

ICANN Transcript

DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group (DSSA WG)

04 October 2012 at 13:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group (DSSA WG) teleconference on 04 October 2012 at 13:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-dssa-20121004-en.mp3>

Please find **the Adobe room presentation recording** here:

<http://icann.adobeconnect.com/p6rx1gj3283/>

Transcript and Presentation will be posted shortly on:

<http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/>

Attendees on the call:

At Large Members

Andre Thompson (At-Large)

Julie Hammer (ALAC)

Olivier Crépin-Leblond (ALAC) (co-chair)

ccNSO Members

Rick Koeller, .ca (CIRA)

Mark Kosters (ARIN)

GNSO Members

Mikey O'Connor - (CBUC) (co-chair)

George Asare-Sakyi – (NCSG)

Rosella Mattioli (NCSG)

SSAC members:

Jim Galvin (SSAC Vice Chair)

Warren Kumari

Expert:

Scott Algeier

ICANN Staff:

Bart Boswinkel

Gisella Gruber

Apologies:

Julie Hedlund

Rafik Dammak

Gisella Gruber: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. On today's DSSA Working Group call on Thursday the 4th of October we have Andre Thompson, Julie Hammer, Olivier Crépin-LeBlond, Rick Koeller, Mark Kusters, Rosella Mattioli, Mike O'Connor, George Asare-Sakyi, Jim Galvin, Warren Kumari. From staff we myself, Gisella Gruber and Bart Boswinkel will be joining us shortly.

Apologies today noted from Julie Hedlund and Rafik Dammak. And I believe that we have just had Jacques Latour joining us in on the Adobe Connect room. And if I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Gisella. And welcome everybody. I think this will be our last call before the Toronto meeting. And it may be a little short; we're sort of running out of material for you but we'll see.

Just briefly spin through the agenda. We've taken the spreadsheet through one more revision and I've got some questions for you. I want to do another section; I want to show you that.

We talked a little bit about paths to getting these things reviewed. And I thought it might be useful for us to sort of brainstorm up a few of those that maybe I can stick into the spreadsheet. I'm starting to try and bake this spreadsheet so that it can be handed to people and not totally confusing.

I just want to touch again on the need for public comments and then spend a few minutes on the plan for Toronto. So if there's anything else that you would like to see on the agenda or if you have an update to your statement of interest this would be a good time to speak.

All right on your screen is version 8 - actually I think on your screen is version 9. The current live version is down in the discussion notes and that's version 8 but version 9 is the one I'm working on right now so that's what's on the screen.

And as you can see last week there was pretty good conversation about the need to make clearer what's going on in these little boxes. And so I stuck in a little series of notes that you can see in each of the four and I just repeated them all the way through to sort of highlight the difference between doing things and sharing things because in many cases it's going to be the case that people do stuff but they don't share those results or that activity with other people so I just changed that very quickly to arrive at that.

I'm sort of stalling; I'm hoping that Cheryl will join. But at some point I do want to circle around and see if anybody tried to fill this out and if you ran into trouble. I sort of want to have Cheryl in on that because she sent one of these off to one of her colleagues in Australia and I want to see if she and that person had any conversation about that.

But one of the things that I thought I would do in the next version is - this a little bit bigger - I'm building a tab at the front that I'm calling, at least at this point, the introduction tab that would be the one that people splash into when they open the spreadsheet for the first time.

And I started sketching out topics. And I was churning along on this and then I got distracted by something so I didn't finish it. And so I rationalized it and said well I think I'll just wait and run this by the folks on the DSSA call and see if anybody has any ideas especially those of you who've tried to fill it out and might have reactions to filling it out right now.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: So this is the topic list right now. I thought, you know, I'd write - on Line 28 I thought I'd write a little ditty about what we're up to with this thing, who we are, some links to the spreadsheets - or to the report and so on - write a little section that says why we're doing this and what we're trying to find out.

I think I need to stick the definition that we're using of the DNS into this and then the last thing that I thought of was to sort of clarify this core sharing edge taxonomy that we've been working on. That's why I stuck this picture in.

For those of you who have tried to fill this out what other things would be useful in sort of a front page of the spreadsheet? If you were getting this thing without having been through all of the conversations that we've been through, what other kinds of background material would be useful to you? Can you think of anything? If it turns out I've hit the whole list that's fine. But I thought I would rely on other people's expertise because by this time I'm so into this spreadsheet that I can't really see it objectively anymore.

Jacques Latour: Jacques here.

Mikey O'Connor: Go ahead, Jacques.

Jacques Latour: All right so I tried last week or two weeks ago before I went on my little vacation I tried to fill in the spreadsheet with Rick. And one of the - if you scroll back up on your picture and if you show the picture like from CIRA point of view I got - we touch - I just want to make sure I get this right because CIRA we touch - basically we have two functions; we have dotCA, which is at the core and we do stuff at the core I guess. And CIRA as an organization we're an enterprise and then we do stuff at the edge as a customer.

So basically we touch the edge and the core. And basically it ends up being we do a lot of the engagement as we do pretty much everywhere. And that was a bit confusing because we do stuff at the core, we do stuff at the edge, we do stuff everywhere.

Mikey O'Connor: I - my hope is that when people are in your circumstance, which I think a lot of people will find themselves, it seems to me that there are - so I think first the question is what could I do if...

Jacques Latour: So we should - so should we break down - let's say you run a ccTLD so the function of running a ccTLD in this spreadsheet and then so that just from that point of view and then the function of running a business at the edge and then fill in the spreadsheet just from that point of view? Or should both be merged together?

Mikey O'Connor: I think the answer is you have choices. Let me just spin out some things.

Andre Thompson: Hi, this is Andre Thompson.

Mikey O'Connor: Go ahead, Andre.

Andre Thompson: Yeah, so one quick question I may have missed something on this. But did we get approval for the scope of our project, the scope like this diagram here? It's very nice; I love it by the way. But did we get approval from whoever IETF, ICANN themselves, on the scope of this posted? That this is what we really are responsible for and that we actually have to cover them?

Mikey O'Connor: Oh I don't believe that we are responsible for all these actually. If we were I think we would be working on this project until we all had grandchildren. So what this is about is really just identifying who does what, period.

Andre Thompson: Right.

Mikey O'Connor: And so actually that's a good clarifying question. What is DSSA's role in all of this stuff? Because really the only thing we're trying to do is complete something that was in our report which says there are a lot of organizations that participate in this. And, you know, I don't even think that we are

responsible for the definitive answer on this. This is really just to complete the report to say, for example, ISPs participate in the following way. And then, you know, develop as many examples as we can. But I don't think that we are actually responsible for the final answer on this. So that's a...

Andre Thompson: Yeah, that's a good answer. And I'm glad that at least although we did not have a clear focus on our scope at least we have a complete or close to complete picture on what is there to consider. And so I'm glad that we've done the whole gamut and that, you know, at least we can say here is what we've come up with or what you've come up with. And okay so where do we, you know, what do we focus on from here?

Mikey O'Connor: Right. And, you know, I think that what the DSSA focuses on, actually, is going to be driven a bit by the outcome of the DNS RMF project - the Board project that is just now spinning up. And I don't know if we have time on this call but if we don't have time on this call certainly at Toronto we will describe sort of what the DSSA is going to do while that other project is really doing its work.

And in a nutshell what we're going to do is pause or at least slow way down so that we don't get out in front of them and do things that are either in appropriate or not necessary or, you know, something like that. So it's always good to sort of be clear about what our role is in all of these things. And, you know, that's a great clarification; thanks.

Andre Thompson: Yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: Go ahead.

Andre Thompson: Sorry, one more question. That project you just talk about can somebody just type in the name of the project so I can just look it up?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, it's called the DNS Risk Management Framework...

Andre Thompson: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: ...forgotten where it goes from there.

((Crosstalk))

Andre Thompson: Yeah, well that's even more (unintelligible) than what we do. We're working on the secure DNS. And this DNS risk management is actually the entire DNS, past, present and future.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, and actually there's - the dimensions of the scope are subtle and complicated because our scope, in a way, is a bit broader. We are looking at the whole ecosystem whereas the focus of this particular group is more on ICANN the Corporation.

Andre Thompson: Right.

Mikey O'Connor: On the other hand our scope is narrower than theirs in that we are doing a risk assessment whereas they are looking at a whole risk management framework. So they're going to look at risk assessment for sure but they're also going to look at risk planning, you know, once you've identified risks what do you do about them. They're going to look at - I just realized that (Phil) is coming back in.

They're going to look at more things around this chart. If you think of the scope of the DSSA we are really just the risk assessment piece of this chart whereas DNS RMF is at least risk planning, risk assessment. But, you know, they sort of stretch around the right side of this chart quite a bit further than we do. So their scope is bigger in one sense and narrower in another.

And I don't want to burden this spreadsheet with all that but I think it is really good to add, you know, what is our role in this so that people don't worry that, you know, we're sort of encroaching.

The queue is building a bit here. Does that cover it for you, Andre?

Andre Thompson: Yes, thanks very much.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Olivier, go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thanks, Mikey. It's Olivier here. Quick question; I've just noticed that you now have the (GNA) table version 8. I was working on the version 6. I noticed that on the version 8 in the example the engagement column seems to be blank whilst in version 6 it was filled up. Is this an error or...

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, that's an error. I noticed that this morning as well and sort of went...

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Oh.

Mikey O'Connor: ...that's odd. And as a result of it being blank the person that Cheryl sent the spreadsheet to didn't fill it out so that's an error that's on my to-do list to fix. Actually...

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: ...I'm going to do a little to-do list here so I don't forget.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: So I'll wait for you to fill that out and then I'll transmit this to a couple of people also to fill up.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I would wait until this...

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: I have a few more examples.

Mikey O'Connor: ...version 9 - actually the one that's on the screen - publishes. I'll try and get that out...

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Okay perfect.

Mikey O'Connor: ...really soon. Because that'll have this front page as well. And I think it'll help people. You know, that's the goal is to make this pretty complicated spreadsheet at least a little bit easier to fill out for folks.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Okay, thanks Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: You bet. Anything else that people can think of? Those were two really good ideas for additional topics. And I'll work those into the next draft.

Okay I think that's enough on this. We'll see if Cheryl has any observations when she joins. But let's go on to the next agenda item, which is the paths for review thing. Oops, that's not the one I want to do though.

One of the things that we talked about was that, you know, what happens to these spreadsheets? Who looks at them? Who decides, you know, when to actually transmit them back to us, the DSSA?

And I was thinking that it might be good to put some of that into this front page that I'm working on. And I wanted some help in sort of figuring those out. Not that we have to figure out the exact path because I think each organization or person may follow a slightly different one but rather list off some possibilities so that people get reminded that yes indeed this could take several paths and here are some possibilities.

So this is a blank sheet that I just sort of came up with this morning because basically I put it in the status report that we were going to do this and then I forgot to do anything about it so my apologies for that.

But, you know, one point is many paths are possible. Here are some possibilities. The final step is transmit it to us. Oop. One of the paths could be describe, fills it out.

But, you know, some of you all are in different constituencies and so what I wanted to capture was whether there are other tracks or, for example, if you're like Andre - or like Rick and Jacques, you know, you're not in a constituency when you're filling these out, you're in an organization or a corporation or you're just an individual. I mean, I think there are lots of different ways through this.

And so does anybody have any kind of other examples that they could share with me so that I could build a few of these for the introduction? If I draw a complete blank it's not a big deal it's just helpful. I think this is desk work. Let me take a path at this. This is - I don't want to burden you all unduly with this. I don't think it's that hard to do; I just thought I'd do a little brainstorming.

Okay I don't see Cheryl or Bart yet so I think we'll just carry on. And I'll maybe ping Cheryl later about the experience she had with the spreadsheet.

The next item is really just an announcement that says - it's sort of a reminder. Each of you is part of and is a representative of a constituency of some sort. And we talked a little bit about this on the last call. We came up pretty short on public comments on this Phase 1 report that we did.

And it would be really, really helpful to sort of stir up your respective constituencies and get them to do some sort of a comment because, you know, we did a lot of work, for one thing. And it would be useful to know how close to the mark we got.

But I think that we're also doing work in a cross-constituency working group kind of way. And it would be useful to hear back from the community how

they are perceiving this to be going whether this is a good model or a bad model or if there's something that needs to change or something like that.

So there are really two prongs to the public comment request. And I just - I just want to spend a few minutes - these few minutes just reminding you of that and encouraging you to sort of run back to wherever your home is and nudge them to do something.

Because basically we had zero public comments in the first round. There's two phases to the public comment period; there's the initial phase and then there's a reply phase. And in the initial phase we had one comment from a person who kind of misunderstood what this was all about so it wasn't a really terribly relevant comment.

Jacques Latour: Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, go ahead.

Jacques Latour: Yeah, Jacques. Where would we see the comments if there were any? Or where - is it on our...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Let me bewilder you for a minute. Hang on a minute. If somebody else can paste - you know, I'm going for the link to the public comments page and I'm going in the quirky way that I go and I'm nearly there. But if somebody beats me to it by all means just publish the link.

Here's the page for the public comments. Pretty small, let me make it bigger. And here's the link. Put that in the chat. And once you're on this page you will see that you can view - there's a link to view those comments that have already been submitted. And going to it right now we have one.

And if you look at it he's got an idea; he's an inventor. And I'll make that a little bigger so you can read it. It's just not - it's not a bad comment; it's just not really about what we're doing. It's really sort of a conversation about a security invention that he's come up with.

And so, you know, with the exception of this comment - this is, you know, we've got zero from any of the constituencies including mine so I'm just as guilty as everybody else.

And I'm happy to report that, you know, my difficulty was that if I write the comment from the ISPs I'm sort of commenting on a report that I had a very large hand in writing and so I've recruited somebody else from the constituency to write comments about the report.

And just like everybody in your constituencies everybody's busy. You know, their general reaction is it's going fine, Mikey, keep going. And I've been saying yeah, well that'd be great but please put it in a comment because we have no documentation of that sentiment right now.

And so I think that's one of the messages to send back to your respective organizations is that, you know, these comments don't necessarily need to be exhaustive. It certainly would be helpful if they were. But mostly this is about some sort of echo back from the community that acknowledges that the work meets with their approval, it's satisfactory, we're on the right track or the converse.

You know, clearly if there's something wrong we'd love to hear about that. But silence is - it's difficult, you know. And so I won't - I'll probably bug you about it one more time; I'll bug you about it at the Toronto meeting but by that time we're, as you can see, the period for comments closes just after Toronto so there really won't be much time left as the sort of the window - the closing window.

And in the GNSO I've nudged many of you in the GNSO. And I know that there are comments coming from the Registrars and the Registries and the ISPs and maybe some others as well. So anyway that's just - it's just an advertisement not to forget.

Anything else about that before we move on to a quick tour of what's going on in Toronto? Okay. As long as I've got the ICANN Webpage in front of me let me just show you the schedule for Toronto.

We are on in our usual slot on Thursday afternoon. Pardon the eyeball-rolling mess here. But there we go. So on Thursday afternoon Toronto time or morning, I mean, we will be in our same three session string where the SSAC will meet from 8:30 until 10:30.

And then there's an odd gap. I'm not sure, maybe - Julie Hedlund's not on the call. Gisella, could you check with Julie and see if we could close up that gap? I'm not sure it's possible...

Gisella Gruber: Sorry, Mikey? Could you just repeat those?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, we're looking at the schedule for Thursday in Toronto. And it's the usual...

Gisella Gruber: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: ...all security all the time in the morning where the SSAC, the DNS Risk Management Framework Working Group and us are all in a row. And there's a half-hour gap between SSAC and the DNS RMF in the schedule. And I don't know if it's possible to close that gap up. But if it were that would be really helpful because that would give us another half hour together...

Gisella Gruber: You mean, okay the sessions that are in Harbour C - I can't really see them, I'll have to look on the schedule.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Harbour C.

Gisella Gruber: That's between the SSAC public - the session and the DNS R - Risk Management.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes exactly.

Gisella Gruber: Or that's between the DSSA and the ccNSO framework?

Mikey O'Connor: No, it's the one between SSAC and the DNS Risk Management Framework. Because then...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: ...DNS Risk Management Framework and us there's no gap which is great.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: So we were thinking, oh, look there's a half hour that we could recover. So anyway...

Gisella Gruber: So you would like - okay, I'll check with Julie.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, just check and see and, you know, or maybe just check with the meeting folks and see if it's possible to close that. It may be that it's way, way, way too late but never hurts to ask, you know? Because the same people...

Gisella Gruber: No.

Mikey O'Connor: ...are going to sit in the room I think. And it would be just nice to gain a half an hour.

Anyway that's sort of the plan for us in terms of the Thursday meeting. And then the other thing that we're going to - that we're doing is for many of you - I'm not sure whether I'm going to do this with the GNSO - the GNSO is pretty slammed with work this time.

But we are going to have sessions - oops - in some of the other advisory committees and support organizations. And there are slide decks on the way. I've got a draft that I need to run by the Ops gang. But we will have, you know, our usual where have we been, where are we going, set of slides to go through.

And, you know, we really have two goals for the Toronto meeting and that is - you know, the rant that I just gave you about feedback on the report and then some reactions to where we're going. And so here's the plead for comment stuff; that's where I took my little script for the whining that I just did.

And the other thing is that we may - I'm not sure what the status this is and I don't know if anybody from the ccNSO is here to tell me what the story is. We may have a slot in the ccNSO Tech Day as well. Oh, Julie, I've totally ignored you. Go ahead.

Julie Hammer: No, not a problem, Mikey. Julie Hammer here for the record. Just backtracking a little bit in looking at the schedule for those Thursday meetings it - the impression I get from the way they're currently written is that they're purely working group meetings whereas I'm wondering whether what the intention is is to get more members of the community along to those sessions, both the DNS Risk Management Framework Working Group, which I guess is a question for them but to the DSSA Working Group so that there's a - if you like, a sharing of information outside the working group.

As it's currently presented on the schedule it looks like it's just a working group meeting, which might not encourage others to attend.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh that's a terrific comment. What are you looking at? Because when I look at the - go ahead.

Julie Hammer: I'm looking at the Webpage for - the one that you just had up I'm looking at it online just the way it's presented on the schedule.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hammer: It doesn't say open meeting or anything like that. I'm just wondering whether if an indication like that were given on the schedule that more people might be inclined to come along to it.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh you mean up in the title like up here?

Julie Hammer: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: So that we actually..

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hammer: Yeah, because some people might not go beyond the title to look at it if they think it's a closed group or a working group meeting.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh right. Gisella, are you still with...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hammer: Anyway I'll leave that with you to think about.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, and I don't know if Gisella is still with us. She is juggling many plates today so let me take that action.

Gisella Gruber: Sorry, I am here, Mikey, but I wasn't all ears with you, sorry.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: No, I know you're really busy.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hammer: Julie here. I was just saying that the current title of that session on the program, which sounds like it's a working group meeting may not encourage other people to come along and hear the briefing in that meeting. I'm just wondering whether in the title on the schedule if the intention is to get a lot of other people to come and join in whether that might be reflected in the title.

Gisella Gruber: Julie, Gisella here. Which meeting are you referring to?

Julie Hammer: Joint DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group.

Gisella Gruber: Okay, Gisella again. I will - I'll forward that comment on to Julie. But the - all postings have been closed for the meeting schedule.

Julie Hammer: Okay.

Gisella Gruber: And I believe...

Julie Hammer: Fair enough.

Gisella Gruber: ...that we have put working group on for previous ones (hence) it just going up like that again. But...

Julie Hammer: Sure.

((Crosstalk))

Gisella Gruber: ...on the comments both of these scheduling comments on to Julie. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Cool. All right so back to - I'm pretty much done with the update on the Toronto meeting. And that was a great idea that came from Julie. It's too bad that I didn't ask for this a little earlier because things are pretty solidly frozen for this - and it may be really hard to get that schedule changed too.

Any thoughts about Toronto? Anything that we can do for those of you who are not going to Toronto to make the experience better or convenient or easier to participate? We'll run the meeting pretty much the same way that we do all these calls with, you know, lots of excitement coming from my computer screen, so on and so forth.

But if there's anything that we can do especially for those of you who are not going to be in Toronto - like I know Julie's not - do let me know and I'll try and accommodate that because easy to do if I can. Olivier, go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thanks, Mikey. It's Olivier here. Just suggesting that we do the same thing as last time in that we have a master schedule of who presents what, when, where. In other words I will be talking about the DSSA working group at some specific point to the At Large Advisory Committee and our community.

Having this on a master schedule so you know that on Monday it's going to be presented in a place and Tuesday somewhere else and Wednesday somewhere else, etcetera, would be helpful. That's the first suggestion.

The other one is that we could actually ask the questions in our communities and then not have to go through a full presentation, etcetera, during the actual DSSA Working Group session. I'm a bit concerned about repeating things and taking a long time actually doing presentations and not enough

time on discussions and stimulating discussions with a lot of people being there face to face.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, that's a good idea. I'll take both of those actions and see if I can get something pulled together on that. Good idea. Good idea. Any other ideas like that? That's exactly why we're doing this so don't be shy.

Okay I think that's it unless there's something else on people's minds. I've forgotten, is next week the week that we travel to Toronto? I think it is so that means this'll be the last - I think this is the last DSSA call before Toronto. So...

Gisella Gruber: Gisella here. Yes, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, okay. And I think we're going to have an Ops call on Monday, Jim, Olivier, etcetera, just to sort of scream through the slide deck, make those last minute changes, get that master schedule sorted out. So we'll try and get all that logistical stuff squared away on Monday's call.

So I think that's it for this week's call. Thanks everyone. I'll see many of you in Toronto. And with that, Gisella, I think you can cut off the recordings and call it a day.

Jacques Latour: We're still going to do the keys, Mikey, yeah?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, you bet. I've got tons of them. I'm bringing them. You bet.

END