

---

RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

GEOFF HUSTON: I wasn't actually attending the last meeting; I think it was at some ungodly hour in my zone, so if someone was and would care to explain where you've got to, that would certainly help me, and possibly others.

Eric, if you're waiting for me to say, "Talk," you shouldn't bother waiting – talk.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Yeah, hey, Geoff. I think we kind of so far have been picking up the pieces with when the Rapporteurs want to run it, and stuff. But I think pretty much everything we talked about wound up getting codified in the comments in the document, so I think if you've read those, I think you're as up to speed as we can get – unless somebody thought that there was something that didn't make the transcription, I think they're all there.

GEOFF HUSTON: Well, we can go through these comments serially and see where we get to. I'm kind of caught on the first one, which says, "This is in direct conflict with the scope statement in our Terms of Reference." And I'm just trying to figure out exactly what that means. If someone who either made the comment or understands the comment could further elucidate, that might be helpful.

---

*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.*

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Sure. I'll raise my hand and then go right away, as directed. I made that comment, and I guess if we sort of were to do a side-by-side, I think the Terms of Reference describe the scope as being one in which we would look broadly and recommend narrowly, and I guess my reading of this was more the – sort of not including the first part. It was sort of like, “The general topics or larger matters will not be considered as part of this review.” So, I think we went back and forth a lot, I thought, during the main call, about looking broadly. We [inaudible] I think we manicured the wording; it's just, we work on a narrower scope, as far as recommendations go. So, that would be my summary, and here is how our list [inaudible].

GEOFF HUSTON: Seeing no others with their hand up [CROSSSTALK] – sorry.

DENISE MICHEL: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm supposed to raise my hand. Okay. I'm a little confused.

GEOFF HUSTON: No, no, no, go for it.

DENISE MICHEL: There we go. I guess I'm the only other – is it just the three of us on the call from the team?

GEOFF HUSTON:                    Sounds like it.

DENISE MICHEL:                    Yeah, not a good turnout.    Okay.    Yeah, I think that was my understanding, as well – we had talked about the need to [inaudible] broadly, and then make sure we understand the broader environment, and then focus in on what the SSR team was going to address, and make recommendations on it.    And it may just be an issue of clarifying the wording.

GEOFF HUSTON:                    So, would it be better if we said, “The general topics are substantially larger matters and, while being considered as part of this review, would not necessarily be folded into specific recommendations”?    Would that be an acceptable way through?

ERIC OSTERWEIL:                    Do we want to reiterate the scope in the subteam, having already codified it in the overall review?

DENISE MICHEL:                    That might be an easier thing to do.

---

GEOFF HUSTON:

Yeah, I can understand the point of view of that, Eric, and I kind of think that's good. The reason why I drafted it this way, all those weeks ago, was to actually simply create a standalone document. But, if there is some other document that kind of sits and puts that into context, that would be better. However, it's certainly true that the body of the document, as it currently stands, is still necessarily relatively focused. And if you're okay with that, then in some ways, it's merely then just the second paragraph that says just, "The focal point here is those activities directed or coordinated by ICANN or the PTI, where it has a presence. Would that just be an acceptable way of getting through that?"

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

So, I guess my two cents is just – I guess I don't have a surface or a good understanding of whether I'm running afoul of a well-convened protocol at this point. But this feels a lot like drafting the introduction before you've done the topical work. It's hard to say where scope is going to be, having not done any of the investigation, or anything. So, in the event that we wanted to produce a standalone document, I think we'd want to produce the introduction to that after we've gotten on the same page, done some work, produced some recommendations or findings, or something. So, I almost feel like it might be a large investment in semantics to do it now, and in lieu of that, I think we have a scope. So, I would say that the idea of making standalone documents is laudable, but I'm not sure – based on a number of the other comments down below – we're all on the same page, so it might – in my two cents – be premature, unless it's well-known that in these circles, we do things differently. That's just based on my perspective.

GEOFF HUSTON: Okay. What was in my head when I produced this document and sent it around for comments – and I must admit, Eric, apart from yours, there weren't too many others – what was in my head was indeed encapsulated by that second statement. It's kind of – one of the things about the stability and security of the DNS that are directed or coordinated by ICANN, or where ICANN hosts some kind of community activity – I appreciate the point, and we can indeed just move on and leave that introduction – which is kind of a scoping introduction, as you point out – leave it alone at this point, and simply move on, if you want.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, there's kind of a handful of things that kind of just got muddled together. I have tried to raise this for several weeks, and I think this is the first time we've both been on the same call. So it's just, maybe the first opportunity – we haven't actually had this conversation yet, but I've definitely been plugged in, trying to. For whatever that's worth. But, nevertheless, I do think that – again, we can try and hammer it out here – I think there were a number of people on the main call that contributed in lots of different ways to the Terms of Reference scope that we have there – nominally, maybe more than were in the first day of the Joburg meeting, where I think this was codified, so maybe it's just best to sort of take it out for now – don't lose it – we can put it back in later – and maybe it winds up being preserved exactly as is, but certainly with not a lot of people on the call, it's hard to know what a strong sense of consensus would be, right?

---

GEOFF HUSTON: Right. So, moving on, then. In my understanding of what the DNS means to ICANN in this process – I had basically shoved it into, I suppose, what one could see there as four basic themes. Root zone management, change management – which is sort of evolution as distinct from day-to-day admin – some consideration of roles and responsibilities, and abuses and threats. And hopefully, that encapsulates it. I haven't heard any other suggestions, so at this point, I'm happy to stick with that, unless – particularly you, Eric – have a view that says, "maybe we should include x, y, or z in that taxonomy."

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, I guess I'm sort of – I'm going to grab the screen for a second. I hope it doesn't mess people up, because I have to refresh my memory, so if this ends up running afoul of someone, you get dizzy, tap out, let me know, and I'll stop. I just want to [inaudible] through.

UNKNOWN: Everyone can scroll their own.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, I'm not messing other people's up? Okay, good. Good to know.

UNKNOWN: No.

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Alright. So, no – so, Geoff, yeah, honestly, I sort of – I guess I just took a different approach – I have a different perspective. I don't have a good sense for the ultimate best way to taxonomize everything, so I personally am happy to start off somewhere with the understanding that we may need to migrate. It's a great starting point, a great thing, and since you sort of directed the question to me, I think there are a couple of places where I wasn't sure if this was meant to be fully all-inclusive, so I made a couple of comments – like the second one, "This section seems too briefly stated" – and I've added a couple, but that was mostly just like, "I hope this isn't supposed to be all the TLD label management issues that could come up." And that would sort of be my perspective in general, which is that – I think, if you look at your other comments about, there's only so many things that ICANN has got the purview to have an opinion about, and then you named a couple things that, I don't know, maybe the IANA subteam would claim that they're going to work on – I'm not really sure, but certainly, you look at the name collision and stuff, it was not immediately obvious that any of that had anything to do at all with ICANN, right? Looking at effects fell far outside of ICANN's purview, led back to things that were very relevant to new gTLDs.

So, I think one of the concerns I have about being too structured, too dogmatic up front is, I'd hate to limit our observation space when we're trying to do – when we're trying to connect dots. And I know that doesn't help us to produce an outline, so I'm not standing hard and fast on that, but I do think producing an outline that we can evolve is real important.

---

GEOFF HUSTON:

Yeah, I appreciate that. I suppose we work in different ways here, Eric. I certainly find it easier to set up major high points – the bullet points – and then start to flesh them out so it’s a bottom-up construction inside a hidden taxonomy. So, sort of create the major headlines, and then under each headline, create the substance – the point that seemed relevant at the time – and keep on fleshing it out. I find it much more challenging to create ten, twenty, thirty separate small items, and then try and put them into some larger context and framework. So, I tend to be a constructionist, and the documents certainly reflect that style, as I try and pull this stuff together, which is why I sort of went straight – when I talked about the root zone – certainly, ICANN has developed policies and practices around labels in the root zone of the DNS. And those practices and policies, although in effect become a formal management of that through ICANN and the PTI, affect what gTLDs are available inside any gTLD process. So, to my mind, when other folk – and particularly, the IETF – seem to be asserting some conflicting claim of control over parts of that namespace, that does become a question about security and stability, because certainly when multiple folk are asserting unilateral control, the result is necessarily a bit messy. Local, with its conflicting claims between multicast and private unicast is a good example. [inaudible] certainly brushed against that, as did .HOME at one point. So, that’s why I thought, sort of dive into this – the root zone management practices – looking at what labels get placed in the root zone – and just a bit further afield, and actually understand what other impacts and pressures are coming in from non-DNS unicast root zone, and how they work together, is actually a useful piece of work, in terms of integrity of the namespace. I’ll stop there.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Now I'm starting to think that you and I are in violent agreement, so I'm going to sort of try and [inaudible] my words, because I think I agree with everything you just said. I think the only point at which I might have – my starting point may have made me feel like I'm running afoul of that is that, in doing an investigation – you know this, I'm not trying to seem pedantic, or anything, but I mean – you discover you didn't expect sometimes. I'm just trying to make sure that when we're doing our investigations, we don't rule that out with an overly constraining taxonomy. But everything you just said, I think I agree with, personally. I think there is a sort of a question in some people's minds about where these sort of conversations and decisions ought to be made, and I think you outlined it very well, that that needs to be sort of considered an SSR issue. And I just don't think it's the only one.

GEOFF HUSTON: Okay. Thanks for that. No other comments? Denise?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, I think one of the things, as I recall, that we discussed on the last call, was adding a little more background to each section or point – understand what the challenge or problem is. I think asking people on the team, particularly for the topics that they're connected to or that they suggested, adding a little more background – it's not always obvious why a particular topic is on this list, or what problem we're trying to address, or what concern we have. I think that was one of the things that was discussed on the last call, as I recall.

---

GEOFF HUSTON:

Right, and that's certainly, Denise, sort of part of filling this in. I can give you one sentence to illustrate one of the issues associated, which is behind this – which is actually semantic work that SSAC and the IETF are both doing. The example is: in [inaudible], there is a codified limitation on the labels in the Top Level domain space of the delegated DNS. That codification is LDH rule – letters, digits, hyphen – nothing else. When we included non-[inaudible] characters from Unicode – so-called internationalization – the concept of LDH doesn't translate clearly to other scripts and other font families, etcetera, you know. There are other things that aren't quite punctuation and aren't quite letters, that sit inside IDN. Does IDN admit anything expressible in the Unicode could be in the TLD? None of us think that's the right answer. But if we try and strictly apply the LDH rule, we don't come up with a useful answer, either, because what we're trying to do is to express in a vague sense, words in other scripts in the DNS. And we don't quite know what that means. So, that's that final bullet – if the proposed TLD contains Unicode characters, what procedures are being followed? Other than the homoglyph problem, they're both displayed the same way – so, let's get rid of homoglyphs, if we can. There is a broader issue about, can I use IDNs to, in effect, migrate non-LDH characters into the body of labels, and is that a good thing if it happens?

As I said, I've simply put that as an example. The intent behind these points is certainly that there was more text here, and part of that text was to actually highlight those issues that are being discussed for some time, in both ICANN and the IETF in particular, without clear resolution so far. And I suppose the broader security risk is, if we keep on ad-hoc-

---

---

ing answers, do we destroy the coherence of the DNS with a pastiche of different responses to different problems from time to time? So, our accumulated legacy is random, rather than thematically consistent.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, indeed. I think you [CROSSTALK]

GEOFF HUSTON: That was the intent of the question.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. No, and that's really useful. My [inaudible] – and I think, similarly, I wasn't talking specifically about this section, but I think all of the sections people on the team should volunteer to add text and give a little – give that, maybe five sentence – here's that challenge or issue in this space [inaudible]. And I think the question's certainly useful, and we can build from that, as well. And I know from the team some text and context on the abuse and threats section, too. Yeah, thanks. This is really useful.

GEOFF HUSTON: Okay. So, moving on, the NS and DS record management. Eric made the comment, and it is true, in some sense – is this a PTI problem or a DNS review problem? Which subteam does this fit in? Because it's certainly true that there is an issue, and I believe, actually, that there are relevant Staff in ICANN's Operations who can answer that. And indeed, if I look back through the interview, I could probably find the

---

point where they try and answer that, so we can certainly involve Steve [inaudible] and his group here. Those questions are questions irrespective of which subgroup takes them up. How do we ensure that the folk wanting a DS record change, which is pretty important these days, are the genuine folk – the folk who have the NS allocation? And to what extent are these things validated by ICANN in both the content and the algorithms used, in the case of DS records – and can I put in dud records? What is a dud record, when there is some disagreement over the algorithm itself, and so on.

So, I'm quite willing, Eric, to say that's an ICANN SSR subteam problem, because I'm all for throwing the cat over the fence. But I put it there for the sake of completeness. But it does seem to me to be a core DNS-style issue. So, I'm pretty sure on this one, the mechanics involved, ICANN Staff in helping us, could at least describe those practices, and then some focused analysis to talk about whether we believe those procedures are appropriate, or if there is further attention that might be needed on those particular actions.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Yeah, that makes sense. My comment was mostly just to make sure that we don't wind up retracing each other's steps accidentally-on-purpose, and certainly not coming up, for example, with conflicting perspectives. So, I personally don't have a preference; I just thought I'd flag it, because a lot of what they're talking about between compliance and auditing, and everything else, I suspect it strongly winds up making sure people are hearing the processes, and those processes might

---

include some of this stuff. But I, for one, don't have a perspective or a preference for where the work is taken up – either group.

GEOFF HUSTON: Okay. So, for the moment, I will leave it inside this group, and if the ICANN SSR group want to claim it, [inaudible] in a second.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Maybe we should just make a point to bring it up on the group call. And that way, folks from the other team can have a perspective – or maybe not. And we can certainly hear it from them. And maybe, it becomes a sort of parley-hot-potato of who gets the duties, but to make sure – just something on the main call, maybe.

GEOFF HUSTON: Okay. Moving on. The respective roles of RSSAC and ICANN. Again, in the DNS, this whole issue of these various groups and their remit and purview – I think it's probably worth raising as an issue the extent to which the root server operators have both the autonomy and an obligation, or even a responsibility, to a common – and possibly unstated – set of requirements. And those four questions try and tease out this issue – that there is considerable latitude in the way in which root service operates. There is question about whether diversity is strength, or diversity is vulnerability. There is some question in this kind of very fast internet, whether the lags or propagation are important, if they exist. Because the root zone is not simultaneously updated all over the internet. We know that.

---

How much auditing is done over inconsistencies, if they are detected? In other words, is there a [inaudible] that defines them, and if there is, how is that effort made? Who is doing that? Now, I appreciate that some of this treads on the toes of RSSAC, and this is not an RSSAC review. It's a DNS review. And I'm kind of wondering, if in some ways – and again, this is a Chairs kind of question – whether we need to answer those questions in a review, or in this stage, raise them, to understand whether RSSAC wants to take that on – in which case, our raising would be adequate, or whether RSSAC is going to say, "Don't touch it." Interesting. Or whether RSSAC would say, "Carry on forward; we will look at your answers with interest." I find it hard to second-guess RSSAC, but Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Yeah, sorry. I felt like this was a good opportunity to raise my hand instead of just talk. So, my two cents – I like this section. I think it's sort of piled onto it, a little bit, but as just a member – making sure I'm not speaking on behalf of the Chair function – I think what we ought to at least do, if not more, is, we ought to outline in what ways do certain aspects of this relate to SSR? So in other words, for example, we may decide that it would be good to know how consistent root servers are at any given moment – maybe even propose a way that you could quantify that, or something. Do we have to go all the way to performing a study? I think that might be a separate question, and it could wind up being a longer discussion with RSSAC. But my two cents would be, I think falls within the remit of the SSR review team to say what constitutes an important aspect of the root zone's management and for SSR issues. I thought that there were, at least for now, good questions

---

to start off with to put into our heads, to try and decide, how does root stability affect SSR? So, I like them, personally, and I think whether we decided we would do the work of measurement studies, or we'd ask another group to do it, or we'd get opinions – I think that would be a separate question, personally.

GEOFF HUSTON: Okay.

DENISE MICHEL: This is Denise. I agree with that, as well. I think it's a good [inaudible] for the team to weigh in, and I think later in the process come the questions of tactics and who does this type of study that we're recommending, whether we do some initial work and what form the recommendations take in the end – whether we recommend actions for ICANN Organization or RSSAC itself, or an outside entity.

GEOFF HUSTON: Okay, so [inaudible] that. I appreciate this next one is not an easy topic. This is respective roles of ICANN PTI and [inaudible]. The reason why – and there was a request from Eric as to some background on the intuition – is that I am one of the folk in the larger community whinging and moaning – rootservice.net is unsigned. And this whole thing sort of relates to, if the prime inquiry gives you back answers that are falsified, it takes the poor end user or end resolver some time to realize that they're being hoodwinked, and then quietly shut down, because there's almost nothing they can do. And then comes the answers that appear

---

to come from this, that, “Well, ICANN only does this, PTI only does that, and [inaudible] does this, and in the days when the U.S. was involved, in terms of the [inaudible] did that...” There was this large multi-party process, and in some ways, some very simple things didn’t happen because there were so many folk involved, simple tasks became complex. And I was simply bringing up the question, taking that as an example – that although multi-party oversight stops a single finger causing havoc – and that’s a good thing; that’s a very good thing, that a number of folks see changes before changes are put in the system. At the same time, it provides a brilliant excuse for inactivity. That’s the bit that worries me – that some of the simple things appear to be getting lost inside what is a relatively complex process.

No hands so far? Because I have one other illustration of this. Okay, Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I can wait. But –

GEOFF HUSTON: Okay. Let me bring up the other illustration, because I think, again, this was a masterpiece of two folk trying to do the same thing, but not really trying to sort out the overall picture. We increased the key size of the zone signing key, and we did that before the first role of the – sorry. So, we increased the [inaudible] size of the ZSK before the KSK role was completed, and indeed, even started. Now, the problem is at this point, the role of the KSK now occurs with somewhat larger responses than was originally anticipated, and the ordering of the inflation of the ZSK –

---

which was quite proper and according to [inaudible] guidelines – and the role of the KSK produced an outcome where we’re stressing some of the edge points on what is a safe and comfortable response size for some of the root zone queries, and in particular, [inaudible] – I think it’s 1414 or 1434 [inaudible] response – certainly has its attendant risks.

Now, it’s not that anyone did anything wrong. Absolutely not. But it is a case that there are two entirely different organizations in control of each part of that key structure. And the question is whether this results in some unforeseen circumstances – because they are two independent bodies making what’s in their view, the best decisions for their part of the role – or whether we could have managed this better, were they orchestrated under a single structure. So, I don’t think there’s a “should do it this way,” “should do it that way” for those particular cases, but I think they illustrate the fact that having different bodies doing different parts of this created attendant issues that wouldn’t necessarily happen, were it one body.

Eric. Now, I’m trying not to criticize [inaudible] at all. It’s not that [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

No. So, Geoff, I appreciate the examples, and the intuition behind that comment. Thank you very much for that. My consensus is that the way you just described it was based on what I would say are first principles. You described the situation, you described the multi-party agreement problem, and you illustrated a couple of examples. I think if this is something that should show up in the SSR review, it ought to be at that

---

level. Just like we said a second ago, with the root server situation – where I said, “Hey, we may want to understand these things and they relate to SSR in the following ways,” I think coming up with a sort of principles approach – a principled discussion - [inaudible] what it is you’re concerned about [inaudible] signing of the [inaudible] – I understand that’s something that’s becoming an issue in a lot of places. Key sizes and rollovers – man, I think I haven’t heard that before. Are people talking about that kind of stuff now? These are great topical examples of what you just described as a general problem. So maybe the general problem is what ought to show up in the outline, saying, “At what point do we have multi-party agreements – situations in which we need multi-parties to agree?” And how that affects critical parts of SSR. Maybe we ought to catalogue that. I think this reads much more focused than that.

GEOFF HUSTON:

Okay. I can certainly – I suppose, with the examples, also – make the point more obvious about where I was heading, and generalize this whole issue about, I suppose, the differences between the multi-party situation and the unitary, and sort of highlight, “These are the things that come out,” and then see if there are recommendations as a result. But I wouldn’t go to recommendations straight away. So, that’s helpful. Thank you.

I’m doing a quick time check. We’re two-thirds of the way through, and it’s been very productive. Thank you, Denise and Eric. Can I move on, then, to change management, which was explicitly around two things – three, actually. The introduction of new gTLDs, which is kind of this

---

cough from time to time – blech, a whole bunch come out; then silence; then blech. The changing waves with ISO’s 3166 and some of these issues that have turned up with the retirement and the introduction of [inaudible] country codes, and whether that’s an issue or not. What’s the relationship here between ICANN and 3166, and are there any, I suppose, security issues around either the delegated domain space occupying labels that ISO’s 3166 later codify for a different purpose? Which is, certainly, [inaudible] some of these unused codes. Or, even if we went into the three-letter code space, which we have never done – but if some countries feel that they want their three-letter code space as their national code, what’s the interaction between that, ISO 3166, and the delegated root zone, was the thing in my head.

And the last two – especially [inaudible] registry, has been beaten to death. With luck, you all know about this; if not, I can explain. And the last one came up because of emojis, and this whole issue of whether just because it’s in Unicode, I want it as a DNS label – because the encoded form is letters, digits, and hyphens, so surely that’s a good label. Whereas the Unicode is some damn silly character that every single browser, every single operating system, every single platform displays a different pictorial representation of the same underlying Unicode doesn’t seem to be a good practice. So, this whole issue of, are we translating Unicode into the DNS appropriately? Do we understand what we’re doing – was where I was trying to highlight with that fifth bullet point.

Eric.

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Hey, Geoff. So, this is an incredibly helpful conversation, because I literally did not understand from the writing what you just described as the intuition, so thank you very much for that. And again, at the risk of being in violent agreement with you, from what you just said – with one notable exception, I think we forgot about [inaudible]; I think that’s been delegated for a while – nevertheless, I think coming up with this, I guess I just would have functioned differently. So, that’s why I didn’t completely grab where you were coming from. Those things all sound like – maybe not all – but they largely fall into same bucket of, “Where are people going to get confused?” And I am absolutely concerned about that from an SSR perspective, and it sounds like if I am not putting words in your mouth, that’s kind of one very terse way to say some of the things you just said. Like, “Is that winky face, or is that winky face with a smile?” And it’s rendered over here this way, and it’s rendered that way, and it just sound like a homoglyph attack on steroids. So, I did not get that, and maybe that was my failing, but yeah. I just found it helpful for you to explain. Thank you.

GEOFF HUSTON:

There is a bank in Australia, Eric. It goes by the name of the [inaudible] Bank. Largely irrelevant. Its logo is the emoji smiley face. And my guess is that if it could ever register an emoji, it would register that emoji. The problem is, of course, as you’re well aware, there are a ton of these emojis that look like a smiley face, and a ton of cases where a smiley face doesn’t look like a smiley face. And the real answer is, “What would you say to this bank to say, ‘That’s a really, really bad idea. Your customers are going to be giving their password away to a whole bunch of folk who shelter behind the endless variation of an emoji

---

smiley face. You thought it was cute; we think it's a security nightmare.'

" That was their sort of illustration of this I was trying to work from. So, violent agreement. Yes.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, couldn't agree more.

STEVE CONTE: This is Steve. I don't have a hand raised, so I'd like to put myself in the queue.

GEOFF HUSTON: You are up. You are there, Steve.

STEVE CONTE: Alright. Geoff, thanks for this. This was actually, like Eric said, really, really helpful. One of the questions – and I'm asking you as the SSAC delegate to the SSRT review team – is it 95 that deals with emojis? Do I have my numbers right?

GEOFF HUSTON: Let's assume it is. I can – I'm looking it up.

STEVE CONTE: Okay. To rephrase that, my understanding is that the SSSAC is looking at this challenge and if SSR 2 touches it, is that going to be a territorial war and [inaudible] can say, "What are you touching this for?" I think

---

you said at the very end of your last statement of, not necessarily the emoji, but unintended consequences of other [inaudible] techs or [inaudible] strings going into the root. I just wanted, from my SSAC perspective, if you could clarify or give us a hint of – if, and if so, what level of work would SSR 2 – should or could SSR 2 look at this as a challenge? Thanks.

GEOFF HUSTON:

So, I think you just walked on something that goes “Bang.” It’s a really good thing to have done so, but let me explain what I mean. For a long time, ICANN took the standard RFCs that specified the labels in the DNS and pointed to those as the boundaries of what it could do when it thought of the new labels in the DNS. So, those [inaudible] RSCs that said, “Look. We’re not better than the IETF. We’re not going to rewrite those standards. Those standards are the parameters within which we operate, and we’re going to agree with them. This is it.” So, RFCs define so that the [inaudible] space, ICANN then creates procedures within that space, but tries not to go out of those bounds. With Unicode and IDNs and [inaudible] 2000 – endless number of years – 2000-something – those lines are getting extremely blurred, and the overarching ability of the IETF to create an RFC about everything that matters to them, and the ability of ICANN to stay within that, when some of this seems a bit dubious. And instead of operational practices that play very little regard to that second level of [inaudible], create, to my mind, an attitude within ICANN that the RFCs are becoming mere guidelines, rather than rules.

---

Now, I know SSR – sorry, SSAC – takes a much more – I don’t know, theological, pure view, that the RFCs are it. The golden writ, and thou shalt not contravene them. And I think SSAC is trying to say, again, and again, and again, “Here are a bunch of RFCs. You weren’t paying attention. You should follow them.” But in some ways, there’s a set of stakeholders who voiced their objectives within ICANN. They tend to have a more relaxed view. They’d say, “It’s not going to break the DNS. The DNS won’t fold tomorrow. What’s your problem?” And in some ways, from our perspective on SSR, itself, I’m not sure there are solutions here. But I think there is an issue to highlight, as to what extent ICANN and its community can convey areas of uncertainty to the ITF standards makers, and ask [inaudible] [AUDIO BREAK]

UNKNOWN: Hello, did we lose Geoff?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I was just going to ask if we lost me or if we lost him. I can’t hear him, either.

UNKNOWN: Sorry. Geoff dropped out of the –

UNKNOWN: Geoff [inaudible]

---

DON BLUMENTHAL: Just to real quickly ask – I’m on RSSAC, also – we looked at [inaudible] I don’t see any potential for conflict. [inaudible] what we did was, we looked at something that exists very much [inaudible] we don’t think it should exist. Emojis should not [inaudible] domain names, because of –

GEOFF HUSTON: I’m going to try the computer audio, and if I come through [CROSSSTALK]

UNKNOWN: Yes.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes, can hear you now. Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, Geoff, we hear you loud and clear.

UNKNOWN: You’re good.

GEOFF HUSTON: Okay. [inaudible] So, yes. The point I was making was that, if you sort of look at this SSR 2/SSAC boundary, I think SSAC is very specific about what it is and why. I was looking at the SSR 2 activity in more generic terms – about trying to understand, as a security review issue, where does ICANN get its guidance from? Where does it find what it would

---

call rules, and to what extent does it interpret these commentaries from the ITF, and is that an issue? And that was where I was trying to bring this up, as sort of going, there are imports from SSSAC, and they cite RFCs. Should ICANN feel obliged to follow them, or is it something about advice, rather than constraint? That was where I was headed.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thank you. I do appreciate that clarification.

GEOFF HUSTON: On the next page are a couple that I'm not sure, and Eric has made some suggestions about whether we should investigate or not. The first one – evolution of the root service - [inaudible] RFC that was published, I think, last week – relatively recent – called [inaudible]. If you look behind the words, what you actually find is that it enlists every single recursive resolver, to be far more capable in authoritatively answering queries that, until then, would have been forwarded to the root. That has a gigantic implication on the root service, and places a huge amount of onus into DNS [inaudible] and signing as almost the only bulwark of integrity. It becomes "It's not who you ask, but what the signature is, whether you believe the answer." That's a big step for us, and even if we simply highlight this, it may be enough. But it is a change, and I wanted to bring that out as a change that's relevant to the root.

The last issue – again, very airy-fairy – but difficult – comes up from the onion problem. It actually comes up from the rationale of the special-use domain names registry in the IETF. It's a big one, and there's almost no agreement on this. Is ICANN's remit the namespace as delegated in

---

the root zone of the public DNS, or is ICANN's remit the domain space? And one is a massive [inaudible] of the other. Even if we simply highlight this and say the DNS is not stopping; there are other forms of resolution. Technology continues," is the name space an important artifact in its own right, and if so, should ICANN, if you will, take steps to be involved in this evolution to ensure that the name space remains in some sense, integral, or should it simply concentrate on the DNS and let other flowers bloom where and how they might? So, I was going to approach it in the generic sense of going, "No answers, but we're certainly at a fork in the road," whether ICANN participates and engages in evolution, or whether it takes its remit quite in a limited sense, with this technology applied this way. Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Hey, Geoff. So, just before I get started, I'll be necessarily brief because I have to run in one minute, quite literally. Just to sort of [inaudible] in parting not to try and get the last word in – honestly, I'd like to hear any response – I think my perspective on that from a lot of [inaudible] work is, it's less about intent and more about consequence. So, regardless – if the intent is for namespaces to stay separate from each other and yet they bleed, and there are collisions as a result and systems are impacted, I think it's necessary for the administrative groups, communities, etcetera, for the colliding name spaces – and we may only be one of those – but nevertheless, if there are collisions happening and systems are affected, users are affected, I think we necessarily have to take it as an SSR issue. So, that would be my perspective. I'm not sure if that is in contrast to yours, or not, especially considering how many times I think we have gotten on the wrong track from the writing and

---

interpreting in the past hour or so. But nevertheless, yeah – I think, yeah, sure, I can decide I want to have a separate name space in which I can have .ERIC, but if it starts to bleed over into the name space that starts with the IANA [inaudible] root, then I think there’s an issue for SSR. That would be my two cents.

GEOFF HUSTON: Lot of agreement from me, Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I’m very sorry that I have to jump off, but I’m glad to end on that note, Geoff. Thank you, and I’ll talk to you all later.

GEOFF HUSTON: Thanks, Eric. We are five minutes to the hour. What I would do at this point is try and look forward. I have now some annotations in the document. I also have a couple of pages of notes. It is my – I suppose – intent, which I would like to at least check with the call and to make sure I am staying on track and consistent with your expectations – to revise the document in the light of your comments, and in the comments already annotated to that document, recirculate – but, sorry, one other thing – to make it clearer where additional information and study is to be taking place. In other words, to identify the bits that we need specific questions answered, or more study undertaken as part of that fleshing out. And to also then try and look forward as to where recommendations might follow. In other words, you observe something, you try and analyze its extent and scope, measure it,

---

understand it, and then figure out whether, is this something we can tolerate? Are there issues that, from an SSR perspective, might be something that we'd like to highlight for the follow-up of such a review to take on? In other words, "Is anything worth doing about this review?" is a critical question. So, highlight whether recommendations are possible.

So, are there any comments or suggestions about that proposed activity, that I revised the document with those three general intents being included in the revision – flesh it out, where we need specific information or more study, highlight what the recommendations might be, and where they might take form?

DENISE MICHEL: That sounds useful. And I –

GEOFF HUSTON: Thanks, Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: – think it would be good to encourage the rest of the group to weigh in on this point with their additional issues, as well.

GEOFF HUSTON: Okay. I am seeing we are a couple of minutes before the hour, so this is your chance. Don? Mr. Matogoro?

---

UNKNOWN:                      Actually, I have [inaudible] [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN:                      Yes, for me –

UNKNOWN:                      Hello?

GEOFF HUSTON:                I see Mr. Matogoro has said in the chat that that would be good for this team to review the document and identify what kinds of recommendations, etcetera. Thank you. Don, do you have any other words to share with us?

DON BLUMENTHAL:             No; I had spoken a little bit about the emoji [inaudible] when you dropped.

GEOFF HUSTON:                I only dropped my microphone; my speaker was working just fine. So [CROSSTALK]

DON BLUMENTHAL:             Then [CROSSTALK] a little behind.

---

GEOFF HUSTON: No problem at all. If that's the case, then thank you all – thank you linesmen, thank you umpires, thank you everyone else. We will meet again, but I am not sure when, so we will leave that to the Secretariat to work through with the Co-Chairs. Let me make the point, I suppose, that this time zone is [inaudible] to this meeting for me. If folks are having trouble, please let the Secretariat know; we'll try and organize a different one. I think we're doing, Yvette, every two weeks – ?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Well, what I currently have, Geoff – this is Yvette – what I currently have is, I have weekly Mondays at 20:00 – if you want to call it 20:00 [inaudible] UTC. Now we can do it weekly, we can do it biweekly – it's up to you. But currently, it was going to be weekly.

GEOFF HUSTON: Okay. For this coming month of August, there's probably enough to go – let's meet next week and the week after. It does strongly rely on my ability to revise the document, which I will do. But in some ways, I think we might not continue weekly after August. We might go biweekly. It's just, I'm not certain there's that much work, but we'll certainly see how we go. So, next week, this time, would be brilliant. Thank you very much.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Okay, will do.

---

GEOFF HUSTON: Thanks a lot.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks, Geoff, for doing this. Alright, thanks, everyone.

GEOFF HUSTON: Thanks, all. No problem [inaudible]. Bye, all. [inaudible]

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**