

---

BUENOS AIRES – SSAC Public Session  
Thursday, November 21, 2013 – 08:00 to 09:00  
ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

UNIDENTIFIED: ...network operators, you know, sort of the usual cascade, and figure out a way to engage some of the people who sort of make it their business to get the word out quickly. And I don't know if there is thinking along that line, but I would love to participate in helping with that...

PATRIK FALSTROM: So yes, so we agree with you and this is also one of the reasons why we, for example, we're running the session at the Internet Governance forum, not only to inject sort of, from our perspective, a clue but also to spread the word. Jim?

JIM: Thank you Patrik. It just occurs to me, Mike listening to you, I mean, you're right, the outreach is an important part of many of the things that we say and it was good of you to pick up on that, and notice it. As Patrik said, we do our part with respect to our recommendations to try to bring them out to a broader community.

And so we do have the session at the IGF, but outreach as it rises in significance, it just strikes me as this is more important for this community to bring here to ICANN, and might make an interesting

---

*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.*

---

discussion for the public forum if you wanted to come up and make the same comment that you made here.

There is an opportunity, make that this afternoon. I mean, I know that ICANN takes very seriously its outreach responsibilities, but it might need a greater visibility and more engagement from a larger part of the community, not just us, and not just yourself.

I mean, the responsibilities that you have are coming in all of this too. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED:

Thank you. Mike, are you thinking of something like the DNS operations email list in the ITF context? Something that operators and IT people could subscribe to? Because right now the channels that we have, are more ICANN flavored channels. They're flavored more from the ICANN push side than they are from the operations staff pull side.

And it occurs to me that maybe something that created a different type of channel, because we do have, from an outreach standpoint, we've got a lot of things saturated. We've got the security team at ICANN putting up log posts, writing up articles that comment on this. We obviously have the announcements every time the SSAC advisory is published, but those have an ICANN – a very specific ICANN flavor to them, and maybe what we need is something that has is the other, the opposite, the pull flavor from the ops folks.

---

PATRIK FALSTROM: Okay. We have a line, so Julie. Do you know whether it is related to this? Okay, please.

JULIE: This is a question from [?] Thomas in the chat room. He asks, "Is there a reason why the SSAC on name collision risk is so watered down? The recommendations seem to be very bland, and not the usual much more specific comments that are usual from the SSAC.

PATRICK FALSTROM: I think there are multiple answers for that. First of all, we have had a long discussion on... Let me start over. It depends a little bit on what one would called watered down. We don't feel the SSAC, as an advisory committee, is the right body that makes specific decisions that we believe should be made as part of the PDP, or as part of an open process.

We view ourselves more as, one could say, a group that is doing audit on the current processes. And what we are doing is that we are in the report, pointing out four – specifically four different areas where, we think, the discussions and the processes can be or should be improved. It is also the case that we in SSAC are not very good at producing documents when we are in a hurry, to be frank.

We are much better writing a report, writing something that actually takes quite some time. And in this case, the ICANN community was moving forward. We were, as everyone knows, we have a report in SSAC that we are working on the name space collision issues as a

---

response to Board requests that we should look at the issue, while working on that topic.

And I always say the acronym wrongly here, MGPC, was that right? NGPC, yeah. NGPC came out with their decisions, and we felt that it is better for us to incorporate what we saw in the NGPC document then writing a more generic document about name space collision, about where we were.

Of course, making that adjustment created another kind of, sort of watered down document, but on the other hand, we think we believed, and this is why we published the document as it is, that it was more important that we finalized a document that would timely, and in this specific context, where we are now, and also made the document available before this ICANN meeting instead of working another month, or whatever it would take until to actually write something more specific.

Because we think that the real hard decisions regarding this topic must be made by the community. Anyone else in SSAC that would like to say something? Okay. I don't know really know whether it answered the question but that's, yeah. Please.

STEVE:

Steve [?] Net Choice. Following up on SSAC 62, it didn't seemed watered down, it was timely. I was so glad that it was thrown into the mix along with the work plan, the JAAS advisors is currently embarking on, for the purpose of defining the framework. And so I asked you, I believe, Friday or Saturday when we were first here, whether we could

---

merge some of the SSAC, SAC 62 discussion of trials with the work plan that Jeff Schmidt is already embarking on now, since it's one bite at the apple to get Jeff to define...

The question would be, did you guys have some conversations this week? Because when I first discussed it with Jeff, he no knowledge of SAC 62, and it would be great to see those two come together, and if there is any way we can help in the business constituency commercial stakeholder's group.

PATRICK FALSTROM:

Yes, everyone can help here, and this is also one of the reasons why we produced the report and made it available. Because, as I said, we believe this discussion should be done in the community. One thing that is also important to remember is that all of the SSAC members are volunteers, and we all have day jobs, which means that SSAC itself can never do any kind of research, or any kind of investigations that, for example, JS Team is now doing, or what was done earlier this year regarding name collision.

Those are like work items that SSAC could not do. So, before I really answer your question, I just want to sort of, everyone should know that we in SSAC, we can only – we only have enough resources to do this kind of [?] how things are done. Now, regarding interaction with the work that's now JS are doing.

I have, unfortunately, personal time to sit down with him, I met him, I told him we should talk, we are in contact with each other, we exchange business cards, but we have not been able to really – not myself, other

---

SSAC members might have done so, but the intention is absolutely to make sure.

What I told them is that my next thing, when I come home, is to make sure that in whatever ways it happens that the JS, that his team understands what we have written in SAC 62. And also, from our perspective, of course, we have a long list of references and data that we were looking at when producing SAC 62, that we also ensure that he sees all those things. If you see what I mean.

It's not only SAC 62, we think that it is everything else. So it's a knowledge transfer, general knowledge transfer from us to him. One way that is happening, formally, is that we do have liaison from staff, ICANN staff, and for example, Francisco is, was part of the work party that produced this report, and he is also key in the connection with the JS team, so to some degree, I'm not worried there is a real gap there. But we will do everything we can from our side to make sure that it doesn't happen.

STEVE:

Thank you Patrik. You made a distinction between research that the SSAC doesn't do, and frameworks, which I think the SSAC kind of does do. And the JS work plan, have you seen the work plan they first published? A lot of disconnects there. Most of what he is producing for ICANN is a framework that will be used to assess each TLD when its turn comes up in the line.

And in that respect, there will be research done to feed that, but most of the framework is that structured thinking. It's very much in keeping

---

with what SSAC does, structured thinking about whether and how one would do a trial, for instance. And you picked up on the NGPC report from October 4<sup>th</sup> on collisions. The JIS project is a direct result of that, and I think you're going to find when you look at his work plan, I'll email it to you, that the work plan has places where it should be plugging in the work of the SSAC.

PATRICK FALSTROM:

One of the things that when we read the SSCC in SSAC 62, specifically regarding trials, this is the reason, me being the chair of SSAC like reading sort of the consensus of the group is that, one of the reasons why we have written so much about trials is that we found that the text in our trial and the use of the word trial without really defining it, GP in there, NGPC report, is something that you're worried about and that's why trial sort of in general is something that we, quite strongly I would say, point out that before doing anything that could be viewed as a trial regardless of how you define it, you need to define it.

What do you mean by it? What is the input? Who do you prematurely end it? How do you... When you are done with whatever you call this a trial, what kind of conclusions? What are you going to use the data for that you presumably are collecting during the trial? What is the whole process around it?

So just saying, there should be a trial without really having any context from our view, this is what we say in the report, is not very useful.

---

STEVE: Yeah, one of the related aspects of this, also came up as part of SAC 63. And the related aspect is that of, what's often termed, breakage. What constitutes breakage needs to be identified in advance, because if things occur that someone, somewhere, are unhappy with, if you haven't gotten some determination in advance as to what is either the way in which you're going to make a judgment, or some determination as to what is, what constitutes, a breakage or a problem will be a much, more policy decision that has to be made if you don't have some predetermined criteria that's laid out as part of this.

PATRIK FALSTROM: And that comes back to SAC62. It also talks about what one would call the most drastic mitigation method there is, which is to remove a TLD from the DNS, which I've been pointing out this week for many people. But what if people are using domain names in that TLD? That's exactly what Russ is talking about.

It is such a drastic measure, but probably, one could envision, that if a situation occur that you really, really, really need to use that very drastic tool, you really need to know what you're doing. You cannot just sort of react, so you need to design these kind of things beforehand. Yes.

STEVE: It is going to be less drastic in the future. It will be, with 14,000 new TLDs, there will be removals from the root that are voluntary on the part of the TLD operator themselves, like a dot brand, there will be zone files that would be orphaned. So let's start talking about how that happens.



PATRIK FALSTROM:

Yes. And I think here lies the danger, and this is why it's important to talk about it. You just said, you used some kind of word that I already forgot, oh there will be lots of these, and it will not be so, so dangerous. Remember that for every holder of a domain name, regardless of what TLD it is, have an external party removing the ability to use that domain name, that means that you are removing the ability for domain name holder to decide himself what persistence that domain name will have.

And that, in this community, that is a very, very, very, very important thing. And that's why it's important for domain name holders to be able to... Basically the only way to get rid of a domain name is by not renewing and not paying, otherwise the domain name holder, which is in charge, and it doesn't really matter whether it's a TLD that only manages to get two delegations.

For those two domain name holders, it's a 100% loss of ability to use the domain name. Yes, only two of them, but for them, it's 100%.

UNKNOWN:

Yeah. Unless they have registrations in other TLDs at the same. You can't know that. The removal of a TLD as a part of a trial is what you're focusing on in 62, and as you said in 63 but, the removal of TLDs unrelated to trials is going to be ICANN's agenda for the next couple of years. So perhaps it's another thing to put into the work plan.

---

PATRIK FALSTROM: Yes. But also, do not mix up the removal of a TLD and the EBRO process, but there might... But you're right in that it might be the case that there is a connection between the two, and that is also very important to know.

MARILYN CADE: My name is Marilyn Cade. I'm the CSG officer in the BC. And I want to say a couple of things. First of all, how much I appreciate the work that you're doing, because for many of the business constituency participants who come to ICANN, they're not particularly, deeply technical, but they are very much aware of the implications of issues that relate to SSR.

We focus on security, stability, and resiliency as a key issue in the business constituency. But I'm going to ask you to think about what you're doing, and how it can be better understood more broadly. And so, it may not be work that you do, but it may be advice that you give to the Board and to the staff about how communications about what you do can be broadly spread.

If we think that ICANN is not recognized in vast parts of the world, the work you're doing is less recognized, but critical. So while I really appreciated the workshop that you did at the Internet governance forum, and I think it was really important to do, I think that the greater impact for you would be to have resources and visibility into the national and regional ITFs, where actually network engineers and people who are going to be effected by this will also begin to learn about your work.

---

And then will perhaps be willing to follow some other kind of communication mechanism. So, I'm not asking you so much to do something today, as to just think about all of these reports, if they remain invisible to the vast number of new and growing network engineers, and young entrepreneurs that are going to be building networks and solutions around the world in developing countries, then we are going to have – [?] to have a big problem.

There are also are ways of reaching these folks through perhaps the IXPs that are beginning now to build communities of interest in the developing countries, networks of contracts. Not to belabor that, but as to say as we look ahead, I don't know that you would have thought it was so specific to what you were doing, but it's certainly is going to be helpful to ensuring that people can respond to the development of the work you're doing.

PATRIK FALSTROM:

Thank you very much for that. I think what you're saying is resonating very much with what we are worried about, or what we would like to do more about. This is one of the reasons why – as I started to open the meeting say that we are trying to do outreach in sort of that direction by meeting with ALAC. We have a very good liaison with ALAC.

ALAC has their local sort of network, we are dealing with the Fellows to be able to build some of this. The other thing that we're doing, or the servicing that we're doing, is that we have been working really, really hard to make sure that SSAC individuals have members come here to the ICANN meeting, and for example, listen to what you just said.

---

Because that is one way for us to also participate in the local IGFs and do more outreach.

MARILYN CADE: I'm going to be clearer.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Please.

MARILYN CADE: I've been told that I'm not being clear enough in a number of settings. Let me be clearer. So ICANN decided that it had almost an unlimited budget to do the DNS sectoring, but I don't see the budget being put behind the support for the distribution and elaboration of the work in SSR, broadly. That's a point that I continue to bring up in the budget process, and I continue to bring up in the public forum.

But when I helped organized an ICT summit in Nigeria, called [Victa] I was able to draw on resources from ICANN to come and do DNSSEC training because that was ICANN's agenda. But I don't have the ability, right now, unless this becomes a priority, to draw on the same kind of speaker support, or travel support for someone to come.

So just think about that because in many cases you're going to have to have somebody come and have a little face time, the first few times.

---

PATRIK FALSTROM: Okay. That was clear, and yes, that is received. It's Robert [?] and myself that participate in the budget discussions, and let's try to coordinate there. Yes, thank you.

JULIE: I have two follow up questions from [?], Thomas related to SAC 62 and his previous question. First is, "Follow up to Patrik's answer. Does SSAC think that the day in the life data is enough to make conclusions, or does more data have to be calculated?" And follow up question two, "Why does SSAC recommend un-delegation of a TLD even after it has become an established name space?"

Surely once a name space is established, the collision risk is very minimal. If it was not minimal, then an existing established name spaces like com or org would have problems all of the time." And just for later reference, [?] Thomas also has two questions related to SAC 60, when you are ready to take those.

PATRIK FALSTROM: So, regarding – let's try to remember these kinds of things, and Julie, maybe you need to help me. So regarding the day in the lifetime data, the little data, more data is always good. We also believe that not only more data, for example collecting day in the lifetime data, not only for over 48 hours, but 96 hours, that is one thing, but there is also data that you might collect by different means, might sometimes give more information.

What is important though is that when looking at all of this data that is collected, it is very important to know within what context it has been

---

collected. So, that said, regardless of how much data you will collect, there will still be a lot of unknowns, and that's why it's important to know what to do.

Okay. Next question had to do with... Yes. We need to take one at a time here, sorry.

JULIE: That's fine. Why does SSAC recommend un-delegation of a TLD, even after it has become an established name space?

PATRIK FALSTROM: We don't recommend un-delegating a TLD. We are saying that ICANN needs to have a policy for that. It might be the case that the policy says that, if it is the case that the TLD has been up and running under certain circumstances, the actual effect, sorry the harm is so great compared to the benefit. So, it will, in practice, never happen.

So it's very important, the report doesn't recommend the un-delegation of a TLD. We point out that that might be a mitigation method, and it's really important that some kind of framework is written around that mitigation method. So for example, the two different... We are sort of saying two alternatives. One, if the TLD is not in use, maybe this is a good mitigation method if it still creates a problem, but on the other hand of the scale, it might be the case, the harm is so high so that it is absolutely not the case that the method would be, the mitigation method should be used at all.

I'm sorry. Yes please, Russ, sorry.

---

RUSS: To the first question about is the day in the life Internet data sufficient, one of the recommendations in SAC 62 does emphasize the need for a better collection method and establishment of a flexible collection method, so that that, at least indirectly, is another reinforcement of the day in the life of the Internet is not sufficient.

UNIDENTIFIED: [?]. I think it is very good that we have now a little bit of data published on the collisions specifically for the second level labels. However, that does not contain a...

PATRIK FALSTROM: So I think something happened with the microphone there. Can you speak and see whether it works better?

UNIDENTIFIED: Is it better now? I'm sorry. We... Okay, thank you. We do have data now indicating that labels that have been found, the second level labels that have been found over the last eight years of little data. However, we do not have, in the published data, any information about the frequency of those labels.

It's almost the cases, you know, it looks quite evident, quite coincidence somebody typed this in a web browser. And I believe we have a great many of them. However, precisely those that have been typed for more or less evident reasons on a web browser, happen to be, typically, famous brand names, or important brand names.

In the case of ccTLDs, they are logically associated with a city, so basically if you have a brand name associated with Paris, people type on the browser. Now, if you have at least, in the published data, the frequencies per year, that would actually be easy to publish, because you get more information from the people that are currently affected by it, and will have better data, better information in terms of mitigation, then if you kept it secret.

So I really appeal to ICANN to publish data that is available rather than keeping it secret, if you want to have information about what has to be done.

PATRIK FALSTROM:

Yeah, I think all day... As we say, the more data that is published, the better. I hope that now your request is on the record. Regarding the day in the lifetime data specifically, that is covered under the various data protection rules loss in the world. For example, the data that we are collecting from [?] in Sweden, it's kind of sensitive data because IP addresses are classified as personal information and cannot be moved around.

But anyone that is a member of [?] can themselves, on the [?] machines, do their own calculations on the collected digital data. So if it is the case that anyone would like to make more calculations on the [?] data, I recommend you to become [?] members, and look at the data itself. Because that includes the specific sort of peak and falls we can see what's in there.



---

UNIDENTIFIED: It's just about a little bit more, mainly the frequencies, not...

PATRIK FALSTROM: Thank you.

JULIE: [?] Thomas had a follow up to your response, Russ, on SAC 62. He says, "Mr. Russ's comments that SSAC thinks that day in the life data is not sufficient, what more should ICANN do to get more data? Will the SSAC give specific advice to ICANN on this before they allow new TLDs to be allowed into the root?"

PATRIK FALSTROM: Let me try to respond to that. SSAC has not said that day in the lifetime data is not sufficient to draw conclusions. What we are saying is that regardless of how much data or how little data you collect, you will always be able to draw conclusions. So, but regardless of how much data we collect from various systems, there will always be unknowns.

So we are not taking a specific stand there. Russ, do you want to say something more?

RUSS: Well, it just doesn't – a little bit more, and that is that the recommendations that we in fact have made in the past, and I don't remember the precise report, it was in the response to the regional scaling studies, we're recommending at that time a data collection

---

system, enhanced over what was there, get defined, get developed, put in place.

So this is really a re-recommendation of, in this particular context, of an earlier recommendation that SSAC made.

PATRIK FALSTROM:

What we are writing in this report is also that you see the recommendation on the screen here, that ICANN should consider, sorry. Okay, sorry, it was not here. What we are talking about in the report, is that, as Russ said, that the various monitoring capabilities that we have, which is the data collecting and the reporting that is happening of the TLDs, are delegated, must take these things into account.

We in SSAC are working together with RSAC and then, regarding what data is collected, and available from the live DNS, and Russ is our liaison to RSAC, the Root Server Advisory Committee. And we do know in SSAC that they are working on a few reports regarding this monitoring capability that we in this report point out, should also give – will recommend that those...

We also recommend that that kind of monitoring must also take name space collision is taken into account. Please.

UNIDENTIFIED:

There is also a fair amount of information that the root simply doesn't see because of caching and similar things. So, if you just look at [diddle] data and some of the things, you don't actually get a very good picture of what the real queries are. So recursive data is also useful.

---

MIKE O'CONNOR: This is Mike O'Connor again. If anybody else wants to ask a question, I'm happy to step back...

PATRIK FALSTROM: Yeah, we have time for this question from you and then one more, and then we need to end because there is another meeting after us. Okay. So let's take those two.

JULIA: Okay. Question one. On the IDN advisory, does SSAC realize that the CJK Panel for Integration is not working well? The K community has not yet started their work and yesterday's IDN session we were told that all of CJK movement may not be possible in that script.

Do SSAC think that it is better to wait for all communities that uses script to complete work before having variant TLDs? Or can the communities that are complete with their work move forward? What is the risk if there are no overlaps? Or if one community declares that they can opt out of working with the full community?

PATRIK FALSTROM: The SSAC view is that key four... The important thing to be able to move forward is that we are a well-functioning integration panel, which means that we need to have an integration panel that find that whatever data they get from whatever group, they get the information.

---

Results in a rules for variance in the root zone, that they believe is stable and sound, and is forward compatible, as we explained in the report. And given that the person asking the question has the view that is currently not stable enough, or that there are some weaknesses, that is an example of why we think the integration panel work is so important, that they can make a judgment on whether the input to it is sound or not.

JULIA: Actually, that was the only question, thanks.

RON: This is Ron [?], I'm with the SSAC. In addition to that, I think our view is that completeness is more important than speed when it comes to the integration panel and the work on IDN variance.

PATRIK FALSTROM: So what we are saying is actually sort of two things. We think that completion is better than speed, but we also say that the actual decision on completion, we believe that integration panel is key to make that decision.

Okay, Mike, you get the last question.

MIKE O'CONNOR: It's Mike again. My voice works better this time. I'm a newly minted GNSO counselor. I've been in the job less than 24 hours. And one of

---

the things that sort of caught my eye is, one of the recommendations is that there needs to be policy on the un-delegation issues.

And I'm just curious from the sort of GNSO perspective, A) whether the GNSO should consider that, and B) if so, how does this happen? This is just a newbie question.

PATRIK FALSTROM:

Yeah, I don't think we really say that there should be policy around it, but of course, the wording in the document is, the words are chosen very precisely. So, please, have a look at that. But, that might be, of course, one outcome that the GNSO is picking up our recommendation, whatever wording it actually is. And see what they can do to make us feel more comfortable.

MIKE O'CONNOR:

So when the SSAC speaks to the... I'm being a process guy at the moment. Do you speak to the Board and then the Board has to ask the GNSO, or can you speak to the GNSO?

PATRIK FALSTROM:

Our recommendations are... Sometimes they are very directed to ICANN staff, to the ICANN Board, or to the ICANN community. Specifically, I'm looking at [?] a little bit here, which is our liaison to the Board, but specifically for ICANN staff, which are things that might have budget implications, then we do recommendations to the Board that actually do a resolution that results in the staff doing anything.

---

But we are doing recommendations targeted at the ICANN community as well. [?] do you want to expand on this?

UNKNOWN:

Thank you. Very quickly, yes we generally... Our recommendations are aimed at the Board, and the Board converts it to resolutions that can go through. But the SSAC also has the ability to recommend the creation of a PDP, or the creation of work, and can recommend that the GNSO or ccNSO, or other SO/ACs, work with it.

We did that with the RID, the internationalized registration data, working group that got initiated by a SSAC recommendation. So we do have the ability to do that, but most of our work is aimed at sending to the Board who then passes as it directives to the staff, or directives to the various SOs ACs.

PATRIK FALSTROM:

So with that, I declare this SSAC at ICANN 48 closed, and stop recording. Thank you very much for coming.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]