

---

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone, and welcome to the ALAC and SSAC meeting on Tuesday the 19th of October 2021 at 19:00 UTC. In order to save time, we will not be doing a roll call today. However, attendance will be noted from the Zoom room as well as on the audio bridge.

We have Spanish and French interpretation on today's call. If you need a dial out to the Spanish or French line, please send a direct message to staff with your preferred language and phone number.

Before we begin, I would like to remind everyone to please state your name when taking the floor each and every time and to please speak at a reasonable pace for accurate interpretation and to please keep your microphones muted when not speaking to prevent any background noise.

Thank you very much. With this, I will turn the call over to Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Michelle, and welcome, everyone, again back to another At-Large session, this time to participate in our joint ALAC and SSAC meeting, something we're going to be a little bit more rigorous about ensuring that it's on our program more regularly than we have over the last few meetings. Apologies to Rod and the SSAC team for this omission. But certainly want to get back on track in the future.

We've got a really great session, and I know that Andrei has actually introduced these documents we're going to be discussing today at a

---

*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.*

---

CPWG meeting. And there was quite a good response to that. So it's really important that we get the good oil from the SSAC team directly. And I know that we really do appreciate that we really do need to have this regular contact to make sure we're up to speed with what developments are happening with the SSAC team.

But in order to get the show on the road, I now pass over to Rod, first of all to introduce his team and of course, I note Andrei will probably take over most of the moderating of this session. But Rod, a few words before we initiate the presentations and the discussion and Q&A with our CPWG team that will follow. Over to you, Rod.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Okay. Thanks, Maureen. And Andrei, I don't know if you had the desire to introduce members individually, or if you want, I can just run down the names of folks who are on from the SSAC.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV:

Well, first of all, I would say hello to everybody, and I'm really happy that we recalled the old tradition of the ALAC and SSAC meetings. The introduction will be very short. We're going to be talking about SAC 118 and 119, and our speakers today are Rod of course here and Tara Whalen and Steve Crocker. So let's move on and save time. Thank you.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Thanks, Andrei. I'd just note too that it's always a pleasure to interact with the ALAC. We had a lot of common topics, discussion over the last

---

few years and you guys ask the best questions when it comes to the reports we put out, etc. So we do really appreciate that and all the support you provided and helping get the word out about some of the work we've done. It's very much appreciated, especially getting it all around the planet so to speak.

Okay, if we're ready to go, let's go ahead and dig into the presentation here that is available. And we'll cover those two documents that we have spotlighted for this particular call. Okay, so I'm going to hand this over to Steve Crocker to talk about sac 118. Go ahead, Steve.

STEVE CROCKER:

First of all, let me say thank you very much. And Rod's comment about you guys asking the hard questions brought back vivid memories of being invited to the so-called skillet sessions at the end of the ICANN week when I guess in my role as Board chair, I would get invited to sit with some set of people, I think the leadership group of ALAC, and indeed, the questions were quite direct and forceful, but very well intentioned and I always found that quite refreshing and looked forward to it.

Okay, Tara Whalen and I sat in the EPDP temporary specification phase 2A working group. I'm sure you all know exactly what that means, but for anybody who has trouble remembering all this, EPDP means expedited policy development process. Expedited is to be taken with a grain of salt because it's measured in years, not days. And after it completed its work, they decided that it wasn't completed and they needed to do it again, so they characterized the first version of that as

---

phase one and they started up phase two, completed phase two and said, well, we're still not done. And I think there was some resistance to acknowledging that they needed a phase three, and so they created phase 2A. I've lost track of exactly how much time from the beginning of phase one to the end of phase 2A, but as I said, it's measured in years, not days, weeks or months.

Focused on two key issues. One was whether or not the legal status of the registrant should be obtained and used in determining what to do with registration data. And by legal status, I mean differentiating between a natural person—that is what you and I would call a human—versus a legal person, what you and I would call a business.

Very detailed conversations, because among other things, a lot of registrants might be small businesses that are indistinguishable from a person, and how do you reconcile all that with protecting the privacy of the individual that's involved? And reconciling that with the GDPR requirements which are focused on protecting people but not businesses and so forth.

Out of all that, it became a little bit clearer that really, there are two somewhat separate although entangled questions. One is the legal status of the registrant and the other is whether or not there's actually personally identifiable information involved.

We went back and forth about all that, the whole working group went back and forth about all that. And kind of a spread across how much to protect the privacy, how much to make available to support important activities like particularly security research which is of SSAC concern,

---

and also not carefully spoken about but clearly an important aspect, which is, how much trouble is all of this to implement?

And trouble comes in multiple forms. The cost of implementing, the cost of operating, and the risks of trying to make those distinctions and what happens if you're wrong about all that. No clear results came out of that, but I'll just speak very personally about it. I looked at all that, and I said, you know, one of the reasons why there's so much wrangling about all of this is that the people who want the data who could legitimately get the data if there was a well oiled system for making requests and getting answers and adhering to whatever the requirements are for protecting the data and how it's handled and all that, that doesn't exist.

So there was quite a lot of pressure being exerted to try and make as much of the data publicly accessible as possible. And again, I'm going to be trying to speak just personally about all this. In my mind, I thought that was kind of a weak approach in the sense that even if you succeed in making as much as possible public, it wouldn't get you all the data that you need to get, and it put a lot of weight on a lot of distinctions that might be very hard to get right.

So what we did from an SSAC point of view is twofold. As part of our participation in the working group, we made comments within the working group and again filed minority reports and participated in the public comment process, but we also took this last point that I've said and packaged that up in a separate document that became SSAC formal document pointing out that what's missing in this whole process outside of the charter of the phase 2A working group is the big picture of how

---

do you get access to all the data for the people who need it, and how do you do that efficiently, quickly, cost effectively and so forth. And that remains undefined and a big hole in the system.

So that's the major message that we got across. Tara, would you like to add anything to this?

TARA WHALEN:

I think that was an excellent synopsis of where all this is going. I'll also take a moment to thank our fellow folks who were around as part of contributing to the process. We had so many stakeholders working on this over a series of, as Steve said, years. So to have had the patience and the fortitude to keep things moving, I did want to take a moment to thank the folks who dedicated time to moving this effort ahead.

STEVE CROCKER:

And Jeff Bedser, would you like to say anything as well? Because you'd also been associated with this for a longer period of time and most deeply and focused on the needs of the security researchers.

JEFFREY BEDSER:

Thanks, Steve. It's an obvious issue when you're trying to tie activities back from the actual registration of a domain to the entities involved. And as a result, the ability to quantify the entity as a real person or a business or even an obviously fake entity is really important in an investigation to determine who is responsible.

---

But on the other side of the same coin, not all things are solved by knowing who did it. Sometimes just knowing that it's not a real person is enough to take action without trying to determine who is the real entity behind the activities or the abuse.

STEVE CROCKER:

I think if we move forward to slide five, I covered that in what attributes have to exist for an effective facility to support access to nonpublic data, and then slide six is what we said regarding formally requesting legal versus natural persons, and then slide seven moves on to the other half of the report which I'll speak briefly about now if we're done with the first part.

So the other half of what the working group spent time on is feasibility of using pseudonymous e-mail contacts, and again, I think there was a fundamental conflation and confusion. On the one hand, there was a desire to provide a way to contact a registrant without disclosing the registrant's e-mail address. So a lot of discussion about whether a web-based system is good enough or maybe the best idea or whether there should be an indirect e-mail, and if there's indirect e-mail, whether it should be done by generating a cryptographically generated e-mail address that would translate into the real e-mail versus just having a forwarding service by the registrar.

All of that was related to whether or not the registrant can be contacted. A separate issue which is related in part to what Jeff just referred to is, can you tell from looking at multiple registrations whether or not there is a commonality in the registration? And in

---

particular, can you see if the same e-mail address is used across multiple registrations?

And it would be useful for those purposes to be able to see the same e-mail address even if you don't know what the real e-mail address is. So if you could get the same pseudonymous e-mail contact, then you would see that multiple registrations share that.

That turns out to be complicated. It's not too hard to do that within one registrar. It is harder to do that across the entire registration system, across registrars. But more particularly, that's separate and distinct from the desire to be able to have a way of contacting the registrant. And a lot of the discussion about pseudonymous e-mail contacts had really these two very distinct purposes conflated and caused a lot of confusion.

From SSAC point of view, we basically said this is in effect an overreach, an overload of trying to do too much, back off and start over, is the bottom line. And with that, again, I'll reach out to both Tara and Jeff and anybody else—I didn't see who all is listed here on the call—who wants to comment on that.

TARA WHALEN:

I think that was a good summary. This is one thing that SSAC likes to do, is to work on requirements and be crisp about them. And this is definitely, I think, one place where we felt there was a use in teasing apart those two threads in order to make progress on the different goals that we had that were being, as Steve said, overloaded into the contact information, the pseudonymous e-mail contact.



STEVE CROCKER: Jeff, anything to add?

JEFFREY BEDSER: No, but thank you both, Tara and Steve, for the very informative structure of this.

STEVE CROCKER: Anyone else want to chime in, any questions about all this?

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Hadia, go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. Just on bullet number two, you mentioned registrars should deploy or continue to deploy methods to support registrant-based e-mail contact. And I'm not sure that any of the registrars are actually doing that. Are they?

STEVE CROCKER: I guess I don't know enough to know what the common practice is across all the registrars. But I guess I could offer that I wouldn't be surprised. I'll just leave it at that. Anybody else want to say anything? What is current practice?

---

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Because I guess what actually we were trying to debate all the time, trying to actually say that it is good to have a registrant-based e-mail contact, and I don't recall that any of the registrars did actually confirm this.

STEVE CROCKER: Yeah, my guess is that there wasn't a lot of pushback on the idea of doing it in principle but there's a lot of resistance to how much work they want to put into what they implement and a lot of issues about how well it actually works.

One of the stories that was repeated over and over again was that some of the registrars had implemented web-based contacts and the web forms weren't all uniform, and some of them didn't provide very much information, didn't provide a way for the person making the request to say very much about what they were trying to accomplish. So the registrant would receive a piece of e-mail that was not very information, and that would bias them towards not responding. So some operational issues of that form.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I think that they were mostly looking for registration-based e-mail contact and not registrant-based e-mail contact. This is basically what they were advocating for, registration-based and not registrant-based, I think.

STEVE CROCKER: Let me ask what you mean precisely by registration-based.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Like per registration and not per registrant. So if you have a registrant who actually registers multiple domain names—

STEVE CROCKER: I see. Well, but it has to go back to somebody so it goes back to the registrant for that registration. But I think what you're saying is that when it arrives at the registrant, they would know which registration it's for.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes. If it's registrant-based, it's different because you could actually from that registrant-based e-mail contact get all the registrations that that registrant actually makes.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Anonymized e-mail used to be relatively common with some registrars actually changing the anonymized address every week, every day, whatever to try to prevent it from being used for spamming. In other words, when you collect the address, it may work today but it won't work tomorrow. But in the last year or two, pretty much all registrars seem to—at least the large ones seem to have gone to webforms. And webforms with often very little capability of actually

---

sending a message with content and almost I think very rarely allowing the subject to have any content in it. So it's become close to unusable for actually contacting a registrant, although technically you are getting something to the registrant, but not necessarily anything useful.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you, Alan. And this reminded me that I should have recognized you a bit earlier. As I mentioned, with respect to the EPDP phase 2A report, there were a number of minority reports filed. ALAC filed one, we filed one, and I think I counted up eight in total.

I decided to see if I could assemble the minority reports in an organized fashion with respect to just the legal versus natural set of questions and reached out to everybody. And Alan came back to me quickly yesterday and I was very pleased about that. So thank you, Alan, and I'm waiting for responses from the others. There are some nuances there that even if each of the parties that filed the minority reports got exactly what they want, do they understand what the consequences would be? Anyway, I wanted to try to assemble all that and maybe that would be helpful in some of the deliberations.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV:

Greg Shatan, please go ahead.

GREG SHATAN:

Thank you. Maybe more of an observation than a question, but first, it seems that the difference being highlighted could be distinguished as the difference between anonymization and pseudonymization where

---

there's a single pseudonym for a registrant whereas an anonymization, you would never know if you're dealing with the same registrant. So I think there was at least a hope of some parties or some stakeholders that there would be essentially pseudonymization and not total anonymity for registrants.

I think one of the problems with the web-based forms was that they didn't show any e-mail address at all. It was simply you were communicating with the registrant of a domain, but there was no indication, there was no association of any e-mail, pseudonymically or anonimically. It's just writing to the black hole of that registrant, which is a very effective way to separate the identity completely of the registrant from the registration, which of course is really not what I think is intended here by most. Thanks.

STEVE CROCKER:

Yeah, we had some discussion about those kinds of things, and one of the problems is trying to get uniformity of the pseudonymous transformation across registrars. I'll just leave it at that. It's a slippery slope in terms of the amount of time it'll take to discuss all that and would get into areas that I would need to call on a few others like Warren and others in SSAC to help out.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV:

I don't see any more questions. There's a chat going on if anyone is interested to follow it. Rod, are we moving forward or staying with the same subject? Thank you, Steve.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Let's go ahead and move forward, Andrei, and if folks have questions, but them in the chat and also, [we can always circle back.] Let's go ahead and move forward, which means we're back to Steve again.

STEVE CROCKER: I'll try to be much shorter about this. With respect to SAC 119, this relates to feedback to the GNSO transfer policy review PDP working group. This working group is focused on revisiting the rules governing transfer of registrations from two separate cases. One is transferring a registration from one registrar to another and the other is transferring a registration from one registrant to another and looking at whether auth codes are sufficient and the implications of GDPR, etc.

The ground rules for that working group are a little bit different from the ordinary ones that are operating on a very fast-paced schedule. In their request to SSAC—and Rod, I'm putting words in your mouth so correct me if I'm wrong—the way in which it was requested didn't allow SSAC enough time to go through our full processes.

The net of it is that I raised my hand and I said I'd be interested, and I got accepted as a subject matter expert, not necessarily a formal representative of SSAC, which I was comfortable with and happy to coordinate back and forth with SSAC any which way, but ... So that's at least a formal distinction. I don't know how important it is substantively.

---

MAUREEN HILYARD: Steve, let me interrupt for just a moment. It actually wasn't a timing issue as much as it was a process issue with the GNSO requesting formal representation from the SSAC and all other SO/ACs that would formally represent the positions of those organizations, which we as SSAC and many other of the SO/ACs don't have a process for doing that. It's much more of a process issue.

As a result of that, we came up with a solution around having an individual member—added a technical advisor and subsequently then the other conversation with GNSO. I believe we're going to see different approaches and requests for participation going out to other SO/ACs. This is something we've been talking about amongst the SO/AC chairs. That is kind of an important distinction. I think it's kind of important for the ALAC to understand that because they have the same issue that we do in that it's hard to formally represent without standing up a big team and other things behind the scenes. Sorry for the interruption.

STEVE CROCKER: Yeah, and it may actually be relevant for ALAC as well, being [inaudible].

ROD RASMUSSEN: Right.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. The reason why I raised my hand is because I had a very specific interest that I thought might be helpful to pursue, which his the following, that in moving a registration from one registrar to another, what happens to the DNS service that is involved? Very often, as we all

---

know, the DNS service is provided by the registrar. Doesn't have to be. Plenty of cases where registrants have their own internal DNS operations or they outsource it to a third party, but there's a large fraction—maybe a majority—where the DNS service is provided by the registrar.

So if that DNS service is provided by the registrar and you're moving to another registrar, typically you have to move the DNS service as well because it's provided most usually as no extra cost, just part of the service.

Further, in the event that you want to maintain continuity of service, DNS resolution, and even further if it's a signed zone so there's DNSSEC involved and you want to maintain validation, then things get to be fairly tricky. And there are some rough edges in the protocol structure that make this not quite automatic. So I wanted to take the opportunity to sit in that working group and raise that issue.

I can report that they were quite respectful and listened, and then said, "Gee, that's not where we're focusing our attention." But I got the message across and I listened, and there will be other opportunities to deal with this particular thing. And that was my primary purpose in getting in there.

Jim Galvin is also participating from the Registries Stakeholder Group perspective, and he's also deeply familiar with the DNSSEC issues. And so on slide nine which I hope is what's showing, the first sub-bullet about DNSSEC is the one I just covered. The second one represents something that he was concerned with properly about increased risk of



---

hijack if the AuthInfo code is not managed according to security best practices. And I believe that they are paying some attention to that. Thus endeth my report on SAC 119.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV:

Okay. Any questions, comments? None. Rod, back to you.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Okay. Thank you for both of those reports, Steve. We have open discussion at this point. I wanted to take this opportunity to congratulate the ALAC on the really excellent session you had earlier today—I attended that—on DNS abuse, brought in a bunch of different voices, etc. on that. I thought it was a really interesting discussion—there wasn't a whole lot of discussion, there was a lot of presentations. However, I thought there were some commonalities and themes that were really good to see.

One of the things I wanted to highlight on that was that there was a lot of agreement, I think, amongst the various people who gave presentations in that session around some of the problems that we highlighted from the SSAC's perspective in SAC 115 around standardizing things around incident reporting and handling evidentiary standards, etc. So I wanted to take an opportunity to point out that we talked about that in prior sessions with the ALAC earlier this year—or was it last year? With COVID, it's hard to tell.

But we have discussed that a bit, but I find that very interesting, that there's a common theme and set of elements running forward that

---

everybody is discussing around those problems with lack of standardization, lack of the ability to act on reports, etc. because of the nature of how they're being reported and the contents of those reports. So I think it bodes well that we're all talking about the same issues, and I agree with the sentiment at the end of that, that it's definitely time for action and moving things forward. It's good to see things like the DNS Abuse Institute and other efforts going on from various parties to standardize things and have discussions around best practices.

Next question then becomes, how do we get that out so that more people are aware of it and start honing their skills and moving towards a world where we can far more efficiently deal with these things? And I think that also ties into some of the things that you said about access to WHOIS information as well because it's a related topic of how do you automate that, how do you do that at scale, how do you do that in a way where data being moved around and transferred is done efficiently and with all the [inaudible] etc. We'll be talking more towards that, I think that was one of the things we tried to emphasize in our 118, is let's get talking about how do we handle this data and make it actionable for the folks who are trying to deal with these issues at scale. So that's tying a couple different things together with the work you're doing in the ALAC and what things we're looking at in the SSAC. So that's just a little side commentary.

Were there any topics or questions, etc. of interest in the SSR space broadly that ALAC would like to bring to our attention that we may not be focused on right now that the SSAC might want to consider doing some work on? It's always one of our favorite questions, which we would be looking at. I'll throw that one out there.

STEVE CROCKER: One of the things that's been truly bringing me joy [inaudible] and it's always difficult for me to choose [inaudible] because they are awesome.

ROD RASMUSSEN: That was interesting.

STEVE CROCKER: My apologies.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Just jumping in here at the moment. I'm just opening it up to our members. I just noticed that Jonathan isn't here. And so we just needed to—I know that there was a lot of discussion and I wondered if there was something that anyone wanted to raise with regards to what you've heard or what you may have wanted to continue on from discussions that you had in the CPWG. Anyone who was actually at those meetings.

Goodness gracious, Steve, I don't know, I do remember those skillet session that we've put you through in the days when you were the Board chair, and I thought that Alan might have mentioned something about that. But I'm not quite sure what Jonathan had actually proposed. He's only just come off the DNS abuse call, so I'm not quite sure what happened here.

---

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Maureen, I remember one topic which we had during the past meeting, a follow-up on how many recommendations did the Board follow up, kind of tracking table of adoption of the recommendations and how fast do they act or how far behind. This was a topic called by Olivier, and as I remember, he said it would be interesting to compare the progress of Board resolutions and decision on both stakeholder groups, how do they follow it, that kind of stuff.

MAUREEN HILYARD: And you're right, and I think that was actually the way the discussion I thought would go with Jonathan and Olivier, but for some reason, they're not here. I see Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm certainly here. Can you hear me?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, we can hear you now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm certainly here but I don't know what Jonathan was going to bring forward, unfortunately. I think maybe if I could just say a few words, one of the things that we've seen in some of the expedited PDPs and particularly in the one on the gTLD registration data, is that the ALAC and the GAC and the SSAC, and effectively, the advisory committees have been aligned on a number of points, and we've found—in some way, we've had some frustration in our community with regards to what

---

consensus was finally called upon, whether it was the correct consensus or not. And in fact, we were—I can't even say surprised. We were not surprised but just felt somehow—well, it's kind of surprising without being surprising to have so many minority reports and so many minority views in dealing with some of the points that we're all in agreement with each other.

I know historically, the SSAC produces SSAC advice, then doesn't really come back to it afterwards, doesn't really lobby for it afterwards. Has this position changed in the way that the SSAC has approached the EPDP on gTLD registration data? And second, is there anything that the ALAC should be or could be reminding the Board or whoever it is that it needs to remind regarding some of the SSAC advice that was received relating to this topic?

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Thank you for that. A couple things on just SSAC process. we do speak through our documents, that's very much been the tradition since the beginning. Steve started and Patrik and I have tried to continue that through our chairmanships as well. And that does limit you a bit in things like advocacy and the like.

What we have done though over the past several years through the relationship with the Board at least is the advice register where we track what happens with advice, where it goes, whether it gets implemented [and the like,] that was brought up earlier with your own processes.

And that has improved greatly over the years. So we do follow what has been done with advice. That doesn't mean it's going to be accepted or

---

acted upon necessarily, but somebody has to make a decision on that and so if there's some advice that's out there that has not been acted upon yet, we will follow back up with the appropriate—whether it's ICANN staff or the Board or it's been farmed out to one of the other policymaking parts of ICANN, then we can follow up with them on that, which we do do to make sure that the advice we've given is understood.

And we found over the years that sometimes what we think we said is not how people interpreted it when they read it and we've had to go back and provide some clarification and the like. And we have done some revisions of documents or come out with newer versions of things that we had worked on in the past. It's not like—the world of security and all the Internet infrastructure [that we look at] changes over time, so we do review older work and it does need to be updated on occasion. So that's not something that's set in stone as it were over forever. We will turn around and look at things, make sure we're up to date on advice from time to time.

I think that answers the various questions that were involved in your comment. I'm happy to talk further.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Rod, just one more thing, actually. And I think I didn't allude to it, but I guess I might as well put the finger on it, which is the recent efforts by Steve Crocker in the EPDP on gTLD registration data to assemble “a composite picture of the EPDP phase 2A minority reports” that everyone has submitted. And I wondered whether there was anything that could be said about this. Perhaps not the reason behind it, but I

---

guess the point that we need to find some kind of a consensus on this, and a number of organizations—and we've seen for example Lori Schulman in the previous call being frustrated regarding the EPDP phase 2A recommendation as not being balanced. Is there anything that the SSAC is likely to come up with further advice on this based on the positions that are now compounded by Steve, or is that just a purely working group operation within the EPDP?

ROD RASMUSSEN:

I would categorize that particular effort more as a working group thing. That does inform us on things as well. I think in this particular area, we're probably going to be focusing on—if we're going to provide advice, it'll probably be around creating a workable SSAD model of some sort focusing on getting real solutions to the data access problem, and I think focusing efforts there where we can actually contribute something that moves the ball forward is probably what we're going to be doing. I don't guarantee that because like any other work, we have to get enough people interested in it and the like, and I think throughout ICANN, there's been a lot of burnout on this particular set of issues. At the end of the day, the problem still exists around getting access to the data for those with valid reasons for having access, at least as far as our remit goes, for dealing with security issues. And that has yet to be solved and we're going to keep working on trying to be helpful and solving those problems, put it that way.

And to your earlier point too, we often have a lot of alignment between the GAC, ALAC and SSAC. And I know we've had informal discussions

---

around that when we're all involved in things. Which is really helpful for helping everyone understand problems and the like.

As a final just process thing though, the SSAC does do its work through its own publications, so that's why we typically don't sign on to combined letters and the like. But you will find that the language will be, if not identical, very similar in our own pronouncements when we have those discussions [which we're aligned on those issues that we are.]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. I guess we are in the Q&A part of this call, of this meeting, and I'm in charge of getting the questions and so on. So I see Hadia Elminiawi has put her hand up. Hadia, sorry for the delay.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Olivier, and thank you to the SSAC team. Just to confirm what you were saying in relation to the EPDP on gTLD registration data minority reports, as Steve mentioned, we had eight minority reports. And just some statistics in relation to requiring the creation and use of a common data element, five stakeholder groups out of the eight actually thought that a common data element should be created. Also in relation to the anonymous registrant-based e-mail address, five stakeholders out of the eight thought that registrant-based e-mail address should be recommended. But again, there was no consensus in relation to those two topics. Thank you.



---

ROD RASMUSSEN: [inaudible] question in there, but the observation is interesting. And at this point, it's a GNSO Council problem to deal with. Speaking for the team that supported the work of our members of the EPDP—which changed over time, as those of you who were involved in the process—many of our members participated at one period of time or another in all that work. We didn't have anybody do the whole thing through, but we did have a work party stood up behind that that did.

And quite frustrating, the whole process. I think—it was well known throughout the ICANN community and trying to do better is certainly a goal that I think all of us share. The question is how. I don't have any good answers for that at the moment. But I would say that the way we went about doing the EPDP, as Steve mentioned earlier, “expedited” was hardly the word. Extended, egregious, erroneous, I don't know. another E word might be better. But hopefully, we can learn from mistakes made there and do a better job going forward.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Rod. My Internet has gone down again, so I don't know if there's anybody else in the queue. No doubt someone will tell me about it. I had a question in the meantime, whether the SSAC is also looking at some of the other EPDPs—whatever the E is—and is looking to partake in writing SAC advice on these. I'm speaking for example of the one that deals with some of the label generation rules that we've seen, some of the other topics that are currently coming for EPDPs.

---

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah, that particular one is interesting. We've had quite an interesting internal discussion in the SSAC on that particular one. We do obviously look at various things like that, especially when there's a call for cross-community participation and when things are of a technical nature like the IDN label generation rule topic is. Other things out for public comment, etc. that [inaudible].

On that particular one, it is unlikely that we're going to have a formal participation. We are discussing how to provide some feedback to that working group around the challenges of doing some of the things they're targeting doing without having put together an actual [work item] that we're ready to talk about. I'm not going to try to get into some of those details right now, but suffice to say there are some really interesting and fairly difficult challenges involved in some of the things being proposed there, which we will try and provide advice through some mechanism to try to help at least provide some input into that process. Steve, do you want to chime in?

STEVE CROCKER: Yeah. Nothing with respect to IDNs or label generation and so forth, but there is also a recently initiated accuracy working group and I've been participating in that, but don't take that as a signal that I personally intend to participate in all things GNSO or EPDP.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry, I misheard. Was it S-something?

---

STEVE CROCKER:                    There's an accuracy—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:      Accuracy. Sorry.

STEVE CROCKER:                    No problem.

ROD RASMUSSEN:                    I was going to point out on that one, if you paid close attention to the way the GNSO made the request for participation, that was as individuals rather than as a formal representative of each SO/AC which was much more useful for us to be able to say, sure, we've got people interested in doing that and we can participate that way when that model worked quite a bit better.

So when there are things of that nature where there's a technical or security aspect, we are definitely looking to try to get one or more of our subject matter experts to participate or at the very least provide some input into the work that they're looking at that could be taken onboard.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:      Thanks, Rod. I was going to ask about one last thing, and you touched on it, actually. That was to do with the way that we organize ourselves when it comes down to the new format for PDPs when in the past, people took part in PDPs as individuals which certainly suited the ALAC

---

as well, and now we have representatives on the PDPs. I'm not saying it doesn't suit us, but it's had our community having to organize itself so as to be able to find the volunteers that will be able to take the amount of time to take part in all the calls in a quasi professional way and then report back to our Consolidated Policy Working Group call that we hold every Wednesday and then act in this way. Has the SSAC also had to adapt its working practices for these PDPs?

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Yeah, we did for the EPDP on domain name registration information. That was a very key one from both an ICANN overall perspective and from our perspective as looking out for the security community and having the ability to do the things that keep the Internet working, at least for most of us. But in general, we are between 30 and 40 members depending on the current volunteers. By the way, we're always looking for more, so please come to our open meeting, we'll talk a bit about that on Tuesday next week.

But yeah, I don't think we're changing our ways that much. My feedback to Philippe and the GNSO on this has been that if we've got subject matter expert on a technical thing, we'd much rather do what we did with Steve as an invited technical expert or have the participation request be not so specific towards representation. We just don't work that way and I don't see that we ever will. We just don't have the capability. And frankly, that volunteer time gets sucked up into doing the GNSO's work, not our work, which is another challenge. Certainly getting a lot of feedback from our members that they'd rather be working on pushing forward on SSR-related issues that we're interested

---

in studying rather than reacting to things in the community that may be of passing interest. So it's a longer answer to your question, but I don't think we're changing much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And with these words of wisdom, if there are no further hands in the queue, I think I can pass the floor back to Maureen Hilyard.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Olivier. And we do have Alan. I think I'll give Alan the last word.

ALAN GREENBERG: I was just going to make a comment on the whole issue of representing the ALAC or the SSAC, or the Registries Stakeholder Group for that matter. The words sound really good in the GNSO charters, but the reality is if you look at what happens during the meetings, we've seen different people from the NCSG saying "I disagree with you," and each of them giving their own opinion. And the NCSG as a whole did not have an opinion.

We've seen a number of cases—and I'll put my life in my hands by saying it—where we've had representatives of some groups saying something which are very clearly a personal position, representing their personal employer, and no one else calling them a liar so therefore it becomes the position of a stakeholder group. But the reality is we have very much individual representation there as long as no one calls them out. Interesting situation.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. Any comments, Rod?

ROD RASMUSSEN: I was going to say, indeed, and that's why we try to avoid that [inaudible].

MAUREEN HILYARD: Great. We have come to the end of our session. I'd like to thank Rod, and especially Steve and Tara sharing their explanations of those two documents for our community and especially with regards to their relevance to us as end users. I'd also like to thank Andrei for continuing to relay that information, any information of interest from the SSAC. Does a really great job. But also, I'd like to thank Olivier for filling in an unexpected breach in our program. It's very much appreciated. But again, thank you, Rod and the team. We're really looking forward to making sure that we keep this contact up and keep in touch.

With that, I'll bring this meeting to a close. Thank you, everyone, for your attendance.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thank you very much.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Thank you.

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Thank you very much, everyone. Meeting has been adjourned. Have a great rest of your day.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**