
KATHY SCHNITT: Welcome to the SSAC Evolution of the DNS Resolution Work Party Teleconference scheduled on Thursday, the 9th of June 2022. Barry, back over to you.

BARRY LEIBA: Okay. Actually, I'll turn it over to Andrew because he can introduce— what Andrew did was—well, let's just let Andrew say that. Go ahead, Andrew.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Okay. Thanks, Barry. I've been listening to these calls and based on what I was hearing last week, I thought I would just come up with some findings and a recommendation. It's kind of a litmus test for the work party to see if this is the kind of thing that the work party could see itself saying in an eventual publication. I mean, of course, this very rough. I just wrote it yesterday. Then Barry and Russ and I reviewed it a few hours ago as well. I'm really just interested in some feedback. Is this the direction the work party would like to take an eventual document, wordsmithing aside, because of course the words aren't perfect. So I'm really interested in just generating feedback and generating a bit of discussion around this text.

BARRY LEIBA: Are these the concepts we've been heading toward?

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.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Exactly, yeah.

BARRY LEIBA: So it's open. Just speak up. I know this the first time people are seeing it so you'll have to do a little reading but it's only one screen.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I'll just pause and let people read.

BARRY LEIBA: Yes.

GEOFF HUSTON: Can you hear me? Good. It's an interesting recommendation. For those of us who have been around long enough to remember the issues in the late '90s and the struggles that the IETF had with alternate roots and the whole name distribution policy, there was this kind of handover which was written in usually willfully ambiguous language that said, "You know those names, that's your responsibility in ICANN. It's no longer the IETF's." We've been arguing about that ever since. Because, in some ways, it was never clear whether it was ICANN's responsible for the parts of the name system that we understand by the term the DNS and its resolution protocol or whether it was you're responsible, ICANN, for the entirety of the name system or somewhere in between.

This recommendation pushes the line towards saying, "If it looks like a domain name, it's ICANN," which is I'm trying not to be judgmental

here. Certainly been tried in the past and failed on both sides, the IETF and ICANN, and it's possibly worth flying the kite again, I don't know. But it is pushing that way. It's saying if we are going to have to coexist inside a namespace then ICANN has the problem irrespective of what the idea is, which is an interesting conclusion. I probably said enough.

BARRY LEIBA:

I think part of what you're saying here is that we know we can't tell everybody what to do. Yes, if it looks like a domain name, it's ICANN. So ICANN should do what it can to make things available to people that satisfy their needs. I think that's where we're going with this. We know that not everybody's going to do it, just like in SAC113 about internal, we know not everybody's going to use whatever gets assigned for that. But at least setting aside something that it can be used will help.

GEOFF HUSTON:

I think it has a lot of implications for the NCAP work to name just one. The NCAP work does not defer to collide in use. It actually says, "We'll do our best to mitigate it. But ultimately, if someone wants the name, we're going to do the name." This saying something a little bit different. It talks about reserving names for other uses in ways that are pretty undefined. That's certainly contrary to most of what ICANN does at the moment. It's going to be a lightning rod for all kinds of disaffected folks. You mean ICANN either pay zillions of dollars to ICANN and get a TLD or ICANN put up my favorite app and get a whole bunch of people to query that name and I've got it anyway. Wow, I'm going to go to plan B.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, maybe we should say only ugly names are going to get assigned this way. We find them that way. Got to begin with some form of [inaudible] such as dash, dash X, not N. Pick some other letter, right, or something like that. Anyway, that was my thought. We could get going further on that, but it's got to be some form of disincentive. Otherwise, it will do exactly what you said, "I want my favorite name and I want it free."

BARRY LEIBA: Well, clearly not. Suzanne, you're next. Suzanne?

SUZANNE WOOLF: Yeah, I think Geoff's right. There's a lot of familiar ground here. I'm sort of trying to spin that a little bit and see if there's any new thoughts here. Because, for instance, I looked at Andrew's document and I recently looked back at SAC090, and they're not that different as far as the key findings and the proposed key findings and the idea of what direction should we go about that. I think the situation has changed a little bit since SAC090. One of the things that has happened is that ICANN Org has made very vague and quasi official comments to the IAB that they regard namespaces as a shared responsibility, which at least seems to rule out this sort of rigid either/or that we've sometimes talked about.

What Russ just said about, gee, if the proposal that there is some semantic difference between names that ICANN should worry about names that the IETF should worry about, I mean, I wrote that up at one point as a proposal that if you want a specific name, go to ICANN. If you

don't care what name you get, as long as it serves the purpose you're building, it's fine to have the IETF generate, have IANA generate something by a published random algorithm and give it to you. That would help separate the people that should be going through ICANN process about their commercial or otherwise meaningful TLD from people that just want to use domain names. Some days, I still think that would be a lovely idea if only to separate the different kinds of intentions.

As far as what we can say now that we couldn't say in SAC090 that was invalid, that we might have changed our minds. I'm not sure I see it. I'm not sure I see that we've moved in any big way since then, and I would love to be wrong about that. I could go on about the things we've tried to deal with, the ways we've tried looking at it from sort of the IETF DNS perspective. Because namespace issues are and coordinating with other bodies that care about namespace issues is in fact in the DNS charter. But if people don't want to work on it, they won't work on it, and I can't make them. So I'm not trying to be a Debbie Downer here. I'm not. But I would like to have a clearer idea of what people think has changed since SAC090. Wow, stunned silence. Sorry, guys.

BARRY LEIBA:

Thanks, Suzanne. I think that was a really good comment. I look forward to hearing Russ.

RUSS MUNDY:

One of the things that has struck me so far about the conversation we've had today is that there's—maybe I'm wrong—but I think an

unstated inference or assumption we're making that people that don't want to do things by the existing set of process procedure rule set, whatever we want to call it, would be even willing to come and discuss at some kind of united names console or whatever it might end up being called. Because at least it's my impression that a lot of the folks that are going off to do their own thing are first going to go off and do their own thing. And then once they've at least got their own thing fairly defined as to what they think their own thing is, then they'll try to come and fit it into one or the other of the existing processes. What I'm seeing here in the recommendation, I think, is an unstated assumption that people will just happily gather together and work all this stuff out before they go off to build, do their own thing. So I'm questioning one of the basic assumptions that I'm seeing behind it. Okay. That's it. Thanks.

BARRY LEIBA:

Okay. Other Russ. Russ Housley, you had your hand up?

RUSS HOUSLEY:

I'm sorry. I was speaking to my mute. I agree with what Russ just said. But I think back to what Geoff said last week in that there are people who just want to be disruptive, and no matter what our recommendation is, they're going to go be disruptive and ignore everything. On the other hand, the people who want to collaborate, this suggesting let's give them a way to do so.

BARRY LEIBA:

Suzanne, is your—okay, Suzanne’s hands down. Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON:

I’m not even sure that that’s terribly feasible. If people want to collaborate, let’s give them a way to do so. You see, ICANN very quickly went down the path of economic rationalism. And to call a horse by a horse’s name, it’s just auctioning off new names. It’s using prices and mechanism. You can have whatever name you want as long as you’re prepared to pay. Over the years, there’s distribution mechanism for all kinds of goods. My water in Australia is not free, etc., etc. But the IETF and its special use names registry does not explicitly price. And disruptors who just simply like apple sees .local, did not explicitly price. And if you sit around the table and you place the various distribution mechanisms on the table as well, you don’t end up with anything positive coming out of it because they’re vastly different mechanisms and they have vastly different outcomes and they’re all colliding in one space.

That’s why I find Recommendation 1 even more naive than the League of Nations in 1920. It’s doomed. Folks with good intention, fine, but that’s not the aim of disruption and innovation. The aim of disruption and innovation is, oddly enough, disruption. This is no way of understanding how to bring those colliding mechanisms together in one space. So I’ll give it points for effort. But I just can’t see it going any further than SAC090 went. Sure, ICANN can talk to the IETF and come to some rough agreement over the special use names registry, this alternate mechanism, yay. But if you look at the history of apple and .local, that was just all we’ve done it. We’ll run an RFC to say what

we've done. Thanks for playing, which was not in anyone's spirit of bringing anyone around the table. So I'm not that optimistic that anything has changed to respond to Suzanne. Thanks.

BARRY LEIBA:

I think my point with this is that you can pay a lot of money and get your own domain name, you have that choice, if that's what you wanted. If Etherium wants .eth and they want to do their thing with it, whatever they want to do and make it be weird, that's fine with them. That's fine with everybody. But the option you have is to use this playground that we're sort of trying to suggesting that get set up. And if you want to be a good player and you don't want to spend the gobs of money for your own domain name, you have that option. There are still going to be people who are going to get their own domain names, and there is still going to be people who are going to squat on domain names and just do whatever they want and you know that. But we're giving them a playground if they want to choose to use it. Suzanne?

SUZANNE WOOLF:

The IETF doesn't actually have a process for updating that registry. It has a description of documentation that would be required once you've made a decision to include something in the registry, but it's even fuzzier than Geoff said is what I'm getting at.

BARRY LEIBA:

Yes, it is.

SUZANNE WOOLF: One of the things though, if you go back a couple of weeks, it sounded like we were heading in the direction of talking about blockchain names as an illustration of some of these concerns. Putting what people are doing with those names and the fact that they're doing sort of this hybrid thing of going after both mindshare outside of the rules and the economic approach of getting registrars to sign up to sell those names, I think it demonstrates some of the things we said in SAC090 if people think that would be worth sort of speaking up on. Part of what's going on with blockchain names, particularly, is the prophecy fulfilled, more or less, as far as some of the things we wrote about before. We now have a work example. Are people concerned yet?

RUSS HOUSLEY: So this should just be, "We told you so."

SUZANNE WOOLF: I phrased this as a question. I'm not sure how I feel about heading in that direction.

BARRY LEIBA: I'll follow up on what Suzanne said at the beginning. Yes, it's the whole process of the IETF assigning should make this very, very fuzzy. When I was on the IESG, when we were asked to do .onion, there were several others in the pipeline like .home was in the pipeline. I was the only one who abstained on .onion, saying that I don't think it's the right thing for the IETF to be carving these things out. But .onion is important enough that I'm not going to stand in the way. So I'm abstaining. But I very

strongly think that we should not process the others. And in fact, we didn't. But yeah, it's a real fraught process to do this through the IETF, and we should not encourage that. Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON:

The problem is it's a world of limited choices. ICANN would find that extraordinarily difficult to create processes that circumvented the entire policy framework of adding new gTLDs. And if that was difficult, they would find it mind bogglingly difficult to accommodate things such as blockchain-based alternates, let alone the interplay between that and the existing root service operators, etc. ICANN, like it or not, has emerged into a one-trick pony and it's only got one model. It, oddly enough, has no capacity to accommodate variants or alternates to that model because it's managed to dig that groove so deep, it can't see the bigger picture anymore, and that's a problem. And it's a problem because the IETF is not equipped to do this, I think, every time it's trying them out using the big lens of a few decades. It's just got itself intractably wedged around the deeper societal issues, I suppose, is the best way of saying it, they're not technical.

You're left with this sort of, oddly enough, back to an evolutionary stance. Either the existing system is strong enough to effectively ward off disruptive attempts in the mainstream isn't going to get swayed. And so these evolutionary variants wither and die because they're just not strong enough, or they assume mainstream and the DNS dies. As ICANN knows it, as the mainstream knows it, because a new mainstream takes over. Now, while that might sound offensive to many who have invested a lot of time money, effort, capital, whatever, into the existing system,

is that not entirely proper anyway? An alternative view is, is this a problem worth managing, or is it really just a free-for-all out there? And if we recognize it as a free-for-all and recognize market determinism, when we feel happier about this, just simply let it roll? I leave that as a question. Thanks.

BARRY LEIBA:

I would say one of the reasons that the IETF can't do this stuff is that a lot of this stuff gets into the realm of policy, and the IETF just doesn't do policy but ICANN does. So I think we need to push it to ICANN. Suzanne? Suzanne, are you talking to mute again?

SUZANNE WOOLF:

Sorry about that.

BARRY LEIBA:

I hear you now.

SUZANNE WOOLF:

I think we just fell into one of the traps that makes it even harder than it has to be. Saying, gee, the IETF can't do this because its policy falls into the trap of, first of all, assuming you're always talking about single label names. Second of all, that there's economic or policy impact to all of them. And in fact, neither of those things is necessarily true, which is why, for instance, we've gotten a couple of special use names delegated under .arpa, which the IAB and the IETF control. Also why you don't want to tell people that when you go build your protocols to do other

things, whether it's IETF or IEEE or W3C or whoever else, we don't want to and we don't have to tell people they can't do that. So what you end up with is, okay, what's a way to let people build new protocols that might in fact depend on something that looks like a domain name without stepping on policy and economic issues that do not belong to the IETF. I think it's still difficult but it's slight less when, for instance, you can get people to put their special use names under .arpa. That's not of ICANN's business. So I think it's not quite that simple and horrible, I guess.

BARRY LEIBA:

That's true, .arpa is a different case. But .arpa has its rules, which we just had major appeal about, specifically because the ARPA rules needed to be updated, the rules were outdated. Some of the things that needed to happen didn't exist anymore. So we just tweaked that to make it work. Certainly the .arpa rules could be changed again to allow this, but I believe they currently don't.

SUZANNE WOOLF:

Well, I mean, any set of rules can change. But yeah.

BARRY LEIBA:

Of course, always. Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON:

When musing about the role of the IETF and the role of ICANN, the role of the IETF is, I have to say, weird, and in the realm of standards bodies,

singular. Because it's one of the few of the standards bodies that has a distinct attitude. There's our way and there's go somewhere else. If you compare that to say, ISO, which kind of goes, "You submit a document, we'll put a stamp on it because our job is not to talk about the right or the wrong way of doing things. Our job is to simply publish specifications that allow others to interoperate cleanly." So it's a very purist view of a standards body that just talks about clean interoperation.

Now, the reason why I bring this up is this whole issue around the common namespace is an interoperation question. It is this whole issue of, well, I've got my unstoppable domain name and you haven't, how do we interoperate is actually, I suppose, a core question here, a very, very core question. Whose responsibility is it to actually keep an eye on that degree of interoperability, and ultimately, stability and robustness as a consequence? That is the fundamental question here. The IETF, like I said, has this ambiguous attitude. It's not sure. Sometimes, "Look, you bring us technology, we'll standardize it." Other times, "We don't like that technology. We're going to mumble and groan and resist for as long as we can." Mention the word "next," and you see where I'm getting to in the extreme.

SUZANNE WOOLF:

How did I know you were going there?

GEOFF HUSTON:

Yeah, right. I was going there, wasn't I? I was always getting there. But you see what I'm saying here that, ultimately, the IETF doesn't quite

understand its position with this. It's a deeply vexed question. If I was on the IESG, I too would be deeply conflicted on what to do. ICANN so far has a lot of pain adopted that one groove, "We're going to do a distribution mechanism based on monetization. That's it." Full stop, end of story. In some ways, that's a fine game to play as long as that's the only game. But as soon as they start doing exceptions, doing alternate paths, doing alternative technologies, they're going to find themselves in a similar suit. Recommendation 1 is actually the first step on the road to hell, quite literally. Because there are no clear answers in where Recommendation 1, as you see in front of me, wants to take ICANN, because ICANN doesn't see outside that groove of monetization of the current model of the DNS. Full stop. I don't know if that's a strength or a weakness. You could say the incumbent system is so good that innovation can happen without any constraint, and our system is so good, it will triumph until it doesn't. In which case, we all haven't got a job [inaudible]. That's one way of doing this. The other way is to try and stretch and bend ICANN that, quite frankly, it sounds painful. I'm not sure anyone would be keen on doing it. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm curious, Geoff, as a reaction to that. If we said the playground is .internal or whatever, would it change anything?

GEOFF HUSTON: No. I don't. Well, maybe I'm just on a pessimistic day. I don't think it would change anything at all. No. The more I think about it, the more

I'm convincing myself. Sorry. Vanity. All is vanity. Isn't that Shakespeare?

SUZANNE WOOLF: Is it Shakespeare or is it proverbs?

BARRY LEIBA: Sounds like Shakespeare to me, but I don't know. It balances out.

GEOFF HUSTON: The point is .internal is a second class citizen. And more to the point, it's a second class citizen in the ICANN world. Disruptors and innovators aren't innovating to get a second class C. That's not the game. The game is to actually assume dominance, if they're playing it appropriately. In which case, .internal doesn't help anyone.

BARRY LEIBA: Suzanne, your hand is up? Go ahead.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Yeah. I feel like I'm talking too much.

BARRY LEIBA: I do not feel that way.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Oh, I do not love .internal for various reasons. All right, I think Geoff is right, that anybody who is pursuing commercialization of whatever their innovation is, is not going to go for .internal. They want what they want, and they want what they think they can sell, and we can't help them except by playing the monetization game. I think there are some uses. Again, there are some use cases for special names that can be answered. But frankly, I've become convinced over the years that that sort of nibbling at the edges, being able to use .arpa or being able to use .internal. To the extent that we're talking about people that are innovating because they want to make a pile of money in some form or another, I am not sure there's much we can say. I think that that ends up being something that ICANN is not really well-established to deal with but nobody else is in a better position than ICANN. So yeah, we're in total despair here, I think, but laughing about it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Barry is already drinking.

GEOFF HUSTON: You see, it kind of leads into almost this fork in the road on what we would say in this context. The fork in the road is one path is where Andrew was drafted. Try and talk to these people, try and find a way to get along, try and try to unite all these efforts, and try and create harmony even though underneath it all is a seething bunch of tensions between the status quo and the disruptors who are trying to alter that status quo.

The alternative way of doing this is more don't. Don't accommodate it. Literally don't. Don't resist it but don't accommodate it. You have a system, you are, if you will, what the disruptors have to disrupt. So be it. Let it play out. There are pluses and minuses on both sides. If you just let it play out and don't cooperate, the barrier to acceptance for disruption is incredibly high. You're not making any concessions. So when it comes, it's going to rip the house down.

We've seen this with the telephone companies and packet switch networking. Resist, resist, resist, resist. Oh my God, it went bankrupt. Because if you don't come to terms with it and you just let it, if you will batter its head against the wall, it needs to be really good to actually better its head against the wall. Ultimately, it's going to destroy the wall and everything behind it. And that's what we did. So we know that happens.

Coming to terms with it is kind of weird because these folks don't really want to play by the rules of the incumbency. That's why I find it difficult to understand how that can play in any other way. I'm finding it hard in my head to think of examples where we've actually managed to integrate and synthesize. Maybe others have some better precedents there, but I'm searching and, I'm sorry, I just can't find one easily. Thanks.

BARRY LEIBA:

Russ, go ahead.

RUSS MUNDY:

Thanks, Barry. This is one I couldn't resist. It's Yogi Bear-ism. When you come to a fork in the road, take it. So that's maybe where we are. I'm old enough that I remember when the phone companies were doing exactly what Geoff just described, and how they started to realize after about 10 to 15 years, depending on the company, that packet switching was going to displace them. At that point, those of us who were around, we were the disruptors. Now we're the establishment. And we're looking at, "Okay, what is occurring there?" Are there things that are sets of technologies or processes or procedures that should be incorporated in some positive way into the establishment? I guess what I'm seeing here is the one side of the fork in the road that says, "Oh well, we should provide a way for people to at least talk about that before they take their battering rams to the wall." Thanks.

BARRY LEIBA:

Two things on that, Russ. One is that what I'm seeing now with the phone companies that one by one, they're dropping all support of PSTN. And everybody is going entirely toward VOIP and PSTN networks be just thrown away. So, interesting with the different stages of the phone companies' process. But the other is that can you say more about what fork do you think we're at and which direction do you think it forks into?

RUSS MUNDY:

Sure, Barry. I think that it's along the line of what Geoff was describing as either we try really, really hard to work with and encourage those coming up with new and great to possibly very disruptive technologies and ideas. Or the fork being, we just continue to steadfastly move

ahead along our current processes, procedures that are in place both in the IETF and the ICANN realms, and not necessarily totally ignore these other things, but basically, they've got to come and convince the establishment that either the establishment has to change their rules so it's easier for these new people to come do what they want to do, or how the new people have to adjust what they want to do to fit into the rules. So proceed along the hard and fast, steady route. We've got procedures, now you guys use them. As opposed to unless I'll try to do a kumbaya and sit together and get as many people as we can together to talk about how best way to do all these things. I think that's a fork.

BARRY LEIBA:

Thanks, Russ. Tara, let me ping you and see if you have comments to add. I don't mean to put you on the spot. If you don't, that's fine.

TARA WHALEN:

No. This has been, I think, for me, it's been helpful hearing a lot of a historical perspective. I particularly am wondering the degree to which some of this will turn into. I guess some people have plans. I think as folks were saying earlier, we'll not be able to be deviated from them. The question is how will it affect everybody else in the ecosystem? So probably to some degree, doing the best the situation that we're in, I guess, in an ever moving environment, which is why I guess I was interested to hear people's experience on things like the .onion. Have we actually learned enough lessons here to have any idea where to go forward? Mostly when I came in here and I was looking at the difference between Finding 4 in this document and Recommendation 1 in

particular about the idea of here. If we can't facilitate coordinated use, then naturally is Recommendation 1 the way to move forward, given the constraints of, I guess, all the stakeholders in the system? I don't have a good solution for this. It's useful for me to hear a lot of [inaudible] ever with us and as these things sort of fragment into players with their own set of goals. How much can we accommodate, and how much ends up becoming defensive play of keeping what we have to some degree of intactness is not the right way to go about it. Maybe that's not saying much terms of the solution. But that's been really helpful hearing people map out some of the problems in the space. But I don't necessarily know where we go with a recommendation in all of this.

BARRY LEIBA:

Thanks, Tara. Suzanne?

SUZANNE WOOLF:

Just one final comment before I run away screaming. Just picking up on what Tara said. I'm thinking about that. Two things. First of all, the environment is always changing. Second of all, when I asked myself what's different now or what's different with what I suggested earlier about blockchain names is here just among friends, there's all kinds of problems with what folks are trying to do there with their particular sets of solutions to naming their various things. Some of them are not even trying to be general purpose naming systems. They're trying to name crypto assets and really not much else. Some of them quite openly want to replace ICANN and run a root zone for the people. Not all of these

things are created equal. For instance, there's probably something out there, though, that somebody hasn't invented yet that, "Gee, yeah, actually, that's a better protocol that solves more problems at lower cost than DNS does. Bring it." I do not feel the blockchain is that system. Again, I don't know what that leaves us saying about it. But it seems that these are completely subjective, admittedly so, judgment of, "Gee, is really solving a problem that we have? Is this an advancement?" We know it's an innovation but is it an advancement? Is it an improvement? Because I actually used to think that by the time I ended my career, DNS would have been overtaken by something much better, and the dream dies hard. But, yeah, in any case, it may or may not be relevant to what we're grappling with here.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, why didn't you invent it?

BARRY LEIBA: The dream dies hard is a good phrase. I like that.

SUZANNE WOOLF: There you go. But I don't think it's mine. I don't have an attribution handy. I think that whether or not the innovation is any good, is it an improvement ought to be irrelevant at some point.

BARRY LEIBA: Yes.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Even though we can't force people to use something we think is better, there's still room for judgment. Especially because where everybody here is prepared to be ignored when we offer our judgment but maybe we still want to offer it because maybe we won't be ignored.

BARRY LEIBA: Indeed. One thing I particularly liked in what you said other than the dream dies hard is the blockchain, and maybe that's not it and whatever. As somebody who follows the attempts at standardizing blockchain technology, I have a particular sense of that because the issue everybody comes up with right now is what's your problem? The answer is blockchain. We know that's not right and we know that we need to pare down the real use cases. What can really be used for? Maybe DNS is one of them and maybe it's not, but I'm not convinced yet. So yeah, I can get my head around that. But it is something that's been proposed and it's something that's put forward. I'm not sure where it's going. Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: Maybe it's the problem of being all things to all people. When you say, "Well, ICANN should accommodate evolution and refinement. The DNS isn't perfect. Suzanne, tell them I'm coming later." It's not perfect. Quite frankly, we do need some degree of change. Anything we have in various ways, changing transport protocols, etc., and one who could regard a bunch of those changes as manageable within the existing framework. So I would sincerely hope that ICANN and its fellow

travelers don't regard the game we're playing as completely static and unchanging. There's always some room for refinement. But—and this is the big but—there are some changes which are radical enough that they are unthinkable inside this environment. That doesn't mean folks weren't thinking. They can, should, and would, but the integration plan doesn't exist. And I would actually argue it shouldn't.

If you're going to radically innovate, then you need to withstand that critical market test of does anyone or at least do enough people agree with you that this is a necessary and appropriate change, and that's the ultimate judgment. It's not you, I, SSAC, ICANN, or anyone else. It is actually a market-based decision. Either it prevails or we move on and look at the next one. So in some ways, this a two-phase conversation about how to take the little changes .internal, different transport, changing of the root structure with hyperlocal, etc., how to take the little changes, and fold them in smoothly into the existing framework if we can. But equally how to say not every change is a little change. Not every change is sympathetic. Quite frankly, at some point, the answer from this area is, "Well, no, you're on your own." That doesn't mean you can't do it. Of course, you can. It just means that the prize you're playing for is now everything. You're either going to disrupt and destroy the incumbents or the incumbents are going to win. That's just part of the game. So maybe looking at innovation and disruption through that lens of you do what you can. When you can't do it, you accept the fact that they're going to do it anyway on their own terms, and that's okay. Maybe that's a better way of looking at it. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Geoff, if you were to write the Recommendation 1 that says, "Chaos is coming, there's nothing you can do about it," what would you say?

GEOFF HUSTON: Sorry? If I was to write it or to read it?

RUSS HOUSLEY: If you were to change what we have on the screen.

GEOFF HUSTON: I actually think that whatever it is technical weenie Advisory Committee that ICANN had done to sort of look out to a certain degree in technology is not a bad idea. To some extent, I actually think Recommendation 1 in terms of look over your fence and understand the bigger picture, any organization must do if it wants a future. But this whole idea that it's couched in terms of way of protecting an asset that must exist is not true. That's not true. This is where we are. And to the extent that there is alternate technologies, spaces, etc., and approaches which are sympathetic to and not innately opposed to the model that ICANN operates, ICANN should accommodate them to the extent that it can, but at the same time, accept that that's not all the innovation out there, and necessarily, some things will not cleanly integrate with what ICANN is doing, and that's okay. It doesn't mean they're wrong. It just means it's, if you will, a consumer-based issue rather than an ICANN-based issue.

So, A, should I allow developers to delineate reserved set of names in their protocol? Actually, oddly enough, no, in my view. This is the way

we do it. If you want to do it a different way, go for it. And it's going to be chaos but that's what acceptance is all about. B, yes. B is a good thing within the limits of what's possible. And C, reservation and delegation of top-level domains, oh my God, no. It's just not possible. ICANN had decided that they're going to make the new top-level gTLDs and ongoing into that process. At some point, I think they've just said it's all turning to horribleness. It's all going to die. And all we're going to discuss now is when. But until then, we're going to accelerate the party and we're just going to do this until it doesn't work anymore. There's nothing ICANN say or SSAC can say that's going to stop that. I was hanging around with B but not A and C.

BARRY LEIBA:

So there's nothing SSAC can say that will do anything. The question is, is there anything SSAC can say that will help the situation or inform people?

GEOFF HUSTON:

Well, some things SSAC could say which might be helpful is stop trying to think that this soluble in the ICANN framework.

BARRY LEIBA:

Yeah, fair enough.

GEOFF HUSTON:

ICANN sounds are only so long. The scale of problems that ICANN can deal with they're only finite. And to be perfectly frank, other things are

out of ICANN's scope. It doesn't mean that the problem is going to go away, it just means don't expect ICANN to have an answer for it. And maybe that's a helpful thing to say.

BARRY LEIBA: Maybe. But at some level, does that mean that SSAC is irrelevant?

GEOFF HUSTON: In this debate, in this topic, or a larger irrelevance.

BARRY LEIBA: I guess I'm talking about larger but maybe we should go over there.

GEOFF HUSTON: I think that's a bigger agenda, Barry. I'm not willing to write off so quickly and so comprehensively. So let's just look here. If our job is to think about the environment and its stability—and this really about stability—and think about the pressures to change and to what extent those pressures can be accommodated within the framework, and to what extent they simply can't. That's a useful thing to observe.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, Geoff, actually, I think what you said is that you would change A to watch what is going on as others develop alternative protocols and keep the community informed. Two, but keep operating the single domain namespace as best you can while being informed from A.

GEOFF HUSTON: That is what I said. I entirely agree with your restatement there, Russ. That's what I said. I don't know if you agree with that or not. But that's what I said, yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: You said the only thing you would keep is B, and I was just saying, actually, that's not what you meant. When I digested your whole—it wasn't quite a rant.

GEOFF HUSTON: Nah. That was a rant.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I need to digest this.

BARRY LEIBA: Yeah, yeah. I think the question now is to Andrew. Do you have things you need to—

RUSS HOUSLEY: Can I make a suggestion that we leave this alone but say approach one and mark at this, approach two and try and capture what we just talked about? So that when we meet next time, we can share the discussion of the two approaches, the fork in the road, and where the discussion went. Because I think we have about half the people here today.

BARRY LEIBA: This seems to be the core group at this point. So I think we need to stop thinking about this as half and thinking about it as the core. So that was my question to Andrew. Do you have what you need to do the next iteration of some text? I just want to let everybody else know that we have asked the Admin Committee to cancel our meeting at ICANN74 because neither Russ nor I can be there. So our next meeting will be actually in three weeks from now.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Our next meeting will be June 30.

BARRY LEIBA: Which is three weeks from now.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Three weeks from now. Yes, correct.

BARRY LEIBA: So, Andrew, are you good with the input from here to move a little bit forward?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I think so. Yeah. So the suggestion is leave Recommendation 1 the way it and mark it as approach one, and then come up with approach two, and then largely take what we discussed on this call. It kind of doesn't

even really sound like a recommendation so much other than, “Hey, ICANN, pay attention to what might be coming in the future.” But yeah, I’ll come up with some texts for alternative Recommendation 1.

BARRY LEIBA: Yeah, I think this iteration of you proposing some text and we discussing it is working. So let’s continue that or at least in the near future.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Sure.

RUSS HOUSLEY: All right, everybody. Thank you very much.

BARRY LEIBA: Yes. Thanks for coming. And thanks for the input. We’ll talk to you soon.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks all. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]