BARCELONA – Joint Meeting: ICANN Board and SSAC
Tuesday, October 23, 2018 – 17:00 to 18:00 CEST
ICANN63 | Barcelona, Spain

RAM MOHAN:	My name is Ram Mohan. Neither Patrik or Rinalia on the transcripts.

This is the meeting of SSAC with the ICANN Board. We have a fairly substantive agenda to go through, so I'll go straight from where we are to that.

We have several items to go through. You see the list out there. And without further ado, I'll hand it over Rod Rasmussen, the chair of the SSAC.

ROD RASMUSSEN:	Thank you, Ram, and thank you to the Board for having us today. I'll put that up there. I think you know who I am, but just in case.

So we have several things to talk about today. We wanted to answer the question about our priorities for 2019, and as you might imagine, right at the top of the list is making substantial progress on the NCAP project, which we will dig into a little bit further into the hour here. We have an IoT and DNS security study that we're actually hopefully -- hoping to finish up by the end of this year, but just in case, we'll call it fiscal 2019, I guess. That's a priority to get that done. But that does leave us, along with some other work we've recently completed, the opportunity to start up at least three new work -- three new studies. One of the first of those, and based on a couple of items, but is looking

at our own working processes and trying to be a little bit more flexible and responsive. The standard SSAC process for creating documents involves forming a work party, getting together, getting data information, doing some studies. And then have that work party deliberate, provide that to the full SSAC, which then deliberates on that, and then there's an approval process to reach consensus, and then publish that. That often takes several months to maybe even more than a year depending on the nature of what we're studying. So we want to take a look at how we might be able to respond to some of these questions that have been coming in that have a more timely need for response.

We also have the SSAC review, which is in its final -- final part of completing. There's a final report out for public comment right now that's leading. Several of the suggestions in there are also around those processes. So this is a good time for us to take a look at that.

We also have possible work on the various DNS things: DPRIVE, DoT and DoH, if you're familiar with some of the IETF parts of that, but those are some very interesting areas of developing technology and potential threats to the namespace in a way. So we want to take a look at those.

There's some DNSSEC DS key management issues when it comes to interesting DNS environments, transfers, things like that where the registry/registrar controlling operational procedures can get in the way at times and make things more difficult. We want to take a look at that.

We also want to potentially look at the hyper-local root issues, pros and cons of things. And then we have an outstanding thing looking at

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

potential -- providing some ideas around takedown requests, especially at scale when it comes to things like domain generation algorithm botnets. And then one that we're keen to look at is taking a look at abuse in some of the new TLDs. I would note that most of the new TLDs were pretty clean and did not have many problems at all as far as abuse goes but some of them had extremely high abuse rates, and we want to understand that, especially when we're thinking about subsequent rounds and the things like that. We want to understand why these things happen so we don't repeat mistakes into the future.

And then a couple other things. As I said, I mentioned we had the review, and we're going to implement many things that we were very -- just for feedback, we were very happy with the review process in general, and we think we were getting very good comments and ideas to incorporate into what we do.

And then we want to do a better job of coordinating with the Board -- in particular, the BTC -- around what our studies and priorities will be as far as taking things on, weighing the needs of the community as well as the things we see coming up in -- as potential areas of concern that we naturally bring to the floor through our work.

So I believe that is the priority section. We're going to pause here for questions.

RAM MOHAN: Yeah, why don't we pause for questions. And, Rod, if you can go back a couple of slides to the start of the priorities. There you go.

Why don't we stop for a moment and poll the Board and board members for any questions.

One of the things I'd like to also invite is the incoming board members, to invite them to pose questions as well if they like, because literally in other -- less than 48 hours, they're actually going to be giving all these responsibilities to look at these issues.

Questions?

Okay.

CHERINE CHALABY: I do want to talk about the NCAP, but we're going to have it. Yes. Okay.

RAM MOHAN: Okay. Let's get going. Keep going, then, Rod.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay.

So first thing we want to talk about as far as things that have happened are the KSK rollover. And congratulations to all on this. It was -- there was a lot of -- a lot of things that happened in the last year since the roll was put on pause, and there was a lot of work that was done by ICANN org and outreach to the community, et cetera. So -- and basically, you know, it was mostly a non-event as we were all (indiscernible). So good job there.

What we do want to start thinking about is what we're doing -- what are we doing next? What's the cadence going to be? What are we going to do on a regular basis for rolling this key? And I think -- rolling the key. And we need to start having those discussions now, especially since we can get feedback from what happened in the world out there in the current situation. And the best time to learn lessons is when they are fresh.

I want to note there was a lot of outreach beyond the ICANN org that went on. VeriSign put out several -- talked to many ISPs. ccTLDs reached out locally as did a lot of the national CERTs. It would be a really good idea, we believe, for us to take a look at what -- not just what ICANN did but what these other organizations did. And it might be a good idea to start collecting some feedback from those organizations on their experiences and bring that in and use that as part of launching a standard plan going forward.

So that was the KSK rollover. Any questions or comments there? No. Just waving, David? Okay.

Good job.

On to the next bit. NCAP.

So we actually had a -- Just for a timeline here, the NCAP is the Names Collision Analysis Project. That was a year ago that that Board resolution was crafted for us to take a look at this question or series of questions, several questions around the issues involving name collisions and for us to put together a plan to address that. We did draft

a project plan that we submitted in March that went to public comment. Got several comments back on that. And in May-June time -- well, June time frame, we got direction to work with OCTO and ICANN org to refine that project plan, take a look at the cost that we thought might be involved, look at the studies themselves, what could be parallelized, what were the real kind of project plans that you would put together in a professional organization trying to do that. So we received a lot of really good assistance from ICANN org on doing that. We did triage on the entire plan, the NCAP admin committee, over a series of several weekly meetings to really refine that.

That revised project plan was submitted to the Board Technical Committee. We had a meeting on Sunday with them. It was a very good meeting, I think, where we got through a lot of the questions that had been outstanding and reviewed, you know, where we were at that point.

Now, at that time, they had just seen the plan for a very short period of time, so I'm assuming there were maybe some questions, but the next steps on this will be that the BTC reviews that proposal, and depending on some tweaks and things like that that may need to be made would make a recommendation to the Board, hopefully, on what to do going forward.

I want to talk about in particular -- well, I want to talk about three things. First that we refine the project plan itself so it is a very tight plan from a -- if you take a look at it from a project plan perspective. We also managed to reduce the cost significantly. Those numbers are available

to the Board, and you can take a look at that. At least the cost estimates.

And then the third thing was the management structure which we have up here, which we had been -- what we found, SSAC, going into this is we thought we were going to take a look at this, we were going to study it. Obviously there was a lot of work involved, so we're going to have probably some outside contractors doing some things. But as we got into actually thinking about how this would work, and especially as we sharpened the pencils over the summer on that, we saw that our basic fiber as a volunteer organization was not set up to do this kind of a management of a project that involves deadlines and management of outside entities, et cetera, that we would need actually somebody whose day job it was, literally, to make sure things were on track. And we were really struggling with how to make that work and how to make that fit.

So long story short, we've come up with this proposal here around a way of managing the project and the various roles that people would have and organizations would have. And you as the Board would be the customer, but we will put together a steering group where those various responsibilities that each of us, as SSAC, the Board leadership, our BTC leadership, and then the Office of the CTO would have, could all play their part in making sure this thing is progressed in a way that meets time, meets budget, meets expectations.

I'll go into some of the details here. As the -- The other top-level roles, OCTO would lead the project, own how that gets done, and SSAC is

really the architect of it and the technical advisor and the -- you know, the intermediate customer, as it will, as this project would go along.

So as you can see here. We've got this deck available for further (indiscernible). I don't want to read all of these things. But I think it's important to make sure at least this oversight Board steering group that we're talking about is that the roles are understood as to who has what. And then the -- So for technical advice that would be coming from SSAC, the personnel and management of any outside vendors and things like that that would need to be used for studies would be run by OCTO, and of course the Board has the purse strings. So that's where -- kind of if you take a look at that from that perspective. But we all three together have to work to make sure that we're meeting our budget and time and project goals; right? So that's the idea behind that.

And then here's some more details about what we thought the roles that SSAC and OCTO would take. Rather than reading that out, I'll turn that back over to Ram to run any questions we have.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, Rod.

These details have gone through in one preliminary discussion with the BTC, but the BTC has not actually organized a meeting yet to go through in any depth. And this is also being exposed to the whole Board really in any depth today for the first time.

So with that, there are two people in the queue. Jonne and then Cherine.

JONNE SOININEN: Yeah, thank you very much, Ram. And thank you very much especially SSAC and especially the NCAP working party. This has been -- We have had good collaboration throughout the whole process, but we've had the challenge, of course, that we've done some new code, so to say, in this; that what we weren't used to. And this -- the outcome, what has come out of that seems to be actually quite reasonable.

So just as kind of like a couple of points. So first of all, the disclaimer that I can promise you guys now anything because I'm gone on Thursday, and the people who are left behind actually have to deal with it. So take what I say with a grain of salt.

But just for the board members, a couple of points that I wanted to point out. So first of all, we had a little glitch in our internal communication with the Board and org on what is the status of this, and, therefore, we didn't have the full status report on this when we discussed this on the Board. And this -- But we have taken a preliminary look at this, or board members responsible have individually taken a look at this, plus we had a meeting about this on Sunday morning, as was discussed, where we discussed it with -- to understand it a little bit better, and we discussed it with the relevant SSAC members. So that is kind of fixed.

The -- Why I understand that Rod and the SSAC in general is really emphasizing this management structure comes from the -- our resolution from last year where we pin this basically on SSAC. And this is now that because in the discussions what we learned and how we

thought that not only SSAC but also on the -- in some discussions with the relevant board members and the -- and the ICANN org, there's -- there's role for the ICANN organization, especially when it's handling money and when it's who is responsible under those things in this. And, therefore, this management structure is so important that we have this laid out in the way that it's in the -- and I personally think this is, in the spirit of the original resolution, and it's something that actually makes sense and where we can think that we can get the results out.

But like said, we have just gotten the new project plan over the weekend. We haven't had a very in-depth look into that, and that is the next action for BTC to do. So basically the ball is now clearly on the Board's court.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, Jonne.

Cherine, and then Avri in the queue.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you. So this is really moving forward in absolutely the right direction.

I have two suggestions for this. One is because this is a project of reasonable size, also reasonable cost, we have created a small group called the project cost support team. It's a tiny group that works for the leadership of any project and gives reports all the time to, in that case would be the steering group and OCTO, on the cost expenditure; right?

And any progress against the work plan. It just is an administrative function but really provides -- it's like a PMO, Project Management Office, yeah? So I'd like to suggest for you guys to consider that.

Okay. The other thing I'd like to suggest is what is not clear from this is who is -- will be the full-time project manager. Who?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

CHERINE CHALABY: OCTO -- No, OCTO is an office.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

CHERINE CHALABY: David, who in OCTO has the time, you're going to appoint to manage this on a full-time basis?

RAM MOHAN: So, Cherine, do you want to finish all your questions or do you want --

CHERINE CHALABY: Those are my questions.

RAM MOHAN: Those are the two questions.

So, David, I'll come to you in a moment. Why don't we get to the first question. Then for the response to the second one, I saw Jonne's hand raised and David's hand raised and Julie's hand raised as well. No? All right?

Okay. So why don't we get to the first question, Cherine, and ask for an answer.

Rod.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah, I think taking advantage of that resource makes a lot of sense. We will talk about that in the NCAP admin but I don't see any problem with that. It makes the load easier.

RAM MOHAN: Thanks.

David.

DAVID CONRAD: With regards to the project management, stucky on this particular project. Right now we're making use of Dennis Chang and GDD to provide that service. Akram had promised to provide continued use of Dennis's skills on this particular project. I have not had a chance to sit down with Cyrus to see if that promise is being kept across regimes, but I assume it will be. So it will almost certainly be Dennis. If not, we do have some other alternatives to look into.

CHERINE CHALABY: Okay. Can we go back to that table, if you don't mind.

I would suggest after adding project director, project manager, Dennis Chang or somebody; right? So it is clear there is one person responsible for the day-to-day management of this project.

RAM MOHAN: I see Jay has an immediate response to that.

JAY DALEY: This is Jay Daley. There are two project lead roles required here. There is the project management, which is for Gannt chart management. Things get done, things happen, but there is also the bigger picture of understanding what we're trying to deliver, herding the cats, spending the money, those types of things. And it is specifically that level of things that had been something that SSAC had been asked to do that we're unable to do.

So Dennis has been available to us throughout this part. There's no change there in Dennis's role. This is the level above that that's required. Perhaps the program director role in an ordinary PMO terminology.

CHERINE CHALABY: I started following you and then I got confused. So the first part --

JAY DALEY: Yeah.

CHERINE CHALABY: -- of the -- we agree, but that's the one about the project cost support team, which is managing -- it's it doing the Gantt chart, doing this, doing that. Doesn't matter who but we need that. Who is going to be the project manager that has the contact who is managing this and driving this and making decisions?

JAY DALEY: That is being pointed towards OCTO by ICANN org, but that needs to be somebody who is sufficiently subject-matter competent around this. This is a difficult technical project.

CHERINE CHALABY: So it's not Dennis Chang, then.

JAY DALEY: No, it's not Dennis. Dennis is a marvelous project manager but this needs to be somebody who is at a more senior --

CHERINE CHALABY: So my question hasn't been answered, then.

JAY DALEY: No.

DAVID CONRAD: I thought you were speaking specifically of project management as in managing the Gantt chart.

What Jay is talking about is the sort of technical direction manager. That will either be someone specifically on OCTO staff or, depending on resources, we may need to bring in a contractor.

CHERINE CHALABY: So I suggest, put that here and make sure we fill in the name so that we don't miss out on it, if you don't mind. Thank you.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, Cherine. That becomes an action not for SSAC, that becomes an action for the BTC. Thank you.

Avri.

AVRI DORIA: I just wanted to say a couple things. First, really appreciate the effort that went into getting it to having the project management actually look at it, rationalize it, and all you guys work with it.

I think at the moment we're being a little premature in that we still have to review it. We still have to make sure that we have got the money for it. We still have to kick it off. So while it's really good to line up all of these really good people to work on it, I think that's another step down the road before BTC has actually evaluated it. Then we've come to the Board. The Board has said, yep, these millions of dollars are in the

budget and we are going to spend them and then we have to get all the others.

So I just wanted to say while I'm saying I really like it, I read it, it's good, I appreciate it, we're not quite there yet at starting it, in my opinion.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you. Other comments from Board members? Akinori, anything you wanted to add?

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much. Akinori Maemura for the record. I didn't -- I didn't make my comment for the previous part, not the NCAP part, but the KSK rollover.

So thank you very much for SSAC's help. You -- you had come up to the Board with your quite valuable input. And that was really helpful. And I'm really happy to have the KSK rollover exercise done.

So your comment is really appreciated. Actually, we, the Board, in this Barcelona workshop, we had a review session throughout a quite packed agenda. We had the one hour to review the KSK rollover because we will have another rollover in eight years. And we need to make sure the next rollover is still successful.

Then we are aware that we need to have the review of this time and then the suggestion to have the feedback from other entities, really appreciate it. And we will do that.

And then the Board itself is carefully looking at the post-process after the KSK rollover with the subsequent epoch with the key handling of the DNSSEC. Thank you very much.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, Akinori.

Ron, did you want to speak to the -- to the finance issue?

RON DA SILVA: Obviously this will be a task back to Goran and his team to figure out how to get it within budget and keep the budget fixed where it is. There are funds in, like, the contingency budget that -- to address projects that come up that aren't set at the time that we define the budget. So perhaps that might be a place that they'll look. But definitely we'll first ask Goran to go take a look at it.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, Ron.

Cherine.

CHERINE CHALABY: I think a project of that size has to come to the Board from two directions, one from the Board Technical Committee to say the project plans, the management, everything is right but also the Board Finance Committee need to look at the estimates to say is the cost reasonable and is it affordable because it is -- it is a very large amount above the

threshold of 500,000. So that needs to go through the approval, the regular approval. That's my suggestion.

RON DA SILVA: Of course. That would happen before we punt it over to Goran. Thanks.

RAM MOHAN: Thanks.

Rod, I think we are done with NCAP for this session.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thank you, Ram. All right. I will go -- Get the clicker here. So the next item we wanted to talk about we wanted to talk about is a little bit of a follow-on from that and that's interactions with the BTC itself.

We actually discussed this a bit in our meeting on Sunday, and we want to -- we are really looking forward after that conversation -- we had a really good conversation about having regular interactions and trying to schedule a regular set of meetings where the SSAC leadership and the BTC can get together. And particularly around NCAP, we have this steering committee that we're talking about where we'd have that on a monthly basis most likely.

But we would also look to have a quarterly meeting or so, try and coordinate that ahead of the workshop so that the BTC is aware of what's going on with SSAC, what we're working on, et cetera. And we make that a regular part of our cadence in going forward. I think that

would make sure we don't have any more glitches or anything like that and that we're really on top of our games.

And having the BTC in the first place was a welcome evolution, and we want to take full advantage of that. So if there are any comments on that.

RAM MOHAN: I'll pop that over to Kaveh and to Akinori as the two folks who are in the incoming/outgoing space and also to Lito who is going to be involved in a leadership role for BTC. Why don't I go to you, Kaveh, first.

KAVEH RANJBAR: So basically we had a meeting. I know that Akinori already discussed it. And there is planning within BTC. So I would like to leave it to Akinori to -- thank you.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much. Akinori Maemura for the record. Yes, I am incoming BTC chair. So I definitely need your help.

[Laughter]

Please. And then for the help, the periodical interaction with SSAC is really, really important for us to do -- for us at the BTC to do our own business because these days, we have a lot of interaction and a lot of input from SSAC side. And that's -- the valuable input should make full use of in the entire Board. And then the BTC is in charge of that kind of

technical input from the other entities. So really appreciate this interaction -- regular interaction to be made. Thank you.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thank you. Let me comment that I think this is an opportunity for us to help each other know what we're thinking in a more regular basis, and communication is always good and especially when you're talking about highly complex technical matters.

RAM MOHAN: Lito.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, Ram.

Excuse me. This is Lito Ibarra. I am currently the vice chair of the BTC. And we still have to define in the new scheme how we're going to work. But certainly I will be cooperating closely with Akinori and the rest of the BTC in these matters.

Personally, I'd like the proposal there that which we meet at least once a quarter. And whenever there is a specific project such as if this gets going, NCAP, or other like that, we can have these monthly meetings to stay updated every time. So we can accomplish our charter of letting the Board know where we are every time.

Thank you.

RAM MOHAN:	Thank you.
	Are there any other comments on the proposals from the BTC? Cherine.
CHERINE CHALABY:	On the last bullet point, I really want to thank you. This is an excellent step forward, and I think it will help us a lot as we move forward. Thank you very much for doing that.
ROD RASMUSSEN:	Okay, great. So two topics on this slide I wanted to talk about. Just to give you a brief update, we are actually working on a revision of SAC101 that we're going to be publishing shortly after ICANN63. We actually just made some progress on that in the hour before we came here.
	We want to provide some clarifications around the recommendations we made and ensure that there's context so that the -- what we're talking about has been -- is easier to ingest and work with. There was -- we received some informal feedback on that to the point where we wanted to provide these clarifications.
	This should be out shortly. We're not changing the fundamental nature of any of our recommendations whatsoever. However, we did want to update the way we were making those recommendations. So we'll see that shortly.
	Then the other thing is the EPDP, just wanted to make the Board aware that we are following this very closely within SSAC. We have a work party formed that actually does support of our two appointees to the

EPDP. And we are keenly aware of SSR issues and making sure that the EPDP is as well.

So any questions on either of these two topics?

RAM MOHAN: Akinori.

AKINORI MAEMURA: My name is something -- Akinori Maemura for the record. The revision is -- what is the point of the revision basically, roughly speaking?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Sure. So we had received some feedback around the way some of the recommendations were presented where the recommendations would be very difficult to implement or were touching on areas that probably were difficult for the remit that we have to square with. So taking that feedback and wanting to make sure that the recommendations we have provided, which were very subtly behind, were actually enacted or had a chance to be enacted. We wanted to make sure the language was such that would not get in the way of actually implementing things.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much, Rod.

Akinori Maemura again.

Thank you very much. So that's really clarified.

And then I appreciate the SAC101 otherwise, which is really helping the next round for getting it better.

And another point is having the appointee -- you appointed to the EPDP activities quite fundamentally, you know, rational to make full use of the SAC101 intelligence into the process. Again, appreciate that. Thank you.

RAM MOHAN: Other comments from this unusually quiet Board?

[Laughter]

All right. Rod, let's move on.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay.   We want to talk a bit about SAC103, which was released in part of the public comment process around the subsequent procedures preliminary report.

So two main points here. The first was a meta comment we made around the fact that we think that this is moving along a little quickly.

We have the NCAP project which we haven't even kicked off with yet that is in our remit that is an important input into subsequent rounds, at least we believe.

And then we have -- the CCT review came out that brought up some substantial SSR issues that probably need to be taken into account. And, of course, there are a few outstanding issues from the prior round.

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

So those are some of the main points in that. I wanted to bring that to your attention.

 The other thing that we made extensive comments -- I do want to say that that working group did a really, really good job of looking at prior SSAC recommendations and really bringing those to the fore. We were really impressed with the quality of the work that the subsequent procedures group did in that regard and quoted SSAC documents extensively. So it's probably -- probably some of the most citations we've ever seen in any document.

So that was very good. We made some specific comments on -- you can see a list of things there that were included in that document and made some clarifications and some -- and the like. But those in general were -- we thought they did a very good job.

There was one area where they did not touch on, and that was what I mentioned earlier, we were talking about a work party around abuse in the new TLDs. And that's an area we thought was a gap. We made that comment in our feedback that really understanding where -- where and how that abuse came in to affect some TLDs so dramatically really needs to be understood as far as the process I mentioned earlier in our conversation. You don't want to repeat the same mistakes, especially when it has a reputational effect that doesn't only hurt those particular TLDs but in talking to a lot of cybersecurity experts and people who defend networks, that painted with a wide brush.

So the fact it's only a few had a really bad problem actually affected the ability for other TLDs in the new gTLD program to get resolution in some

networks or more importantly email attached to them to be able to get through.

So really want to understand this. So we solved those issues, at least the ones we can identify, as input into the next round. And I'm sure there will be some questions on those.

RAM MOHAN: So I see Avri, George, Cherine, and Maarten in the queue.

Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Thanks. It's actually kind of entertaining to come up and stand at a microphone. I actually haven't done it at a while and I like it.

It's actually interesting hearing that it's moving too quickly. I spent most of today being talked to by people who were complaining about the glacial speed and how we have to hurry this on, how we have to get various parts of it moving quickly, how .BRANDS, .GEOGRAPHY, vehicles, dot whatever, are ready to go now, no matter what. So seeing it move too quickly is good.

I think that the CCT review is being taken seriously by the group. It's definitely on their schedule. They're going through it. I think that's part of what makes it so slow for the other folks that are waiting for it because they will take those things seriously. They will go through them all and deal with them to some extent.

In fact, they have been talking about many of them for half a year to a year since the draft report came out.

So I think it's important to sort of look at the reviews -- I mean, the reports are coming out with the drafts -- and see to it that they are, you know, taking these things seriously before they move forward. So obviously the comments coming in from SSAC on the various drafts that come out will be worthwhile.

But, you know, there is a certain pent-up demand. It is getting stronger by the minute. And so I think to try and slow it down would probably be difficult, but I think there's about another year to go before they're actually ready.

So I just wanted to say that, that finding the right speed and the right balance between going too quickly and going too slowly is pretty much what we're living with.

CHERINE CHALABY: Avri, Avri, sorry. This is what we call a two-finger, right? I am concerned when I saw this list that we haven't learned our lessons from the first -- from the previous round where -- let me explain a little bit. That a new round is launched and, yet, there are outstanding issues that are fundamental issues. Name collisions is one of them.

It looks like -- it looks like it will not be resolved maybe in time for the one year that you mentioned. Others as well. Did I -- did you say this can all be resolved within the next year, or we should go full steam

ahead because there's pent-up demand and then we sort those ones out later? Which one of the two?

AVRI DORIA: Both of them. First of all, name collisions, I already had SSAC come and say that this name collision part of the NCAP is not being done for the new gTLDs, that they really need to work this out on their own, how to deal with them.

And I think that they will. They're dealing with, you know, degrees of collision danger. They may not know which things fall in which bucket and such; but they will know that there are buckets, that there are degrees of collision.

They're going through reserve names similarity. Those are things that they're working on. IDNs, those are things that they're talking about.

Now, whether IDNs have been truly resolved in terms of, you know, of universal acceptance terms of universal acceptance, I think waiting for new domain names until universal acceptance is, indeed, universal would, indeed, be problematic and it isn't something they should do.

They are working on all of these things. There's also a certain aspect at which many of these things will never be 100% solved. There will always be a certain amount of improvement coming down the road, constant reviews, but I do believe that they are learning from 2012. They went through, you know, not quite hundreds of issues but close to 100 different issues of different problems that have been seen and are working on them. It's important that they get comments that the work

that they're doing is up to par, is meeting the issues. But I think that to -- to take the side of the fence that says, you know, it will never be perfect, therefore, we should never have any more domain names could be quite problematic. To say, you know -- so I believe that the work that they are doing is improving things immeasurably. They will take CCT fully into account. They have already been talking about it.

So full steam ahead? No, that would have been last year. I think that, you know, making sure that they look at all this stuff, that the GNSO does full diligence to make sure that things have been dealt with, that we then do full diligence with the advice of SSAC to make sure that things have been dealt with, and that the risk is tolerable is really what we have to aim towards. If we're looking for perfection and our risk appetite is -- is minimal so that we cannot take any risk on things being -- you know, the unknowns unknowns, then, you know, yes, we will stop. But I think that that's impossible. I think we need to move forward.

CHERINE CHALABY: One quick response. I don't disagree with you, but I think the one thing we don't want the board to do is to make policy.

AVRI DORIA: We're not making it.

CHERINE CHALABY: No, no, no. Sorry. If and when this -- a next round is launched and there are still outstanding issues, I think we need to have a process recommended for dealing with those as -- as and when they arise and not leave it to the board to then make policy at that time because this is what happened in the previous round.

AVRI DORIA: No. And I certainly agree with that, and I think the GNSO understands that and wants that.

CHERINE CHALABY: Okay.

AVRI DORIA: That issues will come back to them.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, folks. Next is in the queue is George.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Somewhere in Avri's intervention she has covered my point.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, George. Next in the queue is Cherine. Next in the queue is Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I now know why these microphones are this height. Perfect fit. Just to say that very much -- I mean, very aware of a next round at some point is going to happen and that these points are crucial because even if you look outside and the rest of the community will need to benefit from your experience here, whatever we make needs to be trusted and needs to be usable. So domain name abuse, very important, crucial. Very happy you added that. And reserved name strings similarity, these are the stumbling blocks we found. So yes, please, urge and don't try to keep them too long. But for sure make sure there's solid advice. We're dependent on that.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you. I have --

GORAN MARBY: Sorry.

RAM MOHAN: I have Ron in the queue next and then Goran.

GORAN MARBY: I have a question for the board –

RAM MOHAN: Goran.

GORAN MARBY: I have a question for -- I'm speaking on my personal capacity. I have a question for the board and SSAC. Could you please tell me the status of the project between SSAC and ccNSO regarding implementing ICANN board resolution or refinement of similarity reviews related to .EU and Greek.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, Goran. Rod, did you want to take that?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Is there an SSAC member who would be a little more qualified to answer that question?

GORAN MARBY: I agree with Avri, this is great.

[Laughter]

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Patrik Faltstrom, SSAC. I was chair of SSAC at the time and got the task together with Katrina, the chair of ccNSO, to work out the issues regarding -- the issues that were just talked about. There have been a couple of rounds of discussions regarding the EPSRP documents, and I think that we are relatively close to have an agreement of what the outcome is.

At the end of the day, though, I think everyone involved, of course, knows that we talk about EU and Greece and Greek and the -- and the

overall problem there is that if it is the case that you continue to look at confusability rules according to the ccTLD fast track rules, it will be very difficult to find a way to properly approve that delegation because of confusability. And increasing the number of appeals panels will just make things difficult. So at the end of the day we end up in a situation, I think personally, which Avri also was talking about, is the question of what kind of risk appetite there is. So if ultimately specifically when we look at one specific delegation there will be someone that just needs to make a hard call.

GORAN MARBY: Thank you. My name is "Brian" for the record.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, Goran. Ron? Cherine? Okay. All right. Rod, on to the next topic. I think we're -- we don't have any -- any other comments on this topic.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah. Let me add one more comment on this topic that, you know, at the end of the day this is all a risk management question and we're going to identify risks and give you recommendations around dealing with them and you're going to get other input from other parts of the ICANN community. I think that the -- there are a couple of things that will be -- we will be fairly vocal about and from our perspective, but at the end of the day it's going to be all about managing risk when it comes

to your decisions around when and how and if to launch another round of TLDs.

 I will say that the last issue on there, the domain name abuse issue is one that we're going to be particularly strident about as far as getting that examined.

 Okay. The last item on our list is that we now will be having a new board liaison, Merike Kaeo, and Ram has now completed ten years of service to the ICANN board representing -- representing SSAC, and we would like to congratulate and thank him for his service for all these years.

 [Applause]

 Ram is now in the queue.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So Merike, you have ten years to go.

[Laughter]

CHERINE CHALABY: Can I just say something on behalf of the board and for the record, that Ram has been a truly outstanding board member. I think he performed his role as a liaison to the SSAC -- to the board from the SSAC impeccably, both ways. One informing the board of what's happening within the SSAC and also keeping the SSAC abreast of the board activities that matters and are relevant to the SSAC. Ram as well has

been not just a liaison. He got engaged in almost every aspect of the board, demonstrated leadership, and more recently he led our work on the strategic planning exercise, which is to develop the new strategic plan for ICANN, and that's in a way one of his departing legacy and gift to the ICANN board, is bringing the community together and coalescing around a new strategic plan. So we want to thank Ram so much for everything and your contribution. Frankly, you've been outstanding, and I want this on the record. And every board member will echo the same feeling. So we really appreciate it. Thank you so much.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you.

CHERINE CHALABY: And to Merike, welcome aboard. You're on day minus 2. Not yet on the board, but Merike had already attended two board workshop and she's already making a very strong contribution. So we look forward to you being on board. And you're different to Ram so we'll have a different liaison. Don't try and emulate him. You've got to be yourself, which I'm sure you'll be very successful. And we're really looking forward to working with you and you being an integral part of the board and our future. Thank you very much.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, Cherine. Thank you, Rod. And thanks to all of my board colleagues and to all of my SSAC colleagues and folks here in the community. It's been a -- a real honor to serve, and as I've said this

EN

several times, this is really about public service and this is really about providing the best of our abilities for the advancement of the greater good and the greater goals that we have, you know, for the Internet and where we want things to go. So it's been a real honor and a privilege. I have been humbled by all of the words that you've said, and I look forward very much in the next couple of days to change back to being a full-time SSAC member and not the SSAC member who's also the liaison to the board. Thank you very much. Any other business? We're adjourned. Thank you.

[Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]