EN

CR - SSAC Public Meeting
Thursday, March 15, 2012 – 08:30 to 09:30
ICANN - San Jose, Costa Rica

Patrik Fältström: Welcome everyone; this is the public meeting of ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee at the 43rd ICANN meeting.

So quite quickly I will browse through and give an overview of what we have been doing in SSAC lately, and then we'll dive into it a little bit deeper discussion about the recent publications and the work that we are doing.

So we will start with us in SSAC it was actually yesterday, ten years ago exactly on the day that the Board make a decision to form SSAC. SSAC provides guidance and writes reports that is supposed to be of use for any part of the ICANN community, and when we come back in the session on how we are doing, our measurements, that is actually an ongoing work we have to look at how we are measuring that.

The role itself as I said is specified in our Charter, and one of the things that is happening is that we requested a year ago to change our Charter and that resulted in some other work in ICANN regarding overview of the security and stability responsibilities of ICANN that will question what ICANN actually look at. There will be a session directly after this one in this room that go more into details of that overview.

Today we have 38 members in SSAC pending some Board resolutions this coming Board meeting. We are slowly doing a rotation of the Board members and we do it in the form of reviewing people's membership every third year, so when people are appointed, they're appointed on a three-year term, and we have one third of the members be reviewed every year.

The recent publications are one on dotless domains. I will go through a few of those a little bit later, is a report on dotless domain names, and it's single character internationalized top level domains, we will go through a little bit more about those later.

WHOIS' [terminal DS] structure, that resulted in some actions that is currently up for open consultations, as you will see. And then up until the last ICANN meeting we also had a couple of reports on DNS blocking, which was a question from the GAC and a few others on risk analysis, and other things that are related to the new gTLD process.

What might be more interesting to see in front of us and this is where we would like to have some comments on the work plan. We have currently a couple of work parties that we're participating in, the internationalized registration data working group, and the security and stability analysis working group.

And then internal we have the membership committee and work party on impact on DNS blocking, which is a continuation of the previous work on SSAC 050. And we also have a work party on DNSSEC root key rollover, which is looking into the specifics of that.

This week we have had and will have a few more meetings with other constituencies and groups and stakeholder groups inside ICANN. We also had a meeting with law enforcement, various briefings with the various groups inside ICANN that contact us and would like to meet. And what groups we are meeting, there is a little bit between the various meetings, the ICANN meetings depending on the interest from other groups.

We also have a list of potential future work that might be future work parties when we have finalized the ones that we are currently working with, and that includes for example discussion on whether it would be a good thing if we had the ability for registries to for example register domain names, or block registration of domain names that are used in for example false (inaudible) numbers and various different kind of the tax scenarios. We are thinking about

talking about of course we expect to get some questions from other groups that are related to the new gTLD process in various ways.

We are looking various different kind of implications of the, now when we're moving from only using IPv4 to use both IPv4 and IPv6, which might increase the amount of addressing direction that is used in various ways and talk about what kind of implications that have. And we have a few other kinds of things on our list.

But this list is something that we not only create ourselves, but also of course we want to create that based on input from the community, both what should on this list of potential future work, but also the priorities. So if it is the case that you have an interest, or your stakeholder group have an interest on specific topics or need to get us to review something, please let us know, because we are here to help you all.

If we look at the last couple of documents, if we take the last three or something, three or four, the SAC 050 on blocking talks about the need for calculation of balance between benefit and harm. And that there are various different kinds of decisions that can be made related to blocking and specifically when using the DNS as blocking, that has far more harm than the benefit.

Document number 051 on WHOIS taxonomy was a decision – we took a decision ourselves to work on this, and one of the reasons is that we already have created a document number 327 and 33 and all of them talked about for example that we urge people to use a shared taxonomy to make sure that everyone understood what we were talking about.

For example, when people use the word WHOIS, that could guide the protocol or the database or the syntax or the service. And to some degree from SSAC's point of view, we are a little bit nervous that we cannot move; make progress in ICANN just because people talk about different things. So it's unclear what we are discussing.

The second thing that we talked about in this report is that a uniform standard framework for the data, is something that should also be developed so that it's much easier to handle all other kind of things that we were talking about, for example how to handle access control and other kind of things. So we need to start building a framework and we recommend to start with the actual database.

So that resulted actually in a resolution on the 28th of October, 2011 to ask ICANN staff to create a roadmap and the draft roadmap is posted for public comments and it will be this afternoon between 1:00 and 2:00 p.m. there will be an open meeting to discuss this.

SSAC number 052 was a response to a question from ICANN Board on what SSAC's view of delegation of one character IDN top level domains. This report resulted in SSAC recommended strongly, very careful approach, a conservative approach to litigation and we said that well, it's probably the case that, or most certainly the case that specific sort of process needs to be used to be handle one character top level domains.

We did recognize of course that one character top level domain is something that is needed in many cases and also many cases where it's sort of safe to allocate those one character top level domain. The question is that it's hard to know what cases are safe or not, just like SAC 050, this is a short report, it's two pages of background and two pages of recommendation and conclusion, so it's very, very easy for you to read.

Document number 053 is something that we decided to write based on our, we decided ourselves to write this document. It was not a question from anyone, and that was based on us detecting that there were quite a lot of parties out in the community that talked about actually using dotless domains for example, http://exxonpole/ without any dot, or using the domain name in an email address without a dot.

So we went back and had a look at what the problems actually were and the finding is one the SMTP protocol, an email actually requires a dot in the domain name. And two it is and we found surprisingly enough, there were more

applications, operating systems and look up libraries that actually do accept dotless domains but do not pass the name to the DNS. Instead it's actually the case that the token itself will not reach DNS. So the finding was so strong and create so much confusion we felt, so we actually recommend not using any of these address records or records that refer to services in the apex of a zone. And I think that's – yes.

So that was an introduction of what we have been doing lately. And now we're going to dig a little bit deeper into the various topics and I would like to first of all see whether any immediate questions, I don't think so, because I think it's better to move forward, but I just want to check. Okay, thank you.

With that I would like to present the people that are up on the stage, which I intentionally waited a little bit, because I thought that some people might actually be a little bit late. So let's start from my left, and will you say your name and et cetera, present yourself.

Matt Larson: I'm Matt Larson from VeriSign.

Warren Kumari: Hi, Warren Kumari from Google.

Frederick Konabes: Frederick [Konabes] from NIC.br.

Don Blumenthal: Don Blumenthal, Public Interest Registry.

Rod Radmussen: Rod Radmussen with Internet Identity.

Steve Sheng:	Steve Sheng, ICANN support staff.
Patrik Fältström:	Patrik Fältström from Net Mode and Chair of SSAC.
Jim Galvin:	Jim Galvin, Affiliates and Vice Chair of SSAC.
Julie Hedlund:	Julie Hedlund, SSAC support staff from ICANN.
Suzanne Woolf:	Suzanne Woolf, ISC and RSAC.
Lyman Chapin:	Lyman Chapin, [Inter Aisle] Consulting Group.
Mark Kosters:	Mark Kosters, ARIN.
Julie Hedlund:	And on the telephone I think we have at least one person from the SSAC. Could you announce yourself?
Jaap Akkerhuis:	Jaap Akkerhuis.
Julie Hedlund:	It's Jaap Akkerhuis from the SSAC. Anyone else on the phone? And I should note that in the chat room, the Adobe Connect Chat Room we have also SSAC members, we have Julie Hammer and Robert Gurera, they're actually invited

guests at this moment, up for appointment by the ICANN Board. And we've also had someone, another SSAC member just join us at the table.

Ram Mohan: Ram Mohan.

Patrik Fältström: And Ram Mohan is also our liaison to ICANN Board. So let's go into the more interesting details possibly.   SAC 052 Advisor and Delegational Single Character IDN Top Level Domains, very long name for something that is actually talking about one character things.

So some background, currently TLDs consist of two or more characters, the gTLD is more than three or three or more, ccTLDs two. There have been some discussion for example in the JIG Working Group on allowing also single character TLDs and specifically IDN TLDs. The ICANN Board asked SSAC for advice on the security and stability aspect of delegating single character IDN TLDs, and this question was sent to us in the Fall of 2011.

The question was also sent to ALAC AND GAC. This resulted in our report number 52 which is in response to that question. The finding is that single character TLDs are more likely to cause user confusion if you think about the whole domain name than TLDs with more than one character. And this is just because if you only have one character in the TLD, it ends up being sort of the needle in the haystack problem if it is the case that the rest of the domain name is exactly identical or even intentionally created in such a way to create confusion.

Finding number two, we don't find any other kind of security concerns with the delegational single character TLDs than these potential like confusability equivalent issues.

The third thing is that when we looked around to see whether instead of saying well, we don't really know how to handle this, we did quite a lot of outreach to

see whether there were solutions that we could refer to that could be used, what we found is that the work that is ongoing for string similarity and variance and equivalent is something that is still ongoing. So there were nothing that we could reference to say okay, this is actually something, a quirk or something that talks about how to handle this issue.

And the recommendation based on those findings as I mentioned earlier is that we recommend a very conservative approach to the delegational single character IDN top level domains. And the overall algorithm that we recommend is to by default disallow single character TLDs, but allow on exceptional basis. We note that because there are some important relevant work regarding string similarity, for example, related to the applicant guide book and the new gTLD process, the work on variant issues, the fact that the TLD syntax is something that is discussed in the IETF, and other kind of things that are ongoing, we recommend that ICANN have a look at this again and no later than one year after the work that we suggest had been completed.

Any questions on this? Okay, next dotless domains. Yes, please.

Ram Mohan: This is Ram Mohan. I just wanted to also point out that the SSAC report on single character TLDs from a Board perspective, what it helps advise the Board is whether the Board should change existing guidelines and rules that exist as it exists today and in the new gTLD guidebook, as well as in the ccTLD area. But in the new gTLD guidebook, the Board has clearly said single character TLDs will not be delegated, will not be allowed. So this report helps ensure or helps advise the Board to stay that course, rather than change the course. So that's the impact to the Board.

The Board has not yet made a decision, because it's looking for – it asks three communities as Patrik said, ALAC, GAC and SSAC. And two of the three have come back and the third is in the process of looking at the results.

Patrik Fältström: Thank you and that didn't lead to any more questions either. Thank you very much for that outtake Ram, very important. Okay, moving ahead.

Report 53 on dotless domains; we can explain a little bit more about what we're talking about. So we started to get questions like this. If I registered dot brand, will I be able to use the label brand alone in the URL or an email address. And if I do, what will happen? And SSAC decided to call that kind of usage of a domain name, or that kind of domain name a dotless domain.

The findings that we came up with is that the resolution of dotless domain names are not consistent or universal. And now when we talk about resolution, we do not talk only about the DNS, we talk about much, much wider the resolution of the name in an application or operating system or the equivalent, the whole resolution as it general term.

So for example we looked at web browsers, local area network issues, DNS [stub] resolvers and email were the specific areas which sort of looked at this more closely. For example if you type in a dotless domain in the web browser, just like brand, we saw a couple of different kind of different results depending on the browser and operating system.

For example, some examples of behavior is to add the popular domains effects like dot com, dot c or dot uk or something. And sometimes this top level domain that depends on the locale acceptance in the browser. Another potential behavior is to append the DNS search path, and the search path is something that in many – for example it's distributed with the help of DXCP that has to do with what is called the Siri con, Siri configuration issue.

So if it is the case that a user normally for example is in its enterprise network, it might work very well, but then when you're out traveling or here at the ICANN network, you have a different search path, and you will get different results. Another example of a behavior is that if you have a dotless domain, the dotless domain itself is not part of the DNS, but to a search engine. And this is something that can happen either in the application, like the web browser, but we also see in the result that it's actually happened in the sub-resolver which

means – sorry, in the resolver somewhere which means that even though it's a DNS query from the local client, it might be turned into some kind of search engine or key word lookup system.

And then of course we did see cases where the dotless domain was sent to the DNS, but in very rare cases. And the big issue here which concerns SSAC is that there were different results, because that is something that we are concerned over, the non-consistency. So as I said earlier dotless domains of course works in the DNS, so the only thing that we're talking about apart from the [SNT] protocol is the implementation issue in web browsers, operating systems and local resolvers or look out mechanisms locally in the local computer, which means that just by having software vendors change the application, of course it might be case that all of these concerns go away, but we also see from SSAC that updating operating systems and web browsers in the world is a very slow process, where for example at the moment people try to – we get people to stop using Windows XP and Internet Explorer 6, but we still have quite a lot of that in the field, which means that even though we start to develop new software that can handle dotless domains today, the transition period is very, very long. And it's not clear that all of it for example local area network issues for example that is implemented in the [biatal] implemented protocol bon jour will go away.

So what we recommend is that just because dotless domains will not be reachable universally, we strongly recommend against their use. We even recommend that years of DNS resource records such as a "MX" and equivalent in the apex of the top level domain be excluded in all different ways possible. That's it. Any question there?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I always hesitate to ask a question in this forum, because it just reveals my ignorance about most of these topics, but in terms of these recommendations, does the second one mean, so for example when dot brand, to give your example, is approved through the new gTLD process and is delegated ultimately, is it your recommendation that in the registry agreement between

ICANN and the operator of dot brand, this activity that would lead to the use of dotless domains be contractually prohibited, is that what you're recommending?

Patrik Fältström: That is our recommendation, yes.

Steve Metalitz: Okay, and the registry agreement doesn't currently, the draft that's in the applicant guidebook doesn't currently address I think that's correct, so there would need to be a change to that in order to effectuate this.

Patrik Fältström: Yes, we are aware of that. It's also the case of course that we are aware of the fact that of course not everyone will listen to us [laughter], but another thing is that the recommendations that we make are not only directed to ICANN. It's to the community, so we are really, really strongly discouraging the use of these records, just because it will work sometimes and sometimes not, the actual implications are so inconsistent, so we cannot even foresee what kind of secondary effects it might be that's it in use and then maybe work.

Steve Metalitz: I understand that and I think don't underestimate I think the power of your recommendations. I think when you tell people don't do this; I think a lot of people will listen. But your second recommendation should be contractually prohibited to do this. I think there's going to need to be other changes to the registry agreement as it now appears in the guidebook, and this would be one of them, but I just wanted to understand how it fit together.

Patrik Fältström: Another question that we got in another session is that okay, let's say that we do add this, okay, and also remember that we also at the same time write in the report that software implementations, if they change, our recommendations

might be void, because suddenly it might work. What kind of implications does it have that we have in that case a registry agreement that say don't use this, but in reality it will actually work later on, and if we expect this registry agreement to be valid during ten years, the question we got at SSAC is, well, do you think that this will change fast enough, so we'll have problems within ten years, which means that we have to vote – sorry invoke our staff processes on sort of initiated from SSAC or like whatever – or from ICANN side, instead of the other way around.

And these are all valid comments that are sort of typical to come up afterwards. So we are not clear on whether this should be worked into the agreement or not. It could be voluntarily, it could be part of the corporate social responsibility that registries say that we are not going to do this for example.

There had been a discussion on wildcards in top level domains for a while. And that was something that was quite popular in TLDs. We in SSAC wrote and some other organizations' ID – that is not a very good thing. Without any contractual like arrangement or anything, the number of wildcards in top level domains has gone down significantly, which means that sometimes having it really explicitly typed out in a legal document is sometimes not needed. Thank you.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you.

Patrik Fältström: Maybe someone else in SSAC would like to add something to this by the way; I'm not the only one that should speak. Okay, thank you.

Andrew Sullivan: My name is Andrew Sullivan. I wondered, you've got these DNS resource records such as cauda and MX and I wondered what this "such as" means there?

EN

Like are SRBs on this list? Is this a control plane, data plane distinction, okay? Thank you.

Patrik Fältström: The answer is yes, and let me put it this way. We started that discussion on whether we should even have an explicit list. We also were discussing whether the list should be void of this, or allow only this, and I don't remember off the top of my head, exactly what the text says in the document. Do you remember Steve?

Steve Metalitz: I think the committee decided on the exclusion base, because it was easier to justify it than an inclusion based.

Patrik Fältström: But it was one of these last cases we discussed, and because the text, it was a couple – my apologies that I don't remember the actual text that we came up with, so I encourage you to actually go back and look at our document.

Andrew Sullivan: So it's actually that, that caused me to get up here, not this slide. Because when I read the document, I don't understand what the motivation is there. So for this particular case, I was probably able to figure it out, but in the future, it might useful to try to make that distinction.

Patrik Fältström: Yes, I think the control plane, data plane, that kind of terminology, that's fine, that's kind of interesting that you just – that's good feedback. Maybe those are the kind of – those kind of terminology or something that we should use in the future, or even should have used. Ram.

Ram Mohan: Thank you. The report actually has this [elasticized] language that you're objecting to Andrew. The report is – the statement here, Patrik is almost exactly what's in the report, and it does say "such as".

Patrik Fältström: Thank you Ram, anyone else? But the background of the discussion is just like you say, the data plane control (inaudible), yes.

So the last topic on the agenda has to do with the outcome, the work that is ongoing on outcomes Ram, can I hand over to you?

Ram Mohan: Thank you, this is a work party and a project that SSAC began almost a year ago. And in the Dakar open meeting, we reported on where we were and we were just about to begin implementation.

Just to start, with the end in mind, the goal of this project was to understand if the work that SSAC is doing is having an intended effect, and to also improve the way we work based on measuring outcomes, it's hard to improve if you don't know what to improve. And so that's part of the goal here.

So one of the first questions was, what is the intended effect of SSAC's work, and the way we decided to measure it was to look at the following two things. A, are we providing advice in the areas that are consistent with our Charter? In other words, are we sticking to the knitting and not straying far afield from our core Charter, that's the first thing.

And the second is, is the advice that we're providing being used, being consumed by the community that we serve, both the supporting organizations, as well as the Board of Directors.

We reported on this again and ended up our meeting, but continuing forward, it took from 2003 to 2011, if you look at it, these are some of the substantive Board resolutions that came kind of a straight line if you will from an SSAC

report to a result that the Board ended up moving in a certain direction and had the community as a result move in a certain direction. I won't go through all of the details on the slide, but this is one of the things that seem to be a measurable impact of SSAC work.

There was four specific things that we decided to do and each one of them is listed here. The very first one is a fairly straight forward thing, which is to create an additional link on the SSAC website, if you go to the SSAC website SSAC.ICANN.org, you will find listed on the left-hand side, a list of documents, right, and what we have done now is to define for every single report, every single document that SSAC is putting out which focus area or category, under which one of them it falls in the Charter. So that's attempting to draw a straight line between what we are set up to do and saying the reports have come out, you know which category that they fill in. That's the first thing.

The second piece of work that is currently in development is to create a place on the SSAC website that tracks the actions that result from SSAC documents. So for those of you who have read SSAC documents and for those of you who haven't, typically SSAC reports tend to follow a fairly standard format. We define the problem that we're attempting to study. We then have some discussion about the problem. We come up with a set of findings, most often we say here are the findings, the observations and the findings from our study, and if we have recommendations, we have specific recommendations.

And recommendations tend to often be in an action-oriented way "ICANN should do this, the GNSO ought to do this" type of things. So what we're trying to do now is to track the various actions that are listed in our various documents, the reports and actually provide a look and insight into what's happening to those actions. Because that's another way of saying are the things that we are saying, do they have any impact, and are they being acted upon.

The third is to commence a survey of the various constituencies that we serve, the core of folks who constitute ICANN community, and to determine from them, to learn from them first, if our papers are being used and second, how our

papers and our work is being used. We have some anecdotal responses from various folks. SSAC met with the GAC a few days ago, and several GAC members in that session shared with us that some of the reports had been written, for instance the report on DNS blocking had been used directly by some GAC members and cited in the documents that they created. But we don't have a systematic study of that, and that's what we're trying to do here to understand, are we being cited, are there citations, is it really useful reference type material.

And the last is to review Google link statistics periodically for each document as an informal measure if you will; maybe it's even a formal measure, but it's as a measure of the popularity of that document how many other places are linking into the document that we are creating.

So number two, three and four as you can see are in development. So this is what I was saying earlier on the SSAC page, you will find that there now a link to the Charter, so you can see the SSAC Charter, but in addition to that, there are tasks that are listed for every single category of work that SSAC is chartered to do. Questions.

Mikey O'Connor: My name is Mikey O'Connor and it's really early in the morning for me, thanks Ram. I'm a customer of yours when I hang out in the GNSO and as you were speaking, I was sort of thinking about the experience we had on not the current 85th IRTP Working Group, but the 84th one that immediately preceded it. And we were working on that notion that was I think in – I know it was in an SSAC report, I think it was about five or six years ago, where SSAC suggested that there be an emergency action contact established at registrars for situations when bad things were going on.

And this is a way to go and a question. The way to go part of this was, it was really helpful for me, as an advocate for that idea in the working group to be able to lose my temper at a GNSO meeting and say you know we've been waiting around for this for about five years; can't you get off the dime? So that was really helpful.

The question I guess I've got is that how much do you all kind of consider yourselves advocates for these positions, once you've published them? Because in a way it was sort of weird, you know this report is out there, it's got some really important ideas in it, and yet there is very little sort of socializing in the community, there is nobody tugging at my sleeve as a member of the working group from SSAC, you know no SSAC people sort of calling me up saying, hey Mikey you're working on this, anything we can do to help.

Steve Crocker came out with a very helpful email that said way to go and I waved that around too. I'm just curious what you all are thinking about in terms of your role, post publication, because at least the sense that I've got is that it's sort of well we throw these over the transom and then we're done, and we kind of leave it up to the rest of you, and as sort of an aging sales guy, I can tell you that a little more push would sometimes be helpful there. So any thoughts about that?

Ram Mohan:

Thank you for that. So perhaps the biggest amount of focus in the last few years Mikey has been to pursue follow-up actions with the Board. In my direct role as the liaison to the Board, that's one of the things that I worked pretty hard on to birddog some of these issues and to convert the outcomes and the recommendations from the reports. If they are appropriate convert them into taskings and actions for staff to work on.

To the best of my recollection, the best of my knowledge, I don't think there is an equivalent function that we actually do in the other SOs and ACs. And I think your comment is very useful in saying perhaps we should consider that kind of follow up and a follow through function in not only the Board, but in the other places as well, especially in places like the GNSO Council where policy often bubbles up in the bottom up manner.

Mikey O'Connor: I agree a lot. The one thing I'd refine in that is that where the policy really gets created is at the bottom. It's down…

[break in audio]

Ram Mohan: …let me back up.

I don't expect you all to monitor all the working groups and aggressively pursue stuff that seems overwhelming; if I were in your shoes, I wouldn't want to do that. What would be really helpful though to working group members like me is a clear channel to ask you for help, because I bonk into these things in your reports. I go this is excellent. But then I don't really know how to grab electrical cord from the SSAC and plug it into the work we're doing and kind of light it up.

And so I wind up in the working group sometimes being your advocate and I'm really badly prepared to do that, because I wasn't involved in the working group, and I'm not really as technically strong as you all. So what would be neat is some sort of way that I could pull a ticket and say, hey I could use an air strike from the SSAC on this working group for a few weeks or a month, or maybe get somebody to join us in the working group for a while to help us refine this, so that we can – because the way we did it in and just to stick with that IRTP one, the way we did it was the five guys that drink beer all the time, and do all the working groups in the GNSO; me, James Bladel, Paul Diaz, you know the usual suspects.

And we sat around and drank beer and kind of read your report and tried to figure out what you meant, and it never really occurred to me to ask you. [Laughter] And part of that is because there is this sort of distant relationship, you know in a way, we in the trenches in the GNSO sort of view you as the technological priesthood, I mean you sort of heard that from Steve.

We kind of come up here knowing that we are totally clueless and we are dealing with folks who definitely have a clue. And so it would be neat to have a way to open that channel a little bit that was a little bit less mysterious.

Ram Mohan: Very useful, Suzanne?

Suzanne Woolf: Sure. So if I understand what I'm hearing is that we agree on the basic role, which is to provide advice, not implementation or operational support, but also that there is kind of a gap where that advice could be more accessible, either in the primary form of the reports and so on, or in follow up work.

So the issue is less about the fundamental role of SSAC, which is what I first thought you were talking about, and more about making that advice accessible to a slightly broader community.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm going to lean towards the – I love fundamental, because the advice is accessible, it's on the web, you can read it, but if in the metrics kind of discussion where you're sort of – the kind of motivator of that discussion as well does our work matter, I think that the answer to making your work matter is follow through. And I think that follow through, at least at the bottom of the bottom up process which is where I hang out and prefer to be, the way to make your work matter more is to dive into soup with us every once in a while.

We don't want you to take the cycles that's required to live through all of that rumpus, but the way the working group work is typically structured is we sort of have a pile of things to work through. We kind of work on one for a month or so and then we move onto the next.

And what would be neat is if there was a way to get you down there in the mud pit with us for a while to help get it right. Because I don't think we went as far

as we could have gone in that IRTP recommendation. It was a pretty light recommendation at the end of the day. And I think part of the reason it was so light is because we didn't really understand the nuances and edges of what was being suggested, and it would have been great if you had one or two of the authors of that part of the report in there with us. You know hands off on the policy, but hands on with the help to the policy makers. I'm getting the hatchet from Patrik, so I'll stop.

Ram Mohan: Oh, Patrik had a response as well.

Patrik Fältström: Yes, please stay by the microphone. One thing that I had been doing the last couple of days and specifically this morning, actually as a breakfast meeting is that we have seen a couple of clashes in the scheduling at the ICANN meeting itself, where we have what I call clashes between SO, AC group specific sort of silo meetings, and the cross constituency topic-based discussions for example, ccNSO hosted a meeting on the SOPA PIPA thing Tuesday.

Yesterday there was a meeting that was initiated by ICANN staff on what can we do about litigation, so we actually can make it possible and able to use those new top level domains.

One thing that I had been advocating personally is that just like we have the constituency sort of day Tuesday, we need to ensure that there is an ability to do a scheduling so we want part of the schedule of the week should be just topic based discussions, so we don't have topic-based and silo-based discussions scheduled at the same point in time.

I hope that those kinds of things also cannot only help advocating, for example – sorry, communicating with each other after for example SSAC had written a report, but also get some more early warning, and early discussion and early sort of communication between difference constituencies that have interest on the

same topic. And that is something that I will continue to advocate in favor of until either we get it, or someone convinced me it's a completely stupid idea.

Male: Thank you Patrik. Okay, (Inaudible).

Male: I think the only refinement of that that I would offer is that these meetings, I fully agree with the silo versus functional I mean that's a classic managerial problem. The bulk of the work in the GNSO by far probably in the 98% category does not happen at these meetings. It happens in those weekly grinding it out, working group sessions.

And so if there was a way for the SSAC to kind of make itself more available to support those in a way, whatever way is appropriate for you, that's where you're really going to see the impact. I mean there's a lot of conversation of networking and so on at the face to face meetings. That's fantastic, but the work is done –

Patrik Fältström: Got it, so if I could paraphrase it, take away as a request for more SSAC participation in the cross constituency groups and work, and as well as cross-constituency working groups, just directly at that level.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I would rewrite that to say cross constituency and constituency specific ones.

Ram Mohan: … specific.

Mikey O'Connor:	Because you know there aren't very many cross constituencies.
Ram Mohan:	The other take-away I saw from what you said was perhaps the establishment of better channels of communication into SSAC so that you we don't look like some people practicing voodoo.
Mikey O'Connor:	You don't in any way look bad, but you are intimidatingly smart, and we find [laughter] – we find you intimidating.
Ram Mohan:	Buy us a beer.
Mikey O'Connor:	Beer is good, that helps a lot. Thanks.
Ram Mohan:	Any other questions? Anything from the remote side Julie? Okay, any other SSAC members want to say something on this? Suzanne.
Suzanne Woolf:	Sure, only that that's really good feedback to have, just because I tend to think and have thought for all the years I've been doing this that the best way forward for all of us is to – everybody steps in and learns some things, and learns new ways of working together. So thank you.
Ram Mohan:	Thank you, back to you Patrik.

Patrik Fältström: Thank you very much and that was actually the last point on the agenda I think, yes. So I open up for either of the SSAC member or people in the audience just bring up any kind of topic.

Well, in that case, I give back seven minutes of your life.   Thank you. [Laughter] Thank you very much for coming.

[Applause]

[End of Transcript]