ICANN
Transcript
DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group (DSSA WG)
27 September 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 27 September 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-20120927-en.mp3
on page
http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#sep

Attendees on the call:

At Large Members
Andre Thompson (At-Large)

ccNSO Members
Takayasu Matsuura. Jp
Rick Koeller, .ca (CIRA)
Mark Kosters (ARIN)
Joerg Schweiger (cCNSO co-chair)
Katrina Sataki.lv

GNSO Members
Mikey O'Connor - (CBUC) (co-chair)
George Asare-Sakyi – (NCSG)
Don Blumenthal (RySG)

SSAC members:
Jim Galvin (SSAC Vice Chair)

Expert:
Scott Algeier

ICANN Staff:
Bart Boswinkel
Patrick Jones
Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies:
Julie Hammer (ALAC)
Olivier Crépin-Leblond (ALAC) (co-chair)
Cheryl Langdon-Orr (ALAC)
Julie Hedlund

Coordinator: This call is now being recorded.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Tim). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the DSSA call on the 27th of September, 2012. On the call today we have Mikey O'Connor, George Asare-Sakyi, Andre Thompson, Scott Algiers, Rick Koeller, Takayasu Matura, Jörg Schweiger, Don Blumenthal and Jim Galvin and Mark Kosters has just joined the call.

We have apologies from Julie Hammer, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crépin-LeBlond, Rafik Dammak and Julie Hedlund. And from staff we have Bart Boswinkel and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Nathalie, and welcome all to this call today. Just for those of you who have just joined many of you know I've been sort of a regional battle on sand mining - strip mining in my county.

And we had a gigantic victory last night. The meeting went extremely late so I'm partly exhausted and partly completely manic from a victory which may have just put a dent in this thing in the region up here in the Midwest of the US. So I may not be at my peak today and I apologize in advance. But it was a great night last night.

Just a quick spin through the agenda. We're going to mostly just take a look at process stuff today. I'm going to run you through the revised version of the spreadsheet and see what you think of it, collect ideas to make it better. But I think we're getting pretty close to something that you can distribute to your constituencies.

Man: Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: And then we'll talk a little bit about possible ways that you can use this. That's what the paths for review item is. And then wrap up the call with an email that I'll send you right after the call but I want to get your reactions to it. We really need to get more public comment on our Phase 1 report. Basically in the initial public comment period we haven't gotten any. And we need to talk about that and improve that.

So that's sort of the agenda for now. I'll take the pause for people to suggest additional agenda items and also update their statements of interest. Okay.

And off we go. What you see on your screen is the hopefully now familiar spreadsheet. And after we attempted to do this together last time we learned a lot from that. I built a new version which is Version 7. And the link - oh - the link is to Version 7; the heading in the note there right below has now just been changed to match the link.

And I posted that in a note to the list a couple of days after last week's call. The main change is to clarify what we're asking people to describe. And so I just want to very quickly highlight that section of the spreadsheet for you and make sure that this makes sense to you.

Because the thought here, I think, is that we would be perhaps handing this to other people and we, I think, want to take a look at this through the eyes of a person who hasn't been through all of the work that we've been through to

see whether they would feel bewildered as they read this or whether they could fill in these blanks in these columns here.

Cheryl is unfortunately not on the call today. She sent regrets. She had a - she got crushed yesterday and is just not able to make it tonight. But she was pretty comfortable with this improvement and has sent it along to some people.

But basically these descriptions are what I'm interested in. And, you know, feel free to offer ideas, improvements, clarifications, you know, this is all about describing what we're asking for.

And so the first little chunk is about research and analysis. And, you know, again what we're trying to do is say well what does either the entity you're representing like your constituency or your stakeholder group do or what does the type of entity that you work for do when it comes to research and analysis?

And so again what we've - these are pretty repetitive so I think I want to just really work on the first couple because if we get these right then I can, you know, I can carry those forward to the rest. And so I just want you to take a moment and sort of read these things. Make a little more room on the screen here.

You know, what we're trying to get at is that at the edge, you know, what kinds of research and analysis does your entity or your stakeholder group actually do that has to do with your customers and your internal operations?

What kind of research and analysis do you do that has an impact with your peers and partners? We made that distinction because we thought that those things, in many cases, might be different.

And you have choices as to how much you do. You can consume research, you can participate in doing the research, you can be an organization that supports the activity of doing research or you can be in a core group that - or not a core group but, you know, you actually do research.

And so for - by way of an example if I were to take a look at the ISPCP, the constituency that I'm a member of, you know, we don't do much of this. You know, the ISP Stakeholder Group or Constituency of the GNSO doesn't do research. And so we would probably leave this blank and move on to the next thing.

But Scott of the DNS-OARC, you know, probably says no we do this kind of research, et cetera. Rick, go ahead. I'm glad to see a hand. I hate soliloquies from me.

Rick Koeller: Good morning. Rick. Thanks, Mike. Rick Koeller for the transcript. Congratulations, Mike.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks.

Rick Koeller: The question I've got on research is are there any qualifiers around what we mean by research? You know, would it be necessary to share what an organization discovers or does on their research or would it be acceptable to consider research that they keep to themselves (unintelligible). That's kind of what I want to know.

Mikey O'Connor: I think that's a great question because I think that's what you want to put in the response that says our organization does lots of research about this at the edge. Much of which we don't share with others but it's there.

And I think that it's perfectly fine and in fact really a great idea to mention that because there may come a time when someone would go gosh I need to - I need to talk to people who do this kind of research about the way that they do

it; not necessarily the contents of it which in many cases might be confidential and extremely difficult to share for all kinds of reasons but the technique could be shared. And so I really think that's a critical distinction.

Now how could we clarify, you know, I think we need to clarify this statement to make that clear so that people knew that it was okay to acknowledge that you do research that isn't necessarily shared with others. Are there some words and phrases we could stick in there to make that easier to understand or is that just too hard to do and we just tell people that?

Rick Koeller: So let me ponder that.

Mikey O'Connor: Great.

((Crosstalk))

Rick Koeller: But thank you for the answer.

Mikey O'Connor: ...because let's see - I'm going to start taking notes in this particular version. Maybe that, you know, maybe that it goes in a preamble rather than the actual, you know, one square at a time but let me ponder that too and we'll work that. But that's a great - that's exactly the kind of stuff I'm hunting for on today's call.

The next one is the sharing one. And it may be that this is the place to put that conversation because I could easily see an organization saying in the first two, yep, we do tons of that kind of research. We are in, in fact, among the world's preeminent authorities in this kind of research. However the way that we share it and the people that we share it with is quite constrained or is member-only or et cetera, et cetera.

Whereas the response from my stakeholder group might be well we don't do much research but we really want to help people share what they've got that they feel is sharable.

And so the ISPCP would probably hang out and say, yeah, we actually are pretty active participants in the sharing part; granted that we don't generate much information and granted that much of the information that is generated is probably not available to us. We really want to help distribute information that is available to the ISPs that are our members.

And so maybe that's one way to think about the difference between the doing and the sharing. And so maybe some of those words and phrases go into the descriptions that way. Because in a way, you know, this is a great one to lead off with because the research and analysis is often some of the most sensitive information and the most complicated and troublesome to share in the list.

But, you know, we have some other pretty sensitive stuff as we go. And so making this distinction between the doing and the sharing I think is quite important and quite helpful.

And then there's a sort of a fourth layer that's this steering function that says we're, you know, our entity - the ISPCP would not steer this, I wouldn't think. You know, if you asked us we would say no, no we - when it comes to research and analysis of the DNS we don't steer this train. We would quite cheerfully participate in the sharing.

And as long as there was a good group of people at the core that was directing where this research should go and the topics to focus on and emerging stuff we don't need to drive that.

Whereas again to pick on Scott and DNS-OARC I would expect him to be, you know, right in the thick of all this stuff. And I would think that many of the

large - well many of the Registries, many of the, you know, the root server operators, et cetera, et cetera, those kinds of folks I would think would want to be steering where this research went.

It's kind of in my mind a process not unlike what goes on with the SSAC where they do a lot of steering just by the topics that they pick to research in the SSAC. And so I think that's the four-layer distinction that we're working on here.

Don't be shy. I'm going to just keep churning along. I'm only going to do a few more just to sort of give you a flavor of some of the different kinds of roles. But if these work well enough with the caveat that Rick's point brought in then I'm not going to belabor this today because we spent a lot of this on - a lot of time on this on the last call.

But, you know, this kind of thing, standards, tools and to a certain extent, the next one, education training and awareness, I think are less sensitive although there may be some sensitive stuff in each. I think when it comes to tools and techniques that would be harmful if they got in the hands of the bad guys the same issue applies.

But I think that the same answer applies, which is if you're developing these tools and techniques it's helpful to know that you're doing it even if you can't share them.

Again just because by identifying who's in the community of tool builders, who's doing standards, who's building these techniques we learn about each other and we can sort out in some cases with very careful trust relationship matrices between us how to share the really sensitive stuff. But just knowing who's in the game is helpful to the rest of us.

And I think that the ISPCP is in the same boat here although we would be more active in doing the - some of this stuff because we do deploy a lot of

security stuff within the ISPs around our local DNS functions. And again there was the whole big discussion, you know, we're also local registries for numbers.

And so we're sort of at the front lines on the numbers side. So there's kind of another version of it. And so then I think I'm going to jump in to sort of the operational side of things, you know, when it comes to the technology, the operational and technical practices. Again these get very repetitive, the descriptions.

And really all I did was replace the words. But hopefully this is enough that if people ask you, you can clarify this for them. And if you get stuck by all means bring those questions back to the rest of us and we'll help you answer them.

You know, you may get questions as you're taking these worksheets out to your respective constituency that, you know, don't feel compelled to have to come up with every single answer to every single question because just like the question that Rick raised, you know, we may need to think about that as a group.

So I think that's an - you know, I don't want to belabor this. You know, I'm not getting a whole lot of hands so I'm going to take that as this is close enough and sort of move us along to the next agenda item which is sort of what happens next?

Which we started to get into on the last call and I want to spend a little bit more time on this time because I think that there are several paths and that you'll just have to feel your way through it as you have the conversations with your respective groups.

I think in the case of a fairly narrow group of people like, you know, for example the ISPCP, a constituency of the GNSO of ICANN, the process that

I use is pretty short. I filled it out. I took it to them and said what do you think? We did a conference call just like this, spent about an hour on it. Tuned up our answers and pushed it back.

And I think that, you know, for certain groups of stakeholders that's going to work fine. For others - and I think this is where your individual judgment is going to have to come into play - you're going to have to take a slightly longer series of steps.

You know, it may take several iterations. It may - may be something that needs to go through several review cycles either because there's sensitive information in there that needs to be scrubbed out or because of the nature of the constituency or, you know, all kinds of reasons.

And so my immediate reaction to the conversation last week was not to be terribly prescriptive about this but really to leave this up to you. And I wanted to see if that was all right. I would be quite happy to write something prescriptive but I didn't because I decided it probably would get in your way more than anything.

And since this is cross organizational it's also sort of cross cultural. And we each make our decisions in different ways depending on what part of ICANN we're in and also I think we need to reach out beyond ICANN. You know, I'm going to take some of this ISP stuff out to actual ISP members of the ISPCP.

And when we get out into those communities I think we have to sort of have room to do this in ways that's comfortable for the people we're working with. But I wanted to check with you and see if that was all right. If you'd rather have me build something I'm happy to do it. But I didn't feel really the need to.

You know, I just - if that's okay I won't beat that one up either. But if it's not okay this is the time to say so. Getting overwhelming hands here. And Rick is

saying - Rick Koeller is saying in the chat, for sure as a Registry we can self complete. So I think that's the way I'm going to leave it.

And I think that what would be nice is to, if it's possible, to have some drafts. It's probably impossible to have final stuff done by Toronto. But I think it would be really helpful to have some drafts done because I think we'll learn a lot from the drafts. You know, again I want to leave it up to your judgment.

The drafts that are coming out of the ISPCP I don't feel any concerns about sharing them with the public as drafts because it's clear that they're drafts and they're really more just conversation starters. I think it would be nice to have at least a few more of those just to sort of broaden the conversation and enrich it.

But I don't think it's realistic to drive for a goal to have them done by Toronto. It took us, I think, too long to get this far and I apologize for that. But, you know, this is what happens when you're sort of building it as you go; it's a little bit slower but hopefully this will be a good tool for you to use.

And so let's try to have some drafts that we could talk about during our sort of hour and a half together on Thursday at the Toronto meeting. And if you could sort of set that expectation with the people that you're asking to complete these I think that would be a good thing.

Mark is asking do we have a time for the Thursday meeting. And I - the answer is yes. I think it's either 11:00 or 11:30, Mark, I can't remember but it's the same routine that we did in Prague. There are three in a row, the SSAC followed by the DNS RMF, followed by us in the same room.

And so that's the plan. And I just can't remember quite the time. And I also can't remember if it's an hour or an hour and a half. There was some conversation back and forth about that and I don't really know where we landed. But it's kind of like that. Mikey's usual standard loosy-goosy thing.

Jörg is saying in the chat, I think we need one to demonstrate how we think this should be working. What do you have in mind to do with the additional ones?

I'm thinking, Jörg, that if there are a few folks that have them far enough along that they can be like the one that I did for the ISPs - so let me find my mouse here. Oh, make that a little bit bigger, hold on. You know, I put the ISP one in the spreadsheet as an example.

And I think it would be great if we could have a few more examples. So if you...

Jörg Schweiger: Like one is doing one for his constituency and this is going to be presented within the constituency?

Mikey O'Connor: This one has been...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: ...presented within the constituency and will be presented in Toronto at the meeting. And so if we can have a few more that have been pushed far enough along that you're not uncomfortable having it become public I think it would be great.

I'm perfectly willing to just do this one as an example in Toronto but I think it would be completely amazingly cool if we could have a few more just because I think the conversation with it would be better. But I don't think that this should be a requirement. You know, the ISPs are comfortable - the ISPCP is comfortable with this draft being out there.

And, you know, because I was developing the spreadsheet and using them as my test case we're a little bit ahead of you in the cycle; we're three weeks ahead of you. So it may just be too tight to get this far along.

But if a few of you can, you know, for example Rick might be able to get CIRA's done and - oh my line is causing interference. That's terrible. Is it gone now? I've moved my phone to a different place. Is that better, Nathalie?

If not I can dial in on a - all right, I'll dial in on a different line. Carry on. I'll listen in and you can fight amongst yourselves as to who leads the call. I'll be right back.

Jörg Schweiger: Okay this is Jörg. May I just take over for Mikey because that was me - I asked him this question. And I think Mikey, in a way, is right that if we would ask for additional spreadsheets to be filled then this would certainly keep up the pressure that at last some of us are really filling in those sheets.

And I could think, as well, of a way that once, for example, those spreadsheets might be filled out for different constituencies then those of us who are actually presenting what we've been working on within their respective constituencies might just take the spreadsheet for their - or filled out for their constituency as an example and make it easier to explain what we really meant, what we're really looking for with this spreadsheet.

But further than that I just do not see that there would be a dramatic need for having those spreadsheets filled out until Toronto in a vast mass, I don't know what you think about it.

Mikey O'Connor: I thought Jörg was doing great. Carry on. I'm back.

Jörg Schweiger: I'll leave it back to you.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. I was listening while I was coming back in. Tim said I had the world's largest mosquito sitting on my shoulder; I apologize for that. So I loved what Jörg was saying. I mean, I think that one of the things that is really important is no pressure on this. This is going to be incredibly valuable information. We need to gather it in a way that leaves people comfortable.

And so if you can it would be lovely but if you can't don't worry about it because for many of you it's going to be very difficult to get through an approval process in time and it's also going to be very difficult to get people comfortable with the idea.

So thanks, Jörg, for jumping right in; that was fantastic. Any other thoughts on that particular line of reasoning before we keep going? Rick mentions in the chat that CERA may be able to have some input ready for Toronto which would be terrific.

Oh, Rick, as long as I have you on the call do you want to educate us on the pronunciation of the word Toronto, which I believe is incorrect.

Rick Koeller: Oh boy, so Rick Koeller. Toronto.

Mikey O'Connor: Really?

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: I've been instructed that it's Toronto with...

Rick Koeller: No, that's too Canadian.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh okay. All right. All right never mind; Toronto is correct, all right well...

Rick Koeller: Toronto is correct.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay thank you, sir. And thanks for the...

((Crosstalk))

Rick Koeller: No problem. Glad I could contribute.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm going to leave the possible paths agenda item unless there's anything else people would like to talk about on that and move on to one last item before we wrap up the call which is getting some comments, some public comments on our Phase 1 report. So if there's anything else about paths this is the time to speak.

Okay as some of you have probably noticed we have - we've had our report out for public comment for some time now. And essentially the summary of the result so far is that we got one where the commenter I don't think quite understood what we are about and so the comment wasn't really quite on the beam for our stuff - and none from any of our respective stakeholder groups or communities.

And we were talking about that a bit on the Ops group call on Monday and agreed that we really need to get some feedback on this report that we did for a whole slew of reasons. One is that this is one of those cross-constituency kinds of projects and we need feedback from the community as to how that's going.

It's also a pretty important topic and we need to get feedback from the community that what we are doing is correct and useful. So I've drafted a note and I've given the Ops team plenty of chances to beat it up and I haven't gotten terribly beaten up on it.

So I just want to run you through it. I'm going to email it to the list right after the call. But I just want to put it in front of your faces because my thought is that this is hopefully worded in such a way that you can just turn around and

send it to your constituency and say please help us out here. We are in the extended comments period right now. That comment period is going to end pretty soon after Toronto so you don't have a lot of time.

And so again I kind of want to ease the pressure off just a little bit but at the same time note that we really do need comments on this. And we need your help to get them. So I'm sort of saying the same thing that I just said in that preamble but I think here are a couple of points.

These don't have to be gigantic comments. Of course it would be, I think, hugely useful if some of you went through our report in detail and gave us feedback, you know, in depth but they don't have to be.

Because, you know, there's been so much participation via you all, you know, many of the constituencies' views are fairly well represented. But we need to get acknowledgment from the community that you represent that in fact this is working right.

And so while a single line email that says yeah, you're doing fine, is probably a little too light at the same time it doesn't need to be quite as extensive, if in fact we are doing fine, a simple acknowledgement of that would be very helpful.

The second one is that it would be helpful for all of us to hear from your organizations as to whether we're on the right track here and if we're not especially helpful to get some course corrections.

And so down below is - unfortunately the picture book pictures didn't come through so I'm going to take that reference out. But again it's - this is just sort of a plea to get some comments back that say yay or nay that we're on the right track here. And so I'm not going to - that's sort of it from the letter standpoint.

And the only reason for putting this on the agenda is to amplify and reinforce how very, very important this is because while I think our report is terrific a report that's out there with zero comments from the constituency is naked in our process at ICANN and we really need to get comments back.

So I'm hoping by sort of doing this rant that I'm putting some words in your mouths that you can use with your constituencies to get something back by the end of the comment period.

And so I'll stop at this point and just see if there are any reactions, if this is okay, if there's something we can do to improve it. But, you know, I don't want to belabor this; I'll send it to the list right after the call and let you get it, you know, get out to your constituencies on this.

So any thoughts? Okay I'm not hearing any so I won't beat you up anymore. And I guess that's it unless there's anything else that people want to talk about. Today's a little bit short but we are sort of tipping over from a few people doing a lot of work to a lot of people doing a little bit of work.

And so I think the thing to conclude on is if there's anything that either I or the rest of us can do to help you do this work this would be a good time to mention it.

I think what we'll do on the next call is just check and see how it's going, see if there's anything that's come up that's bothering you, talk a little bit more about what's going to happen in Toronto. And not sure - that may be the last call before Toronto; I can't remember the timing. But anyway we're getting pretty close to getting together face to face.

Well I'm not getting any hands so I think we'll call it a day. Looking forward to seeing a lot of you in Toronto. And with that, Nathalie, I think you can stop the recording and we'll shut this call down a little bit early. And see you in a week, folks. Thanks.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. (Tim), you may now stop the recordings.

END