okay. Liman, I'm going to just run through this real quick. Liman is one of the co-chairs – wave, Liman – of the review team. The final report has been published, those recommendations, and that's out for public comment until December something. The standard seven-week process. The third or fourth, something like that. In general, that's gone very smoothly for us. It sounds like we were lucky in that regard. I've heard something from other ACs not to be named. Had some really good feedback that we're already working and we will then … Once we get the final public comments and all that, we'll take that and work that into our whole desire to take a look at our own processes. The timing works quite well for us. Any questions on the review?

ALAN GREENBERG: Congratulations.

ROD MASMUSSEN: So far, so good, unless something really surprising comes in. Excuse me. I seem to have this same cough that Goran and Cherine and others who talk a lot – I'm sorry, Alan. I've had this cough for two weeks, so hopefully not too contagious at this point.

We are doing an Internet of Things thing, which I think we've talked to you about before. Just to give you an idea where we're at, and I think we're going to be pushing this out by the end of the year. We're in good shape. But we want to raise awareness of DNS's role in IoT, how that

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

fits, and take a look at how, in particular to the DNS, there's some opportunities to mitigate risks. Those things could have been tool sets or standard libraries and things that are not necessarily being addressed today and then some things that people can do to protect their networks once they understand what kind of traffic is on them. So, we're going to try and finish a draft document here – [we have a] work party meeting on Tuesday – and then share that with the rest of the SSAC for full review, etc., and then push that out.

There may or may not be hard recommendations in this, but we thought that it would be good for us to at least bring some focus on DNS and IoT and that would be an area we could add unique contribution to all the work that's going on in IoT. Any questions on that? Okay. Oh, I'm sorry, I missed that. Go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE   I'm just saying that's fascinating and I really look forward to it.

ROD MASMUSSEN: Thanks. Julie, you want to talk about some of the other publications?

JULIE HAMMER: Yeah. Just briefly. Just a couple that we commented in the public comment on the ICANN's proposed options for both short-term and long-term reviews, and like many SO/ACs we're very stressed with the demands on our time to participate and contribute to the vast number of reviews that are popping up. So, we actually supported the idea that

the ATRT-3 should be held off until after the recommendations of CCWG accountability work stream two are implemented. We couldn't see the point of having both of those things happening in concurrence.

And on the longer-term reviews, we supported a more sensible approach whereby we limit the number of reviews that occur concurrently, the number of specific reviews, and support a change to the bylaws to allow more flexibility in that regard. The bylaws currently are pretty strict, as you all know, and it just does not allow flexibility and none of us can keep up with it all. That was relaying just general input to those processes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Since ATRT-3 it appears is going ahead immediately, are you participating or are you declining?

JULIE HAMMER: We haven't made that decision yet.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a quick comment. The problem with the reviews, at least some of them, was that you've got the AOC basically committed ICANN to some reviews and that makes it a little bit difficult to say, "Well, we don't feel like it," because we sort of said to the United States we would.

ALAN GREENBERG: As they were incorporated in the bylaw, it turns out under the AOC, although it didn't say it, the board obviously could negotiate with the NTIA and say, "Let's defer it," which they did. Under the bylaws, it gave no wiggle room at all.

For instance, on organizational reviews, it says that it should be held every [N] years, if appropriate but there's an "if". There is no such "if" with specific reviews and that clearly was a mistake.

ROD MASMUSSEN: I note that we're at the top of the hour. There's a couple more things we could talk about, but I'm going to be respectful of your time here. What would you prefer?

ALAN GREENBERG: Let me make an announcement, and then if you feel like speaking … We have another session starting here in 15 minutes, I think. Is that correct? So, we have a few minutes before we need to clear the room and let people get their lunch.

The announcement is the first 30 minutes of the session that is listed as CPWG which for reasons I don't understand said it was going to talk about the EPDP will be back on the rules of procedure. Then, we'll go onto the other items of CPWG. So, we'll be hopefully finishing rules of procedure in the session immediately after lunch and then we'll proceed. There is a discussion of EPDP. That happens, however, on

Tuesday after the public session, so everyone will be up to date on whatever the status of the EPDP is that time. Currently, we worked all day yesterday. There's another session later on this afternoon. The world may change by then. So, it makes no sense to have one discussing it right now. I haven't found anyone who understands why it got onto the agenda. So, it's interesting.

But, I'll turn it back to you for another few minutes.

ROD MASMUSSEN: We really didn't have anything else major to talk about. We also approved the CCWG. I don't know if you want to say anything about that real quick.

JULIE HAMMER: No. Just briefly, we've already submitted our support for the final report of the CCWG accountability work stream two recommendations and we had considered them all the way through, and therefore, we realized that there was nothing new in the final report that we hadn't already seen and we have already submitted our support.

ALAN GREENBERG: We also approved them. Slightly differently, though. We, too, had looked at them all the way along and approved the individual ones, but we did add a comment to our approval noting that, taken as a whole, they are an awful lot of recommendations which are going to be rather onerous on the organization and the ACs/SOs. Not so much SSAC,

perhaps, which doesn't really have a constituency it represents but the rest of us.

When you look at the staff issues, the corporate issues, and the AC/SO issues, the whole package is a little bit scary and it's not clear we have the resources. No matter how good they are, it's not clear we have the resources to implement them and it's too late to back down on the recommendations, but we did make a recommendation to the board that it's essentially taking a very light hand at the implementation and keep it as flexible as possible.

ROD MASMUSSEN: That sounds wise. Okay. Then, the very last slide, which is why I wanted to actually take a few minutes, is your questions, your thoughts on what you would like us to be taking a look at.

We obviously have Andrei as your liaison to bring those things to us, but if there's anything that you wanted to bring up here while you have a bunch of us in the room, we'd love to hear anything that you didn't hear about that we weren't think about that you would like us to think about.

ALAN GREENBERG: As the representatives of interest of users, malware, fraud, phishing, all of those things are of great interest because that's really where the utility of the Internet meets the dangers of the Internet. So, the fact that you already have most of those on your list to actively work on, I think certainly gives me a level of comfort that I might not have otherwise had. I think those are really, from our perspective, the issues that we

need to focus on, get a handle on them. It's not clear what ICANN can do in many of those, but we can't ignore them and that's really important.

ROD MASMUSSEN: Speaking of that, I think there are particular areas technically where there is a role, and when you take a look at things like DDoS attacks affecting the DNS infrastructure, when you take a look at things like malware command and control that uses automated domain registration as part of the way it works, those are all areas that we've either commented on or are areas of concern and interest for us. So, definitely [inaudible] my own personal background, as many of you may know. Those are areas that are near and dear to my heart as far as doing what we can, where we can, where it's within our remits to do so.

Anybody else with any other ideas? Go ahead.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Just thinking about this yesterday on emojis as TLDs. Any thinking on flag emojis as TLDs and the problems there? I'm in work track five, geo-names, and that has never been even discussed or mentioned. So, everybody talks about the angels and the different genders and races of the angels, which is a problem – zombies and Dracula. But, flags and the problems that could create.

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

ROD MASMUSSEN: Yeah. I think I actually have seen somebody do an interesting bit with flags because there are several countries that have the same flag, for example. This is his favorite topic. Let me preclude this by saying we still think emojis are bad as TLDs, regardless of if it's a flag or not. Patrik? TLDs are second level, anything.

PATRIK FALSTROM: One of the persons at SSAC that [inaudible] IDN issues. So, regarding flags, it's not as easy as you think because flags do not exist in Unicode as individual characters. Many of them are a combination of flags. For example, the rainbow flag is actually a combination of white flag, joining character followed by rainbow. That creates the rainbow flag. So, the rainbow flag is not a Unicode character. That's just one example. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think he was talking about national flags, though.

PATRIK FALSTROM: But it's relevant. A community like a gay community would be relevant, too.

ROD MASMUSSEN: As I said, it falls under the general recommendation [inaudible] using TLDs. It's really not a good idea to use them in SLDs, either, because they're identifiers, unique identifiers. You can't necessarily preclude somebody from making bad decisions, especially in the ccTLD space.

Just can't. You can give them really good advice on what they can and can't do with it, but if technically you can do something, somebody will find a way to do it. Mitigating the damage, I guess, is part of that, what we all have to do.

It's inappropriate to use something that you can't uniquely identify as a unique identifier.

ALAN GREENBERG: If someone recorded that, I want to be able to quote that verbatim. I think it's time for lunch. Oh, we have one more from Satish. Last comment.

SATISH BABU: Thank you very much, Alan. I would like to hear from you on your take on the emerging new non-DNS roots. For example, [inaudible] exist long ago but [ENS], for example, [inaudible] naming servers and the [inaudible] cryptocurrency based, blockchain based naming services that are coming up. I'm not sure whether they cause any kind of real threat at this point, but what's your take on the future?

ROD MASMUSSEN: There are a lot of unique and interesting ways people are trying to communicate and set up naming systems. That actually ties into a work party that we were going to set up and that ended up not happening because it was [inaudible] by events. But that's name space

management in itself. We have a name space, the DNS, but that's of a meta universe of potential other name spaces.

The concerns around where those touch on each other. So, name collisions. So, we have the name collision thing that we're doing within the DNS world, but that's often affected by some of these other things because they leak over, because computer software sometimes lets those things leak out because it says, "Oh, it's a label. Let me put it in the DNS." So, I think that's the concern area.

I think a bunch of that will be addressed in the NCAP project, but there are the evolutionary things. This is something that we're definitely following. No particular work planned right now but we are following.

ALAN GREENBERG: As usual, thank you very much for an informative, interesting, occasionally fun session.

ROD MASMUSSEN: And thank you for having us. It's always fun to be here.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018