Transcript
DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group (DSSA WG)
01 March 2012 at 14:00 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 01 March 2012 at 14:00 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-20120301-en.mp3
Presentation will be posted shortly on:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#mar

Attendees on the call:

At Large Members
. Cheryl Langdon-Orr (ALAC)
. Olivier Crépin-Leblond (ALAC) (co-chair)
. Andre Thompson (At-Large)

ccNSO Members
. Jacques Latour, .ca

NRO Members
.Mark Kosters (ARIN); (co-chair)

GNSO Members
. Mikey O'Connor - (CBUC) (co-chair)
. George Asare-Sakyi - (NCSG)
.Rosella Mattioli (NCSG)
. Rafik Dammak – (NCSG)
. Greg Aaron - (RySG)
. Don Blumenthal – (RySG)

SSAC Members
. Jim Galvin (SSAC)

Experts
Scott Algeier

ICANN Staff:
Julie Hedlund
Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies:
Jörg Schweiger, .de (co-chair)
Bart Boswinkel

Coordinator: Please go ahead; the 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 1st of March, 2012. On the call today we have Mikey O'Connor, Rafik Dammak, George Asare Sakyi, Andre Thompson, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Rosella Mattioli, Scott Algeier, Jacques Latour, Don Blumenthal and Jim Galvin.

From staff we have myself, Nathalie Peregrine. And we have apologies from Jörg Schweiger and Bart Boswinkel. I would 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. We seem to have kind of light attendance today partly because people are probably getting ready to travel to Costa Rica and partly because we're competing with an ICANN policy briefing that may have drawn a bunch of people away.

We have a pretty short agenda. We can just take a second look at the conversation we had last time to confirm it. And take a brief look at the schedule for the Costa Rica meeting.

But before we do that just we'll take a moment to see if anybody has an update to their statement of interest that they'd like to share?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I don't, Mike, but I did wonder now that we have a new appointed but yet to be confirmed ALAC liaison to the SSAC whether or not it might be appropriate to get Julie and yourself to reach out to (Julie Hanna) who I know

you've met and several other members have met when she was allowed by you to join our workshop at a previous call.

So it might be good to try and get her up to speed as soon as possible. But it will be her role to take the chair that was allocated to the liaison from ALAC into this group.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh that's great. I - Cheryl, could you send an email to me and Julie and (Julie) to get that started? I'd be...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, I'd be delighted to. And normally I would expect Olivier to have done that but seeing as he's not joined the call yet I thought I'd pick up his mantle and run with it.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh good for you. That's great. And, yes, maybe wire Olivier into that email.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Shall do it, yes.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: All right any other changes to statements of interest before we dive into our fairly short agenda? Oh and it's great to see Mark and Greg joining.

What you see on the screen is really just a different version of the conversation that we had last week. This is all dressed up with the fine colors of the...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Costa Rica...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, ICANN...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Which of course I'm now having to pack because you know my wardrobe for each meeting matches the logos and themes for each meeting. You have, I hope, observed that.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh I am embarrassed to admit that I haven't until now. But...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: A girl tries; a girl tries and no one notices.

Mikey O'Connor: Gracious. You know, my wardrobe is blue.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well we know you've got three shirts and they're all...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, you know, I'm actually kind of down to one shirt now so I have an easier job packing.

Anyway so this is the same words that we discussed last time just all formatted bit differently. And I think it's sometimes helpful to see those same words in a different way just to see whether they still make sense.

I've got some other words in this deck that I'm going to share with you as well but I think this is the main one that we want to focus on today. And so let me just sort of zoom in on each of these three big chunks because each of them are quite important.

The first chunk that we've agreed on is that we've really narrowed down the threat events to three admittedly very broad ones but these are the threat events that we're going to use to drive analysis going forward.

And those three are that a zone doesn't resolve, it's incorrect or its security is compromised. Oh there's Olivier now. And we had a fairly extensive discussion about this on the last call. And I'm happy to take folks through it again if you want or we can simply nod and say yes this is fine and carry on. So I'm at your disposal. I'm getting a nod from Cheryl. Anybody want to go through this in more detail than I just did?

Maybe I'm going to - I'm going to just take a slight slide detour. Hang on just a minute. I think this is a slide that's helpful. One of the things that we've - we also discussed last week is the notion that our charter says actual level frequency and severity of threats to the DNS. That's right out of our charter word for word.

What we've done - and I think quite well actually over the last several weeks - is unpack that word threat just a bit. What we're describing when we say threat events is the things that are bad that happen. And there are really - those three and I'll go back to that slide in a minute.

But we shouldn't confuse those with other things that go into the analysis that we're chartered to make. One of the things that goes into it as well what happens when the threat events happen; these are called adverse impacts.

Another thing that we've got quite a lot of information about that we'll pretty quickly go into analyzing next is the vulnerabilities; those are the things that allow those threat events to happen.

Then there are things called predisposing conditions; those are things in advance that either help or hurt actually. So a good example of a predisposing condition is the architecture of the DNS, for example caching, and we'll tease those out.

Then there are two flavors of threat sources, there are adversarial ones, those are the ones that people think about a lot. Those are people or groups or governments or whatever that initiate a threat event.

But there are also non-adversarial threat sources. And a good example of that is the recent cable cut that's knocked down Internet capacity in Africa when a ship dropped an anchor on a key cable I think into Nairobi or into Kenya.

And then there's the whole conversation about controls and mitigation. So when we were chartered to talk about threats it's our belief that we were really chartered to talk about all this stuff. And so we've got a ways to go. But the threat events are actually fairly simple and quite broad. And so that's a little bit by way of background why we're so focused in on these three.

So this is sort of the last call on this. This is the deck that we're going to use to update the community in Costa Rica. So if there are any last minute reservations this would be a good time to say them because this is also our last meeting before the Costa Rica.

Cheryl is in. She gave us a checkmark. Thanks Cheryl. I think we've got pretty good agreement on this one. I'm going to stop beating this to death.

The next one that I think perhaps our most brilliant piece of work is this very important distinction to be made. And I think that this is what caused us such a struggle as we went through those elaborate tables that I built.

And I will note that both Nathalie and Cheryl were shocked by how simple today's Adobe room is laid out. There's no voting, there's no definitions, etcetera, etcetera. And I think that part of the reason that we were working so hard on that was because of this statement which is that in the worst case any of these three threat events would have really broad consequences Internet-wide.

But even if it's not Internet-wide people who are in that zone that's affected irrespective of how big or small or broad or general or narrow or focused the impact will be quite substantial for the people who are actually inside that zone and will also be pretty substantial for people who use that zone a lot.

And I think that that's a very important distinction and it took us a long time to arrive at it. I think I want to commend publicly Jim for his tenacity in beating me on the head until I finally understood what he was talking about because that was hard work and I think you did a great job on that. It's all Jim's fault.

Then the final thing that we described is that when that event happens either for the people inside the zone or if it were a broadly used zone like dotCom or the root that last list is a very general list of the nature of the impact that would occur if those three things happened.

And those are quite broad. If we wanted to, in subsequent work, I think, you know, we could certainly in the prose of the report give more specific examples of these. But I think that this is a great list start.

Oh I just saw Jim's comment in the chat. I love channeling you, Jim.

So anyway that's sort of our big slide for the conversation in Costa Rica. And this is sort of your last chance to sharpen this up, give us a course correction, add, delete, whatever. I'll just take a moment and let you raise your hands if you want to and we'll go onto some other stuff in this deck.

All right then. Just go back up just a little ways. I want to share just a few other things. Is this the one I really want to share. See, a little mumbling for you, Cheryl, I just want to know...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, I'm pleased with that that, you know, I'm still shocked by the lack of voting in...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bill can only handle so much.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh Olivier has raised his hand. I'll let Olivier go while I find the slide I want to talk about. Go ahead, Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thanks, Mikey. It's Olivier here. The - I'm very happy with the slide deck; very good. The only concern or it's not a concern it's most just of a note some of the slides appear to be written with very small characters a little filled for a punchy slide deck; sometimes less words are better. And it's a little difficult in larger rooms to read the small print.

But I gather probably during the presentation we can read through it so those people that are unable to read these small characters will be able to follow. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Something like that, is that the problem that you're concerned about, Olivier?

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: I am planning - thank you. It's Olivier for the transcript. I am hoping that most people will be within the bounds of San Jose and not in the neighboring town looking at it through binoculars. But you get...

Mikey O'Connor: Sorry, I couldn't resist. I will take a look at that and see if I can thin it out a bit. It never hurts to take words out of these things and I agree that - it is good to do that so I'll take an action to take a pass through the deck.

But I do think that, you know, that is an option is to simply, you know, shrink the deck down to that size. It also makes it much easier to make up things while you're speaking.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Mikey - Mikey, you're having far too much in today's call.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm sorry. This is sort of the celebration of several months of really hard work that we did a really good job at. So you'll have to excuse me. But I will take a look at it thinning out the deck.

And by the way the latest versions of these decks are always on the wiki so if you are either giving a presentation and want to tailor it or if you want to shares these decks with somebody they are in this part of the wiki that's talking about meeting planning. It's buried one level down; you have to go hunt for it because we didn't want to make a big thing out of it. But these decks are all out on the wiki if you want to share them.

Okay meanwhile one of the things that I think that we would like to have conversation with the community about - now I'll do the opposite of what I was going to do.

Is the conversation that we've been having a lot on the ops group call and to a certain extent we've also been talking about it here on these calls which is we've been at this for quite a while. We've been at it, you know, counting the status reports we're on Status Report 42 right now; the one I write this weekend will be Number 43. So we've been at this for at least 43 weeks. And the chartering extends quite a bit before I started writing status reports.

So it is easy to say that this has been going on for over a year. And the question is really sort of the classic project management question which is the slightly smart-alecky impertinent remark at the bottom which is in any project you have really four variables in the equation.

You have the resources that you've got available and then you've got three dimensions that you can use those resources for; you can go to a greater or a lesser level of detail, you can proceed faster or slower and you can be more or less accurate in your results.

And one of the things that's happened during the time that we've been at work is that there are other groups that have sprung up that are, you know, chartered to do either similar or overlapping work.

And it's probably not a bad idea - and I think that Costa Rica is a good meeting to do this at - to talk to people in the community about which way we should proceed in the future.

Because for example one way to think about this is that we - the actual working group - have been at this for 43 weeks. But another way to think about it is to say that we, the working group, have been at this for 43 hours because we meet one hour a week.

And so for example if the community said we would like you to get through a lot of work a lot faster; we don't want to lose the level of detail that you've been going into. One option would be to say all right provide the working group the resources to get together for a week face to face so that we could work 40 hours in a week. And that's just a wild idea; I'm not necessarily saying that's a good one.

But I think that this is an important conversation to have in Costa Rica because we will be able to meet with so many people in the community. And at least during the update I think it's a good idea to raise this and spend a little bit of time during the update to get the sense of people - how to proceed.

Because one way to approach this is to say we'll continue the way we've been working say for an hour a week. We will cover the whole scope of the issue but we will cover it in very broad terms just like we did with the ones that we just completed.

And we may leave a lot of documentation behind in those amazing mind maps that I record when we're having those conversations. But we'll leave that documentation for subsequent and maybe more targeted teams to work

with so that's one approach. And I think that if we were to take that sort of an approach we could have quite a lot of the work done by Prague.

Another approach would be to say no, you know, we're really the detailed work on the issues group. And we should keep at it even though it will take quite a long time there's really nobody else chartered to work at the level that we are chartered to work at which is quite detailed and we should continue that.

And then we should do some planning around the fact that this group is going to keep going for quite some time because for example there are a bunch of people who are no longer on the group partly in some cases because they've changed jobs or changed focus in their job. And so we need to do some planning for a longer project.

And before we do that planning I think it's a good idea to have this conversation both amongst ourselves and with the folks in Costa Rica. So that's the purpose of this status slide in the deck. And I mostly just want to highlight that for you because I'm still steadfastly avoiding putting any dates on this slide simply describing the chunks of the work.

But I'm pretty - I'm being pretty careful about saying when we're going to get done because it really depends on those variables and it really depends on the needs of the community.

And, Mark, you've got a really good question. And I'm not sure that I have the answer because I think we need to ask that question of the community in the Costa Rica - Mark has written in the chat what are the expectations with regard to this group from ICANN?

I think that really this chart - and then his next follow - is the community the one to answer or is ICANN itself? Well we're chartered by the community.

We're chartered by the GNSO, the ccNSO, the NRO and so on. And I think it's really back to that community so ask this question.

We are not chartered by ICANN. We were chartered in response to a conversation that started in...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Nairobi.

Mikey O'Connor: Was it Nairobi?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: It was where Rod got up in front of the ccNSO and said, you know, the DNS is fragile and at risk and so on and so forth. I can't really remember. I wasn't in the meeting so sort of channeling that.

But anyway this is a community-chartered group and so I think we need to ask the community. And certainly I think ICANN is part of that community and I would certainly ask folks in ICANN too. Yes, I was thinking Brussels too because I was at the meeting and I didn't go to Nairobi so I just wasn't in the session. Thanks, Greg.

So anyway that - I think that's the - one of the big conversations that I'm certainly going to be having a lot in Costa Rica and I would encourage the rest of too.

And I think that then on Thursday, which is when our meeting is, we'll sort of poll ourselves and see what we've heard from people and also ask folks who are attending - hopefully we'll have a pretty broad group of people in the meeting with us on Thursday.

And I think that this conversation is quite important to get a sense of the community. Because I, you know, as a project manager type guy I can see

structuring it either way and I can see value in each. But what I cannot support is, you know, super detailed, super fast, super accurate with the resources we've got. That doesn't compute for me.

So I think what we need to do is get some help from the community as to how to make this choice. So that's one of the highlights on the deck...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: ...draw to your attention today. The other thing that I wanted to share with you is - oops - is what's coming. And I think that the other big topic during our face to face meeting in Costa Rica is going to be an exploded version of this slide. And I have an action item from the ops team to dive back into the methodology and pull out information that we will start to tailor.

Thanks for dropping in, Mark. And I think your question was a great one and it sort of triggered a nice long rant from Mikey so I appreciate it. Have a great time. And I'll see you - I'll see all of you I hope in Costa Rica.

So anyway this is the other thing that we'll do but it won't be from this slide; we'll do it from a deck that I prepare that I haven't yet where I'm going to go into the methodology and pull out a bunch of stuff.

Because I think one of the things that I've learned in this process is that we sort of are building the airplane while we're flying in it. And what I mean by that is that in a normal version of a project like this what we would have done or our chartering group would have done is they would have tailored the methodology that we're using before we started to use it.

Since we picked our methodology in mid-flight that couldn't happen. And we then lost a fair amount of time where I plunged ahead in a version of the methodology that didn't scale and that's that whole super-detailed voting thing.

And so I think to avoid that in the future we'll spend some time in Costa Rica getting more familiar - getting more of us more familiar with the methodology and beginning that tailoring process so that we can have that in place before we start actually doing the work. And I think that'll help us get through the work more quickly.

I know it sounds like process stuff and it is but every once in a while we need a little bit of that. We'll spend a good bit of our time I think in Costa Rica planning what these things mean, tailoring their meaning to more correctly fit the mission that we're on which is kind of unusual. I mean, this methodology is not really quite designed to handle the DNS the way we're approaching it. And so I think it's entirely correct to tailor it to fit.

So that's sort of a preview of the conversation in Costa Rica. Is there anything else that people want to either bring up, focus on or correct about what I've done here? Okay.

The only other thing that's left - oh Julie is on - Julie, are you on the bridge as well?

Julie Hedlund: I am now.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh cool. Well I was going to just channel Julie but now I don't have to. Can you - I'll do a little radio announcer filling for you but if you could take us through the schedule of meetings in Nairobi...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Sure, let me go ahead and pull that up. Give me one second...

Mikey O'Connor: ...or in Costa Rica.

Julie Hedlund: ...while I find it.

Mikey O'Connor: And it's not in Nairobi for the record it's in...

Julie Hedlund: Hold on.

Mikey O'Connor: I've got Nairobi on the brain because of that cable cut. I was...

Julie Hedlund: Hold on one second. All right, schedule of Costa Rica meetings. Okay going through the schedule so our first meeting is on Sunday it's the 11th of March. And it is the briefing to the ALAC by Olivier. And that will be from 5:25 to 5:45 in the (La Paz) room. And this is all out in the DSSA list as well.

And I'll send an update to - as well just in case there are any room changes and just as a reminder next week.

And the next meeting is Tuesday the 13th and that is the briefing to the ccNSO by Jörg from 12:30 to 12:45 in the Bougainville room. And this - just as a note - is following the update of the SSR team to the ccNSO by Alejandro Pisanty that's 12:15 to 12:30.

And then there is the briefing to the SSAC that is from 4:30 to 5:15. I think that time might change slightly. If it does of course I will provide the updated time in my reminder next week. That update will be provided by Jim. And it's in the (Hela Conjia) room.

And then moving along to Wednesday there is the briefing to the GNSO Council. That's going to be at approximately three o'clock. And that will be given by Mikey. And I say approximately because that's about where it would be in the agenda assuming that all the agenda items take the time that they are allotted in the agenda. Of course if something runs over it might be a little bit later than that and that's in (La Paz) A.

On Thursday we have several meetings. There is the meeting for the DSSA working group members and the SSR team. That's in the morning from 7:30 to 8:30 in (Hiera Sol) and we have asked for lots of coffee for that one.

And then immediately following that in the same room from 8:30 to 9:30 just of interest to DSSA members will be the SSAC public meeting. Some of the DSSA members who are also in the SSAC then will be in the room they're supposed to be in for that SSAC meeting. And that is actually the public meeting so it's open to everyone.

Immediately following that is the - from 9:30 to 11:00 is the ICANN Board DNS risk framework working group. And I'll check the room on that. I think we were able to get that also changed into the (Hiera Sol) room instead (La Paz) A and I'll send that update but I think the intention was to have all of these meetings run back to back in the same room so we didn't have to go running off someplace else.

Because then in (Hiera Sol) from 11:00 to 12:30 is the meeting of the DSSA working group. And that is also in (Hiera Sol) so hopefully we'll be all in the same room. And that room is booked until one o'clock in case we need the extra time.

Over to you, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: I love it when I can just throw the football to Julie and she just snags it out of the air and runs with it. Thanks that was...

Julie Hedlund: You're welcome.

Mikey O'Connor: I think that's it for this meeting unless there are any questions about anything that we've covered. I think we'll draw this one to a close a little bit early to allow us all time to pack to go to Costa Rica now that I know...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh come on, you've got one shirt to pack, Mikey, we all know that.

Mikey O'Connor: Well I'm thinking about your color coordinating and I'm noting that there's a lot of blue at the bottom of this slide so I think I'm covered because my one shirt, which is blue, will fit right in so I'm pretty pleased about that.

So anyway thanks all. I think we've done a fabulous job over this last period between the two meetings. I think we've got a lot to be sharing with people and we've learned a lot that others in the community both the community as a whole and also the security community can use. So let's go have some fun in Costa Rica and talk these up and find out what we need to fix and carry on. And with that...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Are you bringing stickers, Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: You bet. I'm bringing stickers...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: What color?

Mikey O'Connor: The same. I was thinking...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's still pink.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes that violent pink...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Well that's true I had - I could bring other colors; would you like multiple colors? I think better stick with pink otherwise we'll be confusing ourselves.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Fine.

Mikey O'Connor: So pink it is. And yes I will be bringing stickers for sure. All right then we'll call it a day. Thanks, all. We'll see you in Costa Rica. Nathalie, I think we're done, you can wrap up the recording and see you in Costa Rica.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Mikey. Thanks, everyone.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you everyone. See you soon.

((Crosstalk))

Nathalie Peregrine: (Tim), you may now stop the recordings, thank you.

END