SINGAPORE – SSAC Public Meeting
Thursday, February 12, 2015 – 08:00 to 09:00
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

PATRIK FALSTROM: Welcome, everyone. This is the open SSAC meeting at ICANN 52 in Singapore. We are in this hotel room with the same design without any windows. Singapore this time.

I'm happy to see so many people, and specifically happy to not only see SSAC members. I hope that we will have a good discussion.

SSAC, the Security & Stability Advisory Committee began operation in 2002 and we provide guidance to ICANN board, supporting organizations, and advisory committees, and the general community. Our charter is to advise the ICANN community and board on matters relating to the security and integrity of the Internet's naming and address allocation systems. It's definitely not only the DNS and domain names.

Jim and myself were reappointed as chair and vice chair and Ram Mohan is on your last year of your term this year.

RAM MOHAN: Running out.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Time is running out. We have 34 members as of February 2015 and they're appointed by ICANN board for three-year terms. Since ICANN 51 in Los Angeles, we published SAC 69, advisory on maintaining the

---

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.

security and stability of the IANA functions through the stewardship transition and we will describe that document shortly. It is the third out of three documents related to the IANA stewardship that we have published. The two earlier, and those were the two we released after ICANN 50 in London. SAC 67, that is an overview and history of IANA, which is the description of what the IANA function is doing and SAC 68, which is a report on what the contract between Department of Commerce of ICANN is covering.

Since last meeting in Singapore, we also published our comments on the JAS Phase 1 report on mitigating the risk of DNS name space collisions.

Current work in progress includes a work party on public suffix list. We are looking at the results from the SSAC workshop at the 2014 Internet governance forum in Istanbul. We have one work party on new gTLDs that look at mid-course correction, collisions, and timing of the next round.

We have one work party on registrant protection and credential management. Then we have three ongoing work parties: the membership committee, DNSSEC sessions at ICANN meetings, and one new standing work party which is tracking the advice that we give specifically to the board. It would look at the future milestones. First quarter of 2015, we are looking at finishing the advisory and public suffix lists, finishing the work on advisory on the IGF forum and having the DNSSEC workshop at ICANN 52, which took place yesterday.

Second quarter, we look at DNSSEC workshop at ICANN 53 and finish the work on advisory on registrant protection and credential management.

Third quarter, finish the work on new gTLD issues. And then the fourth quarter, host the DNSSEC workshop at ICANN 54.

Are there any questions in general on the work that we currently provide or not provide or not working on? Yes, please?

PAUL MUCHENE: My name is Paul Muchene. I'm an ICANN fellow from Kenya. I just wanted you to tell me a bit about the advisory on the IGF forum on why would SSAC do an advisory on IGF?

PATRIK FALSTROM: The advisory is not on the IGF. SSAC hosted – thank you for the question, because it's really important to clarify when there are some misunderstandings. SSAC, just like many other organizations, applied for a workshop at the IGF. We were granted the workshop and we hosted a workshop at the IGF that was dealing with blocking and otherwise actions taken by specifically non-governments that could have impact on the openness of the Internet and the ability to communicate.

So SSAC hosted that workshop. There were a lot of people there, so what we in SSAC are working on is to draw conclusions from the feedback of that workshop and see whether we can give any advisory to someone based on the content of the workshop. We are not commenting on the IGF process itself.

So to the IANA function stewardship transition, which of course is a pretty big thing here at this ICANN meeting. As the chair of SSAC, I can tell you a little funny story. I of course talk about how hard staff has to

ICANN | 52
Singapore

work, ICANN staff. And one thing I understand is that the ICANN staff that worked with the function stewardship transition, they are completely burned out just like us that work with it.

On the other hand, I had some discussion with some staff that is not working with the stewardship and [inaudible], "What do you think about this meeting?" I said this is one of the greatest meetings ever, because everyone is working with that thing over there, so I can actually get things done. So maybe it's not such a bad thing after all.

So we published SAC 69. The comparison between 67, 68, and 69 is that 67 and 68 are trying to describe – just describe, in a clear way – 67, what the IANA function has been doing, is doing and why while 68 talks about the contract between Department of Commerce and ICANN, regarding the IANA function.

There is a discrepancy between these two because the IANA function are doing other things as well that is not covered by the contract.

For example, 69 is the SSAC view on this transition. In this document, we describe in which way the NTIA currently contributes to the security, security, and resiliency of the IANA function activities.

We present questions and issues that the SSAC believes must be addressed by the Internet community in order to preserve the security, security, and resiliency of the IANA functions activities through and beyond the transition. And SSAC do make recommendations to each of the questions and issues raised in the document.

Like we pointed out yesterday and we met with the CWG names and presented this, I want to emphasize that instead of running to the hills,

people should actually read the document and see that one of the things that we try to do is to point out to the community how few things there are that actually, first of all, IANA is doing and then how few things it is where NTIA actually is involved.

On the other hand, those things which we do list it is extremely important that the community do have a good plan for how those things are taken care of. It's much easier to boil one pot of water than the ocean.

We further say that any proposal to replace the NTIA's final authorization of the root zone changes with an alternative must be at least as reliable, resilient, and efficient as the current process.

Effective arrangements should be made for the reliable and timely performance of all aspects of the root zone management process post transition including inter-organization, coordination if the post-transition root zone management process involves more than one root zone management partner.

And NTIA should clarify the processes and legal framework associated with the role of the root zone maintainer after the transition.

We further recommend that it should be determined whether or not the requirements and deliverables defined in the IANA functions contract should be retained, and if additional external controls are necessary, how and by whom they should be administered and also determine whether existing mechanisms outside of the IANA functions contract are sufficiently robust to hold the IANA functions operator accountable to the effective communities for the proper performance

ICANN | 52
Singapore

EN

of the IANA functions after the IANA functions contract expires. And if they are not, the community should determine what additional accountability mechanisms will be needed. This is explained in more detail in the document itself.

One should also investigate and clarify the process for handling the possibility of governmental sanctions and restrictions i.e. the protocol for obtaining OFAC licenses, where the US sanctions might interfere with the ability to execute proper instructions to IANA following the stewardship transition; consider the extent to which the importance of transparency and freedom from improper influence in the performance of the IANA functions might require additional mechanisms or other safeguards.

And finally, review; and if necessary, enhance its policy development process to ensure that all of the instructions that it provides to the IANA functions operator are clear and implementable.

It will end up being very much me just reading exactly what is on the screen, but there is a reason why I do that, because the words are chosen pretty carefully. There's more that describes this in the document. Any questions on this? Questions or comments?

Russ Mundy, SSAC member, please?

RUSS MUNDY: Patrik and I were the ones that did the presentation at the CWG yesterday, and for the information of people in the room that may not be closely following CWG activities, the CWG did take as an action item to examine and study and analyze the contents of 69. Although our

ICANN | 52
Singapore

CWG members had previously pointed this out to the CWG, they hadn't explicitly taken an action prior to this. So now they have. So they will be looking at it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You may be already intending to answer this, but when a consensus proposal emerges, is it your intent to measure whether or not the work that went into that proposal has actually done these things?

PATRIK FALSTROM: It might be the case. The formal thing is that SSAC can always do whatever we want. This is our consensus on what we think is important. This document we have passed to our appointed members of the CWG names [inaudible] and Robert.

So, first of all, these two have brought this to the CWG names. Then me and Russ presented this to the CWG names, so that is how we passed the message to the group.

What we are doing at the moment is that we are following the feedback coming from Robert and [inaudible]. Like I clarified yesterday, this is a really good question. We in SSAC do believe in the consensus process of ICANN. Were a charter organization of the CWG. We are aware that every group cannot get all their interests through, if you understand what I mean.

So, yes, we are going to compare, but we are going to take into account the process that has taken place in the CWG, and if it's the case that we are in minority, the important thing is that the CWG do take these

things into account, which doesn't mean that they have to sort of act on all of those kinds of things.

So there might be some disagreement, but that's how it is with the SSAC advice, that not everything that we say is implemented. Ram?

RAM MOHAN: Just to be clear, the work party inside of SSAC to look at these, that work party is done. Its work is done and its effectively been disbanded. So where we do work on feedback, etc., that would require for the SSAC to decide it's a work item and then constitute the membership for that.

PATRIK FALSTROM: I read between the lines on what you said. Yes, we are a chartering group. We are to – what is the word? – rectify the result, which means that we do have a step where the result will come back to SSAC.

So what I understood your question was, at that point in time, will you compare the output of this document? Yes, we have signed up to do that. We will do that comparison, but my answer is just because there might be differences is absolutely not by any means whatsoever any reason for us to not ratify the result.

In fact, we actually inside SSAC, I speak as the chair, but as an individual as the chair, I'm really happy with the work that all SSAC members in participating, and specifically Robert and Jaap, and I feel that we get good reports back which means that we are very well aware of what's going on, so I think the community – specifically you who asked the

question – do not have to be worried about any surprises. Anything else?

Also, thank you, Ram, for pointing out that the work item from SSAC to look at the IANA stewardship transition, from an SSAC perspective, we are done. We are not working with this anymore. Only the individual SSAC members appointed to the ICG, me and Russ Mundy or to the CWG, Jaap and Robert, those individuals are still working but is not any work item for SSAC as a whole.

Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: It's also I think worthwhile to point out that a number of SSAC individual members are actively following and engaged in the process also. So it's not just the four of us that are formal members. There's a number of other people that are SSAC people that are following, engaged, and active also.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Another thing I would like to clarify has to do with the other work that is in ICANN that is related to the transition which is the CCWG on accountability.

There has been some discussion here at ICANN regarding that CCWG how come SSAC is not a charter organization. The question on whether that will weaken the value of the result of the CCWG.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

The reason why we are not a chartering organization is something that I hope can be resolved. It's pure . . . Let me phrase it this way. It's a kind of [silly] detail.

We in SSAC, we felt that as an advisory committee, and given the way we are working and the recommendations we wrote on the CWG, which very much are related to accountability, we didn't feel that we had the time and resources to actually participate in the accountability work. It's also the case that we came to the conclusion that it's up to the community and not within the SSAC charter to participate in that work.

That said, we support the charter and think that the content of the charter is okay. It's sound. And those are the work items that the CCWG should work on.

But, the charter unfortunately says that every chartering organization should send two or more members to the CCWG, which means that chartering organizations must send members. And as SSAC is not doing that, we cannot be a chartering organization. That's the only thing that blocks us from actually ratifying the charter. I hope that can be resolved and that we retroactively can be a chartering organization for the CCWG.

So, next, the registrant protection credential management. I don't think neither Ben nor Merike is here. So, Ram. So you don't have to listen to only my voice. Ram, please.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you. This work party has been quite active, and we've spent quite a bit of time discussing it. The focus here is to augment the prior work

that the SSAC has already done in the registrant protection and credentialing management area, SAC 40 and SAC 44.

The intent here in this work party is to create a document that would focus on best practice guidelines. The target audience is listed there: the wider ICANN community, registrars, the usual players inside of ICANN. But also software developers, application developers, DNS service providers, hosting and e-mail service providers.

The reason for such a broad audience is because we feel that, inside of the work party, that there really is still a big gap in comprehensive [inaudible] credential life cycle management, both in terms of understanding the scope of the problem, but also in terms of what's available, what tools. And to some extent, what are the pros and cons in this area?

We discovered, even inside of the ICANN context – registrars, registries, registrants – that there had not been work done to catalog what's actually being done, what standard practice, if you will, with credential lifecycle management. So we're attempting to go and do that.

I've more or less covered what's on this slide.

The document that we're working on, we have a draft. What we're working on has these sections in it. Define the problem space, speak a little bit about recent attacks. Saying recent we're looking at about a 12-month timeframe. That's all we're looking at in terms of recent attacks.

Then an attempt to define what are the various types of credentials, and then really how those credentials are being used.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

And what is the lifecycle today? Now, that part is so far turning out to be quite a detailed and interesting set of conversations because there is not uniformity of course in how credentials are managed. It's almost a case-by-case model there. So we haven't figured exactly how to address that in a final document.

And then of course the last part of the document would be what we recommend to the community as best practices for a comprehensive lifecycle management.

The timeline is to get a final draft in the second quarter of this year, and then once that's done, get some consultation with members from the target audience, get consultation so that before we actually publish advice, we get folks from those communities to come back and say this is really crazy or this is really good, and then we intend to publish the advisory.

These are some of the questions that we're working through. How do you manage the credentials? What are the issues that you encounter? We have some focus on what are the successes or challenges in implementing [inaudible] authentication. We notice that in lots of [inaudible] authentication is being touted as a silver bullet. And of course there are challenges with that as well. there are successes, so we're looking into that. The same thing with engaging registrants as well as determining password strength.

What we would like to ask from you is if you'd be willing to share examples about lifecycle management in your context. If you're in a corporate environment or if you're a network provider or a hosting

company, a ccTLD, we would really love to get information that you feel comfortable to share that can inform and be part of the document.

The other area where we'd love to get some community feedback is what you're aware of. What tools or software projects exist that could really raise the bar in terms of credential and security as well as management of credentials?

In our conversations with the registrar community, one of the things that came up was to make sure that our advice and the best current practices that we are providing.

Also keep in mind the small registrars, because large registrars have kind of a corporate environment with potentially dedicated teams to work on this area, but small registrars have – in many cases, they have jack-of-all trades in those places and they are very priority challenged, if you will. So what kind of challenges exist for small registrars?

So these are some of the questions, and we certainly solicit feedback either here or into the SSAC, in [inaudible] the team leads for this.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Any questions? Please, questions or clarifications.

MARK SEIDEN: Hi, Mark Seiden. I'm a member of this work party and on the SSAC. I think when we say comprehensive, I think we're also talking about more than just the contracted parties. We're also talking about resellers, privacy/protection services, third-party providers of DNS service and

anybody else who has credentials that would benefit or represent a registrant's interest.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Thank you very much for that clarification. Any questions, comments? Thanks.

[SEAN]:   Hi, this is Sean [inaudible]. A question about the frequency with which you'll update this because attacks always seem to change over time. Is this something that you would do every two years or something to try to update things? Because I know that people pay money to get these things installed, and it's like, "Okay, it works. But oops, now this thing's not working." I guess if there's any thought to revising this as time proceeds?

RAM MOHAN: We really haven't had much discussion about that inside of SSAC. If you look at historically how we work, we usually end up putting a report out. We'll revisit the topic if we feel that the landscape has changes sufficiently for us to have some new advice to come out. So I think that is probably going to be the triggering factor rather than just a periodic update.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks. Julie Hammer, also a member of this work party. I'd just add, too, that this touches on work that has previously been dealt with in SSAC 40 and SSAC 40. So if you like, this already is a bit of an update on

some previous ones, but the update tends to be triggered I guess by need and events. So chances are it could well be redone in another few years if the recommendations don't end up being implemented.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Thank you very much. And let me clarify regarding the bullet here where we ask whether you're willing to share specific examples. Let me just say that SSAC compared to most other groups in the community of ICANN. We do have a non-disclosure procedure, which means that we can receive data in a secure fashion.

So with that, some interaction, if possible. We got some questions from the community that we try to answer, so let me try to go through those.

The prioritization that we do in SSAC when we choose what to do, and we [inaudible] providing between, let's say, five and seven – order of five to seven reports each year, which means that we cannot work on, for example, everything that GNSO is working on.

So the way we prioritize things is that we prioritize ourselves. Every time we close the work party, we have the ability to start a new one and we decide what to do next.

When we're doing that, we are trying to gather data from all different kinds of corners and one very, very important area where we are gathering information from are questions from the ICANN board and from the community itself. So it's really, really important for us and we are interested in knowing from other groups in ICANN what you want SSAC to – what would be interested in SSAC to work on.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

For example, getting feedback, like you just pointed out. That it could be interesting to come up with mechanisms that every few years at least, as we heard, look at whether the landscape has changed, and if so, update some kind of summary or something.

We are trying at the moment an initiative that I took together with [inaudible] from GNSO that we are working out together with ICANN staff a matrix of all the ongoing work items from all the SO and ACs within ICANN, so that it's easier for us, for example, to know what ccNSO, GNSO, and ALAC is working on. So were trying to build a mechanism so each one of our groups can do a more informed decision, and hopefully we'll find a way of sort of informing each other better on the priority list for each one of the organizations.

The way we address requests from ICANN board and community is, just like I said, if we get a question from another community we really, really try to answer that, which means that if we get the request from another group in ICANN, whoops, that increases the priority immensely, because our goal is to write reports that people read.

So if people tell us even before we had read a report, we have written a report that it could be interesting, that's really what we would like to – we like that.

Regarding SSAC tracking the board response to SSAC advice, we did that on an ad hoc basis up until a couple of years ago when ICANN took the initiative of implementing a very simple tracker of board advice.

We liked it. The board liked it. But unfortunately, the tracker was too cumbersome to update. It was not updated for pure human reasons. So

as you saw on the list of new ongoing activities, we just create a permanent ongoing work party that at every ICANN meeting we produce a report on the current status. Ram, do you want to say anything about that? Because you're running it.

RAM MOHAN: Sure. ICANN staff, David Conrad, who is an excellent – there we go. David is there. So David, why don't you take the mic and provide the update?

PATRIK FALSTROM: That was quick. It is about the board tracker, the advice tracker for the board. Actually, David had a question to me yesterday and I didn't listen. So I think it's even now. It's one-one. Yes. So an update on the board tracker, please. Advice tracker.

DAVID CONRAD: Right. We're undergoing a requirements collection phase of the advice tracker. We have met with GAC. We're unable to arrange a meeting with ALAC at this meeting. Tried to meet with – well, did meet with SSAC, but the topic was redirected elsewhere.

The status right now is we have sort of settled on the process. We're doing the requirements collection for the application. I've begun to estimate, put in the budget requests for the actual development. So things are moving along pretty well.

Getting requirements from the people who will be affected by this would probably be helpful in the development of the actual project, but

if you don't want to tell me, I'll make stuff up because I usually do that anyhow.

I guess that's pretty much it, unless anyone has specific questions about it.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Thanks, David.

DAVID CONRAD: Sure.

PATRIK FALSTROM: So the last bullet on this page, a question we get, how do you inform the community of what we're doing? Well, we publish reports, we have meetings like this, we are trying to meet with other SO and ACs. We are not meeting with every one of those groups at every meeting, but now and then we are meeting with each one of those groups. I think the only group we have not really met with for many, many years is the ICANN board, right? Yeah. Kind of interesting.

It's also the case that we have started to work with the ICANN communication team on doing some videos on the reports that we are releasing. The first thing that we managed to do just to see how the system worked was a five-minute introduction with me, Jim, and Ram on what SSAC is doing. It's kind of scary to watch oneself on the video, but anyway . . .

ICANN | 52
Singapore

Now when we have that up and running, we are going to work with specifically the key SSAC people that have been working on each one of the various work items that we have and do similar short very few minute briefings that can be passed around.

It's also the case that we have started to increase the amount of translation of our documents, so all the IANA stewardship transition documents are translated to all the languages that we have translation service available to. The last one actually included also Portuguese and Turkish. So it was eight languages it's translated to.

For longer documents, just because of purely cost and also because people will not read long documents anyway, our goal is to at least translate the executive summary for longer documents. But we are definitely increasing the amount of translation we are doing and we'd like to thank ICANN for allocating and giving us a budget for that.

So feedback that we always want to have has to do with, for example, the documents. Do you think it covered the right thing? Was it the right level of language? Was it written in a too simplistic manner, too complicated? What is the level of detail? Would you like to get more detail, less detail? Do you think the document reached the audience? For example, have you been working on something for five years, and then suddenly now you understand that we actually wrote a document a long time ago that would have made your life easier [inaudible] didn't reach you?

Is there any new ways that we can reach and work with the community and for the community? We are an advisory committee, so we are supposed to do what the community wants us to do. To some degree,

ICANN | 52
Singapore

we don't get much feedback, so we actually are a little bit working in the dark here. On the other hand, sometimes I'm surprised over how positive feedback we get. I think that has to do with the fact that SSAC members now being at ICANN meetings do participate, just like Russ said. That SSAC individuals participate at so many other parts of ICANN, so we indirectly get quite good view over what ICANN community wants.

But on the other hand, that's ad hoc. It's good to have those kind of ad hoc connections and I'm really happy we have succeeded in doing that and working. We three of us, specifically, are working really hard at increasing that, but getting formal communication requests also helps us do prioritize.

Then in general of course what can we do differently? We got a lot of positive feedback for the DNSSEC For Beginner's and the DNSSEC workshops. By having me in the program committee for the formally ccNSO Tech Day, now Tech Day, we are supporting the development of a tech track – let me call it that – at the ICANN meetings for people being interested to coordinate the agenda for the various technical meetings taking care during the meeting. That is also something that we in SSAC in the more formal change requests for the layout of the ICANN meetings, it is from us in SSAC, in coordination with ccNSO and the other groups, this is something that we are trying to work on. If I understand correctly, it will, in Buenos Aires or something, that will be tested.

So it will be easier for technical community to see this is the track, this is [where] we can go. There will not be an overlap. So both the [agenda]

and time allocation will make it much easier for people being [inaudible] technical things to participate.

Also, in the list of work parties, what is missing? What should be added? What are doing that is a waste of time? Just give us more feedback, please.

So, with that, we are done with what we had on the agenda and we have plenty of time for some questions and discussions.

Before we do that, let me ask the SSAC members in the room to stand up so you see who they are. Good. So you see we have Xiaodong as well. Don't try to hide there in the corner. Thank you very much.

So you see we have a lot of people here, SSAC members. But I said I'm really, really happy. I think this is the highest – almost 50% are non-SSAC members. That's good. Thank you very much for coming. I'm sorry, I've run out of chocolate.

Please, I open up the microphone, either to SSAC members or to non-SSAC members of course. There are plenty of things we can talk about, so please.

JIM BASKIN: This is Jim Baskin. I've been following the vulnerability issue that came up in the JAS report early last year, and now that the past Tuesday/Wednesday has happened that includes the purported fixes or things that need to be done because it apparently is not a simple fix.

The question is does the SSAC feel that it needs to further review that vulnerability or is it really not – within the scope of general SSAC-ICANN activities.

PATRIK FALSTROM: SSAC – after the vulnerability was released on the past Tuesday/Wednesday, depending on what time zone you were in, we have been briefed by ICANN staff and JAS, and the conclusion there is that we got confirmation that there is interest from ICANN and JAS to produce the final report, the complete report. And when the complete report has been published, then the consensus – the discussions that we have in SSAC at the moment is that we will evaluate the full report, and at that point in time, make a decision whether we should make any further statements.

But that's where the process is at the moment is that even though we have been informed with the same kind of things that everyone has seen, but JAS and ICANN took the time and also answered questions from SSAC after the disclosure when everything was public. We are still waiting for the full report before we make the decision.

JIM BASKIN: If I could just follow up. At this point, you couldn't say whether the vulnerability itself – not the collision report or the final version that does need review once it comes out, but this vulnerability itself may or may not be something that could impact ICANN and its community other than the way that any other vulnerability in the Internet and systems could potentially affect us.

PATRIK FALSTROM: What we in SSAC are looking at specifically is the – if you read our comment on the JAS report and also the actions that ICANN took, you will see that we suggested one kind of potential mitigation [inaudible] for name space collision issues and the JAS report and later ICANN conclusion, what is now implemented is something different.

Just because SSAC suggested one thing and then ICANN chose a different action is of course not anything that [inaudible]. That is something that absolutely should be perfectly okay.

The reason why we would like to wait for the report is that some of the – when SSAC and others asked ICANN, "Why did you not implement what SSAC recommended," some of the references and arguments were to things that has been under non-disclosure that is now, as you say, known just because of this past Tuesday/Wednesday.

So we in SSAC envision the reasoning behind the design choice that ICANN chose now be completely disclosed. So that is what we are waiting for that we then will evaluate. Because regardless of whether SSAC do believe that we were right or wrong when we made our decision, it's really important for us at SSAC to have a look at that situation because we actually have a very high success rate of being able to give the correct advice and we really, if nothing else, we want to know internally whether we actually did give the right or the wrong advice given what we now know.

EN

Anything else? Is there anything on Adobe Connect? Anyone asking anything? No? Is there anyone participating remotely by the way? Three people participating remotely.

Benedict?

[BENEDICT]:
You touched on the report about participation in IGF last year. What's the plans for IGF this coming year, please, if any?

PATRIK FALSTROM:
Benedict is an SSAC member, and asked what the plans are. The call for participation from the IGF was just announced, and interested communities have to respond I think until before February 24 or something whether there is interest in participating.

We in SSAC have not decided yet whether we're going to participate, but that is because of the tight timeline. That's something we need to decide upon within the next two weeks, which means that you as an SSAC member have to make up your mind whether you think that's a good idea or not?

Anything else? If we break now, then all of us have time to go and get some real coffee before the next meeting. With that, thank you very much for coming. I'm, once again, really happy for so many participants. If not before, see you in Buenos Aires.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN | 52
Singapore