
ANDREW MCCONOCHIE: Welcome to the SSAC DNS Evolution of the Resolution Work Party Meeting for August 1st 2022. Over to you, Barry.

BARRY LEIBA: Which, by August 1st you mean August 4th. And that's fine.

ANDREW MCCONOCHIE: Yeah, August 4. Yeah, you know, Kathy does this so much better than I do. I don't even know the date.

BARRY LEIBA: The first one in August. So, there you go. All right. Andrew and I have been talking about some things that ICANN's been doing at ICANN meetings in the last few years. Andrew sent a note to the list just in the last hour before the call, so I'm sure nobody's had a chance to really look at it. But the idea is that they've had what they call emerging identifier technology. And they've had sessions on those in four different ICANN meetings in the last several years. And the next one, the fifth one, is scheduled for next month in Kuala Lumpur.

So what I thought we would do is take a little look at what they've been talking about at those sessions and see how that meshes with what we're doing. Some of the technologies that they're talking about are looking at ways of avoiding issues with DNS like the denial-of-service attacks and that kind of thing. Some of them are looking at branching off technologies like using blockchains and stuff like that.

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.

And we can get started on a little bit of discussion on some of them now and give people a chance to read the slides and perhaps the transcripts between now and next week and have further discussion on this next week.

Also, because we seem to have settled on this path of going with the alternative technologies rather than some of the other things that we had put into the draft outline, we moved the other things that are not related to this to the bottom of the outline so that as we move forward, as we start fleshing out the document, we can go pick topics from there that we really do want to keep and move them back up, but they will not get in our way as we start writing text for the focus we've started to settle on—we seem to have settled on, is what I was going for.

ANDREW MCCONOCHIE: Barry, I haven't moved them yet, but that is the plan.

BARRY LEIBA: Ah, okay.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Everything is still in the outline, but I'll do that tomorrow and kind of weed out the non-alternative protocol stuff.

BARRY LEIBA: Okay. And so one of the things, one of the reasons we want to talk about these ICANN presentations in the recommendations that we are

projecting, we say, "SSAC recommends that the ICANN Organization regularly host a forum for all interested stakeholders of the domain namespace." This is at the bottom of Recommendation 2 under Section 8.

And I think that that's substantively different from what ICANN is doing at the ICANN meetings where people come and present alternative technologies that they are using or proposing or developing, or whatever. The forum we're talking about here is discussing them with each other and with DNS people and looking at how to avoid problems as they interact. Does everybody seem to have that sense that that is where we're aiming this?

Presentations at ICANN meetings are a great start, but we still want to recommend some sort of give and take forum for this sort of discussion. And just go ahead and unmute yourselves and ...

GEOFF HUSTON:

Well, I find it difficult to criticize that approach, Barry. You know, it's better than burying our head in the sand or insisting that it's an IETF problem and that ICANN should ignore it. All of the alternatives that appear to have popped up on a mailing list over in the IETF-land in response to Eliot Lear's issues was the independent submissions editor. All of that saying that the IETF should solve it seems to strike me as just discarded. And this is the right venue for this kind of discussion. You know, it is a discussion to start with. Not a solution space. So, like I said, I find it hard to disagree with.

BARRY LEIBA: Okay. So as someone ... I gather that you attended DNS-OARC after the IETF meeting.

GEOFF HUSTON: I did.

BARRY LEIBA: How does this relate to that? Would [inaudible]?

GEOFF HUSTON: There have been no, to my knowledge, presentations or consideration of madly alternate namespaces or even the conventional blockchain-based systems. They just have not been a part of the program committee's thinking in OARC. They just don't do it yet. They haven't in all of the, I don't know... It's had 38 meetings. I've attended about the last 15–20. It certainly hasn't featured in the last 15–20.

BARRY LEIBA: Do you think they could be ... Do you think interest could be raised in that?

GEOFF HUSTON: No.

BARRY LEIBA: No? Okay.

GEOFF HUSTON: I'll be blunt. These are folks who operate the infrastructure in front of them, you know. It's not madly speculative. It's more practical. It's about deep introspection into the DNS as it behaves, and far less noodling around namespaces, alternate realities, etc. It just isn't a feature of what OARC's about.

BARRY LEIBA: So it's likely not to be of interest to them until and unless it actually does become an operational problem.

GEOFF HUSTON: Yeah, until it gains some deployment momentum, and so on and so forth. All of a sudden, it's part of a namespace landscape, in which case then, it might well be that OARC takes an interest as a result of that. But OARC is not there to try and second guess that.

BARRY LEIBA: Right, right. Okay. Anyone else with comments about anything that I have said or Geoff has said? Okay, why don't we take a look at ... I don't know. Andrew, do you want to try to look at some of the ICANN presentation pages, put them on the screen? Or do you want to hand it to me to do? Or what?

ANDREW MCCONOCHIE: Yeah, I have them all here. I have them all queued up. Is there a particular presentation you wanted to focus on?

BARRY LEIBA: Well, what I want to do first is just sort of look through what has been presented. And so let's just sort of pop through the four of them and see what the agendas were, what the presentations in each one was—

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Sure. We can do them in order.

BARRY LEIBA: [inaudible] see if there's anything we want to talk about in them. So the Copenhagen one, the first one, ICANN58, is up now.

ANDREW MCCONOCHIE: [inaudible] you're looking at.

BARRY LEIBA: Yeah. I just want to ... Right where you have it is just what I wanted to look at without going into the slides.

ANDREW MCCONOCHIE: Okay.

BARRY LEIBA: So yeah, what I found what I looked at these, DOA had some interest. Namecoin had some interest. Yeah, let's go ahead pop to the sites. Start with Namecoin, and let's just flip through the slides very quickly and see if any of this prompts us to discuss things.

ANDREW MCCONOCHIE: So just start going through them?

BARRY LEIBA: Yeah. Just go through [inaudible].

ANDREW MCCONOCHIE: [inaudible] stop.

BARRY LEIBA: Yeah, here's ... Let's take a look at ... Yeah, this doesn't say enough yet. Keep going. Okay, here's an interesting bit. So, Namecoin is an experiment to find out can we make something similar to DNS but with minimal human involvement. I don't remember whether the slides make it clear what that really means, but let's ... Next slide. Okay, next slide.

So, here's where we are. And they say it's not safe from non-deterministic human third parties. Okay. Next slide. Next slide. Alright, next slide. All right.

So, Namecoin's aim, they say, is to get all three of those characteristics human meaningful names in a global namespace and to be safe from

non-deterministic human third parties. So, let's see what that means. Next. Okay, I think, next. All right.

So they're looking at a compatibility layer to translate. And they seem to be only translating in one direction. So they key off of the .bit top-level domain which, at the time of this presentation, was not registered with ICANN. I don't know whether it is now or not. I suspect it's not, but someone might have grabbed it. Next. all right, next.

This was one that made me scratch my head when I looked at it. I don't see a claim that using Namecoin, you can implement two-factor authentication without fully trusting the two-factor authentication service. So, scratch his head. Next.

So, they kind of wave their hands and say that malware could take over Namecoin names, but just use air gap machines or two-factor authentication. Which I think is a little funny, but ... All right, next.

If anybody has anything to say about any of this ... If anyone's heard about this before and wants to comment, please just unmute and say.

The idea to be that users would opt into blacklists is a little odd, too. Next.

Blockchain privacy projects. So they don't describe ... And I haven't read the transcript yet, so I don't know whether they described in the transcript how they're using blockchain in this system. Next. All right, next.

And I think that's ... Yeah, let's see if there's ... I think there's one more slide. Right? That's it. Okay.

I found that one to be something we might be interested in looking a little more deeply at.

GEOFF HUSTON:

But don't forget, it's not anything to do with resolution. This is actually about the registry/registrar system, and it's an instantiation of first come first serve with a ledger based around, presumably, blockchain. They did talk about majority votes at one point, so one assumes it's a standard blockchain architecture where there's a consensus to the next block that gets added to the chain. It has the entire issue of irrevocability or permanent ledgers that you can't undo anything.

And the other thing which I think they're waving their hands at a million miles an hour about is that transactions normally require the participation of both parties, which means undoing things without cooperation of the nasty person that did the evil thing in the first place is kind of impossible. And to my mind, this whole thing is now into fantasy land. It just doesn't [match] reality.

BARRY LEIBA:

I did read that part, too. I also consider it fantasy land. But what I see them doing is putting names under .bit, and using anything under .bit gets resolved in a different way through their system [inaudible].

GEOFF HUSTON:

I didn't see ... I thought .bit was the space of the names about non-collision. So you translated them into .bit and that's your ledger. Your distributed ledger is in .bit so that the name in this context is unique

because of the issue of the legacy of everyone else. But that didn't necessarily mean there's resolution that way.

BARRY LEIBA: Hmm, okay. I'd have to read the transcripts on these because I'm sure the presenter said things that aren't on the slides.

GEOFF HUSTON: Sure.

BARRY LEIBA: All right. Andrew, let's go back to the ... Yeah, let's look at the ... I forget whether it was DONA or DOA that was more interesting, so let's start with that. Let's look at those two. Okay, yeah, the handle stuff. Let's flip through these slides right quick. Yeah, next. Let me get to what they're actually doing. Next. All right, here we go.

Yes, so they are ... DONA and DOA are related. " ... resolves a handle into its associated digital object's current state information." Next. All right, next.

So this is using something they're calling "handles." And I'm not sure whether these are human-manipulable things or just stuff that computers pass around. I don't know the answer to that. Let's see what the next slide is.

Here we go. So, not really human-usable things. And I gather they're dealing with the prefix and suffix to deal with distribution of this. Next. Next.

It looks like an interesting graph. Chart. Diagram. That's the word I'm groping for. Okay, my quick sense of this is that this doesn't particularly relate to what we are discussing. I just ...

Merike, do you want to?

MERIKE KAEO: Yeah. I have to catch up on the work that's been done in the last month and then, also, with these technologies, obviously. But some of these presentations are dated. Right?

BARRY LEIBA: Yes.

MERIKE KAEO: And so with Namecoin, I was just kind of looking up what the latest was. And, you know, they seem to be alive and testing away. And in the chat I just posted, I found it interesting that a few months back NLnet Foundation seems to have given some funds to Namecoin. And, you know, I was just kind of wondering whether or not NLnet Labs was in any way, shape, or form involved. It will be interesting to know.

GEOFF HUSTON: I just posted a response that they're not related. NLnet Labs spends the money. NLnet Foundation provides money.

MERIKE KAEO: Right. I might want to ask Jaap anyway just to double-check because ... Just to kind of make sure that there's nothing that they're doing that they can maybe talk about.

GEOFF HUSTON: NLnet Labs is very concentrated on DNS. The foundation is just .nl's excess money.

MERIKE KAEO: I understand.

BARRY LEIBA: Yep.

MERIKE KAEO: But my curiosity was piqued.

GEOFF HUSTON: Yes.

BARRY LEIBA: Yes, and the presentation did say that they were seeking funding from NLnet Foundation. So I guess they got it.

MERIKE KAEO: Yep.

BARRY LEIBA: All right, Andrew. Let's get out of this one and go back to the list. All right, I'm not sure that this is a good use of our time, but let's take a look at the other ICANN meeting agendas/slides, whatever, and just see what they've been talking about.

So this one is from ICANN60. And there's more stuff about blockchain and Ethereum here, so this one might be a good one to focus on in the reading for the next week so we can chat about it.

Scroll down a bit. Or is that the bottom? No, there we go. So, yeah, a lot of this is blockchain. All right, what do you guys think we should be ... Should we be flipping through slides now or talk about something else and let people flip through the slides themselves over the next week?

GEOFF HUSTON: It's hard to say what you want to get out of this, Barry. There are two kinds of focal points here. One is structuring the identifier space, the namespace. And the second one is structuring the resolution where the identifier is the key into a lookup in a distributed system. And you're trying to get the associated attributes.

A lot of the work in this space has been along the lines of Namecoin/Ethereum/blockchain where you actually have a relatively unstructured space. And what you're trying to do is to create uniqueness without having a manually-written ledger. Yeah?

BARRY LEIBA: Yeah.

GEOFF HUSTON: So when I get a name, I'm in complete control. I'm not beholden to a registry. It's my name, and it's unique because of the workings of the system. That doesn't give you any resolution mechanism, but it kind of gives you assured uniqueness by the properties of the system. And it has all of the downsides of these automated ledgers that we've talked about.

The other way is handles, and that's a very good instantiation of a tightly-controlled hierarchy where, at each point in the hierarchy, there's only one operator. It's not competitive. So at any point in the hierarchy, the name is assuredly unique because there's only one allocator of that name.

It's human based. It's not automated. It's highly structured, not flat. And the resolution is actually isomorphic to the DNS. You squint a bit, and it's the same thing. I haven't seen any other ways of doing it in all of these presentations.

BARRY LEIBA:

Okay. What do we want to say in our paper along this line?

ANDREW MCCONOCHIE:

Well, one of the things I was thinking about ... You started off this discussion by talking about how we kind of differentiate Recommendation 2 from what OCTO was already doing. And if I listen to this work party, what people are primarily interested in—and of course, what the SSAC is interested in—is stuff like the namespace. Name collisions. Consequences of everybody kind of playing in the same yard and squatting on everybody's space and bumping into everyone else.

And there isn't actually much. I mean, I don't think we're going to find any focus on that in any of these presentations. These are just presentations where people are kind of like, “Hey, look at my cool protocol.”

So maybe in crafting Recommendation 2, the SSAC wants to be really specific about the kind of discussions that should take place in this forum where the SSAC says something along the lines of “... to bring people together to talk about the consequences of everyone stepping on one another's feet in a shared namespace.” As opposed to just having presentations where people just come and present their cool protocol.

BARRY LEIBA:

Right. I mean, that's certainly what the recommendation is meant to say, but we've got a lot of text to write before we get to the recommendation that talks about what the issues might be, what

difficulties are we anticipating. And Geoff's comment seems to be downplaying that, saying that, well, they're playing around on their own stuff and it's not really an issue.

GEOFF HUSTON: Well, no, it is an issue. And handles don't directly collide with the DNS namespace as we know it.

BARRY LEIBA: No. That didn't seem to be. No.

GEOFF HUSTON: Right? Because the way they've structured it, the intersection is very sparse—the syntax, etc. The others do correctly collide, and badly so, because on the whole they are partial solutions and they borrow everything else from the DNS technology. And so whether it's, “Well, I'm using .bit”—or .gnu or .onion—“and I'm changing the way it resolves, but I'm using the same space” is one example.

And the other way is, “Well, I'm changing what uniqueness is and who can be a registrar by basically saying there are none. But we're going to operate in a space that is directly colliding with ICANN, so we're going to take .geoff and give it a different syntax.”

And the problem there is, of course, that ICANN has never really accommodated alternate spaces because ICANN had decided many years ago that their policies applied to all of the DNS namespace and

the resolution, the matter of resolution, effectively didn't. And we've been wrapped around that axle ever since.

Other folks have made the assumption, which I think is incorrect, that ICANN is concerned with names and names that are resolved by IETF DNS technology. Right? And if you don't use the DNS, ICANN doesn't apply.

BARRY LEIBA:

So, suppose you get through ICANN. You legitimately purchase the TLD .geoff, and you decide you're going to use all of the names under .geoff in a funny way in your own protocol with your own thing. Does that become a problem for either the DNS or users who—

GEOFF HUSTON:

Well, it becomes a problem in many dimensions. I've breached my contract with ICANN because I'm not using DNSSEC. .geoff is not handled the same way as all of the others, so every resolver on the planet needs to have exception rules. .geoff is going to have a hard time. So mapping .geoff in is going to be difficult.

BARRY LEIBA:

Jim.

JIM GALVIN:

You know, I think about this problem ... For me, I think about it in the context of name collisions and I think about some of the history about things that ICANN—I'm sorry—that SSAC has said over the years in this space about managing namespaces and what's important here.

What I worry about is at least ... What I'm not getting yet in what we're proposing, and even the text that we're trying to write and some of the findings that are there, is that we need to explain in non-technical terms why this problem matters to the ICANN community—why it matters to users, why it matters to ICANN Org—because, frankly, in my view none of that is clear. Different people have different views. And I think it matters to each of those communities for different reasons.

And I'm still not convinced that there's anything under ICANN's control here. I mean, what do you want ICANN to do? What do you want to be done within the ICANN community? Let's be very clear about who we're talking about here in terms of where this action belongs? I mean, ICANN as an organization, I don't see it doing anything in this space. I can't see anything that's within its control that it can impact. So there has to be something that users motivate or something else. I mean, I don't know.

I'm not understanding the why in the action that we want. Even having this discussion is like, "Okay, why?" And I'll be quiet now. Geoff put his hand back up again.

GEOFF HUSTON:

Well you see, my view, informed by the work around 1998 through 2000, is almost the exact opposite to where you are, Jim.

JIM GALVIN:

Do tell. Help me. Help me understand.

GEOFF HUSTON:

Well, the IETF—and in particular, I think, Scott Bradner—was at the pointy end of the problem. But the IAB and the IESG were having an extraordinarily hard time with the issue of alternate roots, alternate namespaces, an alternate name resolution technologies. And there was an endless beauty parade of bad ideas, and endless sets of pressures to open up the DNS for competition, etc. And some of it was open up the DNS for competition within the DNS as we knew it. And the sum was to extend the DNS. And the IETF.

And by the IETF—and by the IETF, I actually mean somewhere between the IESG and the IRB—found itself fundamentally ill-suited to host this discussion. It was literally tearing apart the meetings. It was tearing us into politics. And some wiser folks—and Scott, I think, was certainly in the wiser, and John Klensin ...

The conclusion was: it's a good discussion, it's a good problem, but it's not the IETF's problem. And there was a clean issue, as folks saw it, between the IETF job in a technology focus and creating a forum whose job was the policies of names, to actually host these difficult discussions about new top-level domain names, new DNS names, namespaces. And that was intentionally where folk who were interested in that could go, and ICANN was co-opted as being the host of that, initially with Mike Roberts. And then off we go from there. Right? Now—

JIM GALVIN:

Yeah, but that's, you know—

GEOFF HUSTON: The IETF kind of made itself weird by not sticking to that. And 2860 was very ambiguously written, and RFC 6761 tried to get it back again, and no one knew what it really meant. So if you want to discuss .gnu, where do you go?

JIM GALVIN: Regardless of the history and how we got to where we are, I mean, help me to believe that ICANN's roll is something other than managing the DoT, which is the DNS protocol, because that is the only protocol that the IETF put out there for a namespace that is the index of the Internet, if you will. And I probably should not even try to invent new things. And that's ICANN 's role and that's what it does.

The fundamental issue here, I believe—that's just my point of view, speaking personally—what we have is a syntax for a name. And we have a particular resolution protocol for that namespace. And fundamentally, if anybody else wants to use that same syntax for a name, the rest of the Internet is confused because there's no way to manage the need for the resolution of it. And I just don't see how that's ICANN's problem. Am I wrong?

JIM GALVIN: Well, there's a variance of opinion out there, Jim. And I'm in the other part of the spectrum that kind of goes, "Names and namespaces, ICANN. DNS, technology du jour."

JIM GALVIN: So, you want ICANN to manage all namespaces?

GEOFF HUSTON: For the Internet, I want ICANN to be the venue that hosts that discussion. I didn't say manage it. I said folk are going to talk somewhere.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. I'm tracking. But, I mean, SSAC has said this before in prior publications. I'd have to go look. I think SAC090 is one of them. I think there's another one, too, where we kind of expanded on this issue. So what are we adding to this discussion in this ... What are we adding to those recommendations in this discussion?

GEOFF HUSTON: Ah, I'm not addressing that question, Jim. I'm a bit lost about that. That answer, too. It was more a generic question.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. So let's try a different question approach.

GEOFF HUSTON: Right? The generic question. ICANN and names? I think they're relatively mapped together. And that ICANN's work to date in those sessions, looking at alternate technologies, was consistent with that broader view of being a place where these things can be discussed in a rational, reasonable model rather than the hysteria that comes from the IETF and

the DNSOP Working Group, which is neither helpful nor productive. Apologies to Suzanne in her absence.

JIM GALVIN:

I would say that ICANN has, in fact, been doing that. And to the extent that we've got these presentations we're looking at here, they have provided a venue and an opportunity to do that. I'm still trying to figure out what is the further action we really want them to take here?

GEOFF HUSTON:

Ah. And, you know, I think I agree with you. ICANN has done, I think, what it needs to do at this point—post the discussions, expose the points of view to the names community. And it's really up to the proponents to understand what policy questions should come out of this and how they coexist. It's not up to the IETF. And nor is it truly up to ICANN to pull solutions out of the hat.

But if ICANN were to say to these people, “You're not welcome at our meetings. Go away,” that would be wrong. But that's not what's going on. ICANN's going, “Yeah, sure. Come along.”

JIM GALVIN:

Right. And I see Andrew's hand, but let me also add a comment in all this, too. I happen to agree that there's an issue here with other namespaces existing, but I don't know where to go to get a solution. And the interesting thing is you're suggesting ...

And I accept at face value that, sure, the community at large is being exposed to the fact that there's an issue here. "Gee, folks, what do you want to do about it?" Well, heck, I mean, this is just entirely the wrong set of people to try and think about a solution. I don't know where that solution comes from. I don't know where else to take this discussion. And it assumes that these other people really want to come to the table and play nice with us, and I'm not even convinced that's true.

So again, I just keep coming back to this question of what's the next step? Where do we really want to take what's going on? And do we recently think that's going to be achievable?

And we should probably let Andrew jump in here. He's had his hand up and patient for a while.

ANDREW MCCONOCHIE:

No worries. I don't know what to do. I don't have an answer to that one, Jim. I've been tracking the SAC113 stuff, and there were a couple of documents. There was correspondence that first went from the ICANN Board and Göran to Alissa Cooper and Mirja Kühlewind. And then it came back. They came back with a statement as well.

And if you read them closely, I mean, this is I guess you'd say the most recent precedent on how we should interpret the MOU between ICANN and the IETF and the IAB and whatnot on who's responsible for what. Right? And if you read it closely, my interpretation of this document—and it really is kind of spelled out here in this taxonomy—is that the IAB feels that ICANN is really just responsible for the DNS root, and that names that are resolved via other mechanisms are either not ICANN's

thing or in the purview of the IESG or the IETF. So, it's not enough ... Unfortunately, it's not as simple as just saying everything involving names goes to ICANN. Or at least that's not how the IAB interprets the MOU. Hopefully, that was enough acronyms to confuse everyone.

JIM GALVIN:

Yeah, I mean, I think that's kind of where I'm coming from. I think it is possible here. Geoff said earlier, you know, maybe he and I are on opposite sides of this. I don't know. I'm not convinced of that, either. I think we agree there's a problem. I don't know where to go with it. I don't think ICANN's the place to fix it. The IETF clearly tried to fix it historically, and kind of threw up its hands.

And at least you've now shown and demonstrated that the clarity we have today is ... Well, the apparent clarity today is different than what, historically, gray beards might remember. I don't know what to do about that either. I don't know.

Merike's got her hand up.

BARRY LEIBA:

Yeah. Go ahead, Merike.

MERIKE KAEO:

Thanks. Andrew, can you refresh my memory? What is the date of this document that you are showing? Because—

ANDREW MCCONOCHIE: It's in the URL. It's 12 November 2020.

MERIKE KAE0: Okay, yeah. So this is what I was thinking. So at the time, I was the liaison to the board. And because of the advisory of the private use TLDs, I actually instigated having the discussions between the IETF and ICANN to revisit that MOU because there was a lot of ambiguity around that.

I believe that, with this letter, there was also discussion that the IETF and the ICANN folks really should continue to explore what exactly the MOU means. I don't think this particular letter was the, "Yep, we're all in agreement."

And to the best of my recollection, there was going to be a follow-up meeting. And I don't know if that happened after this letter had been sent to Göran. And from an ICANN perspective, they initiated this discussion to facilitate the discussion to see whether or not some resolution could be reached.

And just as an FYI, during this discussion I was just looking at some e-mail to catch up on a few things. And I saw the DNSOP thread which relates to what we're discussing. The alt.tld-related long discussion which I just took a look at and said, "Okay, I've got to read this in detail."

But I do believe that there's still work to be done between the IETF and ICANN to actually come to a resolution because every year I see a recurring, circuitous conversation on this issue. The issue being who's

responsible for what and who's got the ownership of solving a piece of the issue? So I don't know—

BARRY LEIBA:

[So my thinking on it] was that it's not ... We're not trying to say ICANN owns everything to do with names on the Internet no matter what they're used for, no matter how they're resolved. The issue was that they are the place where this discussion can usefully happen. And the request is not to have ICANN declare ownership and say, "I'm in charge here," but to say, "I have a place where we can all talk about the interactions among these things and how to make sure that we don't screw each other up in the process."

And if the parties who are developing this stuff are interested in playing well with each other and not stepping on each other's feet all of the time, perhaps they would want to come and collaborate. I could be wrong on a number of those pieces, but that's my thinking.

Jim.

JIM GALVIN:

Yeah. So, I took the time here to go back and look at SAC090. And I will ask again, what is it that we are trying to add to what's already going on? I mean, it seems to me that SAC090 is pretty clear about what we think ICANN should take some steps to do because we described the whole fact that there are other people who've got namespaces. And, "Oh, by the way, because of those other groups that have namespaces ..."

Kind of an interesting trivial example is the fact that the IETF has this thing called special-use domains. Right? So arguably, that represents a namespace. And ICANN should establish some mechanisms to go forward, and in some way establish a means for coordinating with other owners of namespaces things to do so that we can work together. I think they're headed down that path with what they've been doing, but they have not proactively tried to look for actual solutions. They're just having the discussions right now.

We were pretty specific and SAC090. So you can see them now up there on the screen. Recommendation 2 gets to dealing with, "Gee, if you're going to grow the namespace, there are some things you really ought to do here about how you interact with some of these other groups."

And Recommendation 3 just sort of takes a step back in my mind. This is my recollection of all of this. It takes a step back and it says, "You really do need to think about other groups and how you're going to coordinate with them."

Now, of course, you can't force them to, but I think, consistent with what we've been saying here, you're just trying to create a forum in which these other groups, if they're willing, will come and work with you. And presumably, they would want to be willing because they want to work without us, too. And we want to work without them. Or we want to work together. We want to have our own little worlds and not conflict.

Of course, truth be told—and this is the last comment that I'll make—some of those blockchain technologies exist in part because they

expressly don't like the ICANN process and everything that goes with it. So they don't really want to come to the table and play nice, but we can't do anything about that. It is what it is. Anyway, I'll be quiet now.

BARRY LEIBA:

Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON:

So the issue, Jim, was that in opening up 6761, if they didn't like it, they made a case to a working group—not even to the IAB or the IESG—a working group, and got the name entered in 6761. And it's kind of like, “Where's the sense in that?” And part of the—

BARRY LEIBA:

Who's “they”?

GEOFF HUSTON:

The applicant—the folk wanting .onion, the folk wanting .bit, .gnu. And part of the issue is that if you have two folk who are basically pulling names out of the names-not-yet-allocated pool—1) by writing documents/standards/RFCs going through into 6761 and the IETF, and 2) by folk making applications into ICANN—you're basically heading straight for a collision. Because it's pretty easy that if I know you're going down Path A, I go down Path B and block you. Yeah, great.

So this situation is a mess. And quite frankly, with all the will in the world, SAC090 was unimplementable. Trying to get a commitment out

of the IETF is impossible. Literally impossible. Every few years, new IAB, new working group chairs, new this, new that, new rules. “Oh, we didn't like the old rules. We've changed it.”

So this is never going to work. That's part of the issue. And this was why a lot of folk, including me, [think] that a single forum to have these conversations is part of a way forward. Now, ICANN isn't perfect. Absolutely not. But unilateral actions by the IETF isn't going to fix that. It just isn't.

BARRY LEIBA:

So, I don't ... The solution that I was thinking about when we wrote SAC090, in looking at Recommendation 2 in particular, is that—maybe you can't document this—but ideally you'd have sort of a good faith effort towards it. And frankly, in some sense, it may be the ... I don't know.

What I really was looking for was that ICANN—as a process, as an organization—what it has to do is have rules that say that it will recognize this special-use domain and it will promise that it will never delegate those names into the root zone. Right? And so that's really what has to happen here.

And then there's simply this broader ... Taking a step back, there's this acknowledgement that maybe there are other groups that might want to have a similar kind of registry. And ICANN as an organization and community should figure out what it wants its response to be to these groups outside of that.

And I agree with you that that's a mess. If you allow other groups besides IETF into all of this, that gets ugly. But let's set that aside. I'm sorry. Just for practical purposes, we're only talking about the IETF and ICANN here. On the IETF side, the only real good faith obligation, at a minimum, on the IETF is the set of things that go into the special-use domain registry should be a very small number. It should be a really high bar to get there, which so far it seems to be. We can quibble about whether it should exist or not, but I think the system works at the moment.

And again, what are we asking in our group here now? In this document that we're looking at writing, what do we want to say that's not already said? I mean, what are we trying to do to advance what's already laid out in SAC090, whether or not you believe SAC090 is salvable or not? That's my question.

GEOFF HUSTON:

Yeah. The assumption is that 6761 is stable and the barrier is high. It wasn't for a while. It was very low. It was unstable. It was a problem. To all intents and purposes, 6761 is now a closed registry. In that respect, the problem is solved. But now it's an ICANN discussion again because the IETF won't host it. And so this whole bowing towards the IETF is really just lip service. The reality is, it's not there. Which I'm fine with. But every time a new draft pops up and the IETF goes, "Oh, we should do it again," we sort of sit there and go, "But the last time we tried it, it went bang in our face."

But we're arguing over [inaudible]—

BARRY LEIBA: Look, I'm sorry—

GEOFF HUSTON: —in that respect. And I agree.

BARRY LEIBA: I got confused.

GEOFF HUSTON: Your meta question—what could we say here now to make this better—I don't have an answer to that. And if that's the heart of this discussion, where's the delta from here to somewhere in the future? I'm kind of lost, too.

I think ICANN is doing the right thing already in hosting these discussions and being amenable to having these discussions at its meeting and in its community. That's great. I think the IETF should do some work, but we're not here to tell the IETF what to do like, "Point people to ICANN." We're not talking about that. So, that's okay.

What else should we do here in SSAC? Yeah, like you, I'm kind of a bit nonplussed about this. I'm not sure.

JIM GALVIN: I also want to add, with respect to the particular issue at hand, the

Shenzhen document? I don't know why it wouldn't be published in the IETF. It's GNU going off and being a blockchain guy. And why shouldn't they have that privilege? There is the issue of, do we want to let them publish in the RFC series. Okay, IETF's got to sort that out.

What I take exception to is Warren's proposal for the .alt TLD. Now, that's a step too far in my mind. But, I don't know. Yeah, that's it.

Merike's got her hand up.

BARRY LEIBA: Yes, please.

MERIKE KAE0: Yeah, we're veering to IETF discussions and, you know. Bringing it back to this particular working group and what are we trying to say. And caveats and apologies, I haven't read the latest version of this draft yet.

But something that I believe—was it Barry who said it, or Jim—that from an SSAC point of view and looking at these alternate name aspects, has this document delved into what specifically the SSR issues are or could be that need to be discussed as ICANN continues to provide a forum for folks that are creating these alternate namespaces where they can bring forth what some of the security and resiliency aspects for consideration might be. I don't know whether or not this document has delved into what needs to be looked out for.

BARRY LEIBA: Right. It has not yet. That's exactly what we need to be [inaudible] and writing down.

MERIKE KAEO: Yeah, because what I started to think of as I just looked at this [coin name] and some others ... And I also saw something that Dave Conrad had just written in the IETF DNSOP list. And it's looking at maybe creating a table—well, this is my view—of what are some of the risks and then which of the alternate namespaces cause which risks to the SSR of the DNS namespace. Just a thought.

BARRY LEIBA: And with that, I think we're done for today. We're almost at the top of the hour. Andrew, do you have any wrap-up you want to say?

ANDREW MCCONOCHIE: I don't think so. Is there an ask to me? I can certainly throw some text in the document. And I can rearrange it, as we talked about moving things out of the outline that we're no longer really interested in. But is there any specific ask to me?

BARRY LEIBA: No, just doing that. And if you have any text that you think you can throw in at this point.

What I'm asking the rest of the work party to do is to look over the four sets of presentations and see if any of that is ... If we should be

discussing that next week for the purpose of, as Merike pointed out, getting some text in here that talks about what the issues are, what the SSR issues of having these alternative namespaces or emerging technologies, or whatever you want to call them, around.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Okay. I'll put that in the notes then.

BARRY LEIBA: Right. And so there's the e-mail that Andrew sent, maybe a half an hour before this call started, that has the links you'll need to get to those presentations and have a look. And let's discuss them next week. Maybe some of them apply. Maybe some of them don't.

All right. Thank you for coming, everybody, and thanks for the discussion.

MERIKE KAE0: Thanks, all.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Thanks.

JIM GALVIN: Thanks, bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]