Transcript
DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group (DSSA WG)
07 June 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 07 June 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-20120607-en.mp3
on page
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jun

Attendees on the call:

At Large Members
. Olivier Crépin-Leblond (ALAC) (co-chair)
. Andre Thompson (At-Large)
. Julie Hammer (ALAC)

ccNSO Members
. Takayasu Matsuura, .jp
. Rick Koeller, .ca (CIRA)
. Arturo Servin (LACNIC)

GNSO Members
. Mikey O'Connor - (CBUC) (co-chair)
. George Asare-Sakyi - (NCSG)
. Greg Aaron (RySG)

SSAC members:
Jim Galvin (SSAC)

ICANN Staff:
Julie Hedlund
Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies:
Katrina Sataki, .lv
Mark Kosters (ARIN); (co-chair)

Don Blumenthal – (RySG)
Cheryl Langdon-Orr (ALAC)
Rafik Dammak – (NCSG)
Scott Algeier (expert)
Warren Kumari (SSAC)
Jörg Schweiger, .de (co-chair)

Coordinator: Please go ahead. Today's 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 7th of June, 2012. On the call today we have Mikey O'Connor, Rick Koeller, Olivier Crépin-LeBlond, Andre Thompson, Julie Hammer, Jim Galvin, Takayasu Matsuura and Greg Aarons.

We have apologies from Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Arturo Servin, Katrina Sataki, Don Blumenthal, Warren Kumari, Scott Algiers, Mark Kosters, Jörg Schweiger and Rafik Dammak. From staff we have Julie Hedlund and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

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 (Tim) for getting us going. Thanks, all, for joining us. The usual agenda applies. We'll spin through it really quick. I think today we're really doing the second and hopefully final consensus call on the report. And do want to dig into the appendices a little bit. Those are very rough still and then anything else on people's minds.

We'll take a moment to listen in on any changes to statements of interests. Okay. And with that off we go.

Take you very quickly through just a few things. There's not a lot of substantive change since last week. We've acknowledged Jörg's idea that

what we need to do is something that's applicable many times but we didn't modify the charter part; we drove that further down.

And then you'll see Julie's work here. Julie and I are the perfect team because I hate doing the last stages of final reports so Julie has carried me across the finish line here. And I'll acknowledge that so you'll see a few formatting things go by. But then there are just a few wording changes that I think are great but I don't think change things substantively.

Just rolling this by your eyes so that you can - how little has changed. But here's the first actual content change - this one here. Where we're saying - we're acknowledging Jörg's idea that the framework that the Board committee - word in there - is selecting presumably the beginning of an ongoing security management process whereas the DSSA is chartered as a one-time effort.

And this is acknowledging that we're a one-time thing but that there should be an ongoing thing that follows it. Highlight that. Pictures - I don't think the pictures changed at all.

The next change is on this line where Jörg suggested a slight wiggle room in our next phase charter. Said - going to go into at least one of those topics. But it gives us an out if we discover that these things take forever. This gives us a way to wrap this up so that we don't all die and the (trace is) on this project.

Change that. And this is the next part that I wrote. It says, "We observe that there's a need for ongoing risk assessment of the DNS. The DSSA is, again, chartered as a cross constituency working group within ICANN that will end soon. It is not an entity that can organize or deliver this kind of permanent capability."

"However, the DSSA has several observations about ongoing DNS risk assessment that the community may find helpful as it decides whether to

organize and deliver that capability." And again this is just acknowledging Jörg's idea that we think an ongoing thing is a good idea.

Sorry to roll you eyeballs for you it's just the easiest way to do this. The pictures haven't changed. Julie's tuning up my language. And, right, Julie, this was a note to the future. Good catch so I'll take that out.

Oh yes and this is one that we're going to take out because this is before we drew those pictures. Put this one in their place. Little editing on the fly because this came in this morning.

Julie Hammer: Yeah, Julie Hammer here. Sorry that was so late, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: That's all right. I'm still in the - it turns out when you're over 60 it's really a bad idea to play 12 hours of rock and roll over a weekend. I'm still in recovery mode doing things on the fly so that's fine.

All right then we've got stuff out that was pretty defensive. That's an old comment. Oh and then this is the final section. So I just want to draw your attention to this part because this is all new. Julie tuned it up a little bit.

But what we're saying here is that we hope that our work will continue ongoing community - will contribute to an ongoing community-wide effort to monitor the security and stability of the DNS. We will refine the results, methods and tools presented in this report with that goal in mind during the next phase of the work. Here are some final observations.

First of all that this is a baseline; it's a momentary picture. It's probably obsolete the day it's published. But the thing that I think we really contribute is the methods and tools. And we also, I think, did this - this last paragraph - with the goal in mind that these could be shared pretty widely, community and beyond.

So that's the sort of acknowledgment of Jörg's idea that we want to keep an ongoing effort on the burner. And I think this is probably mostly aimed at Bill Graham's Board committee. It's really in their charter to sort of figure this out. But I think we wanted to lay the underpinnings for that.

So those are the changes. Not much change - and that's a good thing because we arrived at consensus on the last call. I will note that I totally fell down on the job and have not written an executive summary yet. So if you would like to wait a week and see what I've done to hack out the executive summary that's fine. Otherwise we could go ahead and do our second round consensus and just tune it; whichever way you prefer.

My goal with the summary would be not to introduce any new ideas at all but simply to collapse this report down into a page or two for the people who need to read it in a hurry. So any thoughts on that one way or the other? It would be nice to get a consensus call out of the way. But if you'd prefer to wait for that I'm fine doing that. And I apologize, I just totally forgot. Rock and roll.

Not hearing a whole lot of opinions either way. Why don't we go ahead and do the second consensus call and I'll just note in the status report that the executive summary isn't done and that you all have the perfect right to come back and hit me up if that's not in good shape the next time. So there we go. Last chance to say no otherwise I think we'll take our silence as ascent approach and say hooray, consensus on the report.

Okay I want to go - oops, that's not - the appendices and just get some thoughts from you on this. Looking at the appendices now that we've redone the report and I'm starting to think - this wider. This is the outline view of the report rather than the text view.

And the first question that I've got is when we look at these appendices now this whole risk scenario section in the appendix - let me open this up - is

pretty redundant. And I'm thinking of taking it out because it, you know, basically these pictures that we drew pretty much put everything on one page and we've already driven them up into the body of the report.

And so my inclination is not to try and manage two copies of the same thing. And unless anybody - just feels really strongly about this I think I'm going to take this out of the appendix.

Julie Hammer: Mikey, Julie Hammer here. I think that's a really good idea. The only thing that currently appears in the appendix that isn't in the report are the descriptions of the example scenarios.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. And, you know, I - as Jörg started to dive into editing these and as he started to do that I realized that we probably have a fair amount of work to do on these examples before we want to publish them to the world.

Julie Hammer: So maybe move them out altogether?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I'm thinking that rather than try and edit these down to a state that's sharable with the world that we should probably just - I mean, they're in the record, they're on the wiki. But they could easily get misinterpreted. Let me just get a little closer to these so that you can actually read them.

Julie Hammer: I think that's a good idea because to some extent they're just examples, they're not a complete and inclusive list.

Mikey O'Connor: Right, they're - I think that they are better thought of as conversation starters for us. But they, you know, I could see these getting copy and pasted into a blog post and taken completely out of context and this splashed all over the place when in fact that's not our intent - we were using them.

So I'm inclined to just drop this whole section. Not that we'll use it, you know, we'll use these when we return to these topics. But I'm a little uncomfortable publishing them the way they stand.

Julie Hammer: And we just need to roll the most recent version of the pictures up into the report.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Oh let me share - I don't know if I've got this window open or not. But Julie is - I tell you what Julie has - oh this is...

Julie Hammer: That's not the one...

Mikey O'Connor: ...my version...

Julie Hammer: ...with the arrows.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. So this is our little animated series of slides. You can see them sort of rolling through. And the major change to this version of the pictures is that we've got the threat events and the adverse impacts on each slide.

Julie Hammer: There was a later version, Mikey, where I managed to get that red arrow on but you might not have liked that.

Mikey O'Connor: I can't - You and I can tune these...

Julie Hammer: Yeah, we'll - yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: I've forgotten - I've misplaced it. It's not that I don't like it it's that got too many windows open at once and we'll get that sorted out. But anyway I think that these slides actually do a much better job of replacing, you know, of telling the story in the appendix. So I really - I think we should really just delete these from the appendices.

The next thing - there's one big piece of the appendix that's not in very good shape. And I wanted to ask your opinion. Those are all the threat scenarios going by. But the one thing that's not in very good shape at all is the background materials; there's nothing in there right now.

And I'm starting to run out of daylight. So again with your permission I'm going to delete that from this version of the appendix. It's not that it's gone but it's sitting in one of those goofy mind maps and I'm getting a little concerned that I will not do an adequate job to have it in any kind of shape before Prague.

And rather than send off an unedited one I'd prefer to just put a stub in here that says this will be completed prior to publishing the final report. Because I think that the background materials are very useful it's just that I don't want to publish a crummy version and (edgy) that (unintelligible).

I think the rest is in reasonable shape. I may tune up the methods part a bit. I'll show you what it's like right now. This is pretty sketchy and many of these things are really here really more for documentation than anything else.

Again the framework - you know, these appendices are really a mess. But fortunately we have nice pictures. And again this is another candidate for being deleted because these pictures are now up in the body of the report. I think I'm going to use the same rationale that these are better in the body of the report.

I think that - I think the difference is that these are larger. And I may leave them in the appendix for people who are actually reading printed versions of these. If you're in the thing on a computer you can simply expand these pictures on the screen.

But for people who are actually reading a printed document these are laid into the appendix in landscape format so they're a little bit bigger. But other than

that I'm not planning to go any deeper in the appendix because I think these are great; they sort of cover the whole waterfront.

The charter - oh no this is the - this is the confidential information stuff that's completely unchanged from the draft that we developed and a little glossary. And I'm going to put a little ditty in here right at the end just noting (Paul Vixy)'s willingness to be an intermediary for people who have embarrassing scenarios that they want to submit.

So that's kind of the state of the appendices. I apologize for them being so raggedy but in a way I think what's happened is better because a lot of the material that was going to go into the appendices because it was so complicated and long I think has been summarized into those pictures and driven up into the report.

And so the bad news is the appendix is in pretty rough shape but the good news is that most of its important content is covered better in the report. That's my rationale anyway.

And I just wanted to check for shrieks of anguish from the rest of you about that approach to the appendices. There aren't any then I'll go ahead and drive along with that. And I bet a nickel that Julie Hammer will be right there with me tuning this stuff up which is perfect because I'm terrible at putting stuff across the finish line.

So is that okay, folks, if we approach it that way? And I'm not sure I'll give you a whole lot of review opportunities. I think one other business item is whether we should cancel the rest of the meetings between now and Prague. We're getting awfully close to the meeting and I'm tempted to say - to let the rest of you off the hook if you're comfortable with where this is headed.

If you want to keep meeting I'm absolutely delighted to do that. But I know that everybody is getting crazy busy and could probably use the time. So again no shrieks of anguish...

Julie Hammer: Mikey, Julie Hammer here. I'm happy if others don't want to then again I'm happy if you want to just use me as a sounding board and email a draft to me and I'll can turn them around.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. I think that would be fabulous because I think you can I can turn this around a whole bunch of times between now and Prague. For those of you who are on the ops group, no, you're not off the hook because we still have to do the slide deck for the presentation and a few other things for Prague.

Oh, yes, the schedule for Prague is done. Let's see is - Julie Hedlund is on the call. Julie, can you remind us when the face to face meeting is? I know it's...

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, hello, Mikey, this is Julie Hedlund. The meeting is on Thursday. And it's from 9:00-10:30. And let me - in fact let me just bring up the schedule very quickly here and I can tell you what room it's in. But I'll send the information around as well as I've done before. And in fact I'm actually going to be putting together today a schedule of meetings of interest that I normally do for the SSAC.

And so let me do what I did last time which was basically modified that but, you know, sent it to this list as well because I think that there's a number of meetings that this group would be interested in addition to the face to face meeting. And then just to confirm that it is scheduled from 9:00-10:30 and it's in the Tyrolka room. But I'll send that around today with some other information.

Mikey O'Connor: Perfect. Thank you, Julie. So the one other thing to add to that list that will be different than the SSAC one is all of the update sessions so that folks like me

can trail around to them like I did the last time and just be there to sing harmony.

Julie Hedlund: Right. So, Mikey, this is Julie. I have not seen the schedule of the update sessions.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I think that's a research project actually. You know, I've sort of worn out my welcome with Jeff Neuman who's scheduling the GNSO one. Have no clue even whether I have an update session.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, actually for the GNSO that is the one I am aware of. The - you are on the schedule the GNSO Council meeting on Wednesday afternoon. I don't know exactly where on the agenda because that agenda is still in flux but you are definitely slotted there.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay so...

Julie Hedlund: That's the only one I'm aware of. I don't know what's happening with ccNSO or anyone else.

Mikey O'Connor: Can you bug your respective - maybe we bug ourselves on the ops list on that to...

Julie Hedlund: Well I don't - you know, I'm not aware, did we extend - I mean, I know as staff we didn't extend, you know, request to the groups other than GNSO. I don't know that other requests for meetings have been made to other groups, you know, ALAC, etcetera.

Mikey O'Connor: Jim, Olivier, any - Olivier, go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thanks, Mikey. It's Olivier for the transcript. Just to let you know we have at the ALAC we have reserved some time between 1350 and 1420

on Sunday the 24th of June so you're very welcome. And everyone here of course is very welcome to come to that session.

This is our - we have a full day of work but usually - we might be a few minutes late, maybe 10, 15 minute late by that time and so we will have been in that room since 9:00 am. Nonetheless we'll have enough time to be able to discuss the DSSA so 1350 to 1420.

Mikey O'Connor: Cool. There's one.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Olivier. This is Julie. I have noted that and I'll include that in the schedule.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh and I guess, Julie, you're the SSAC person so you'd know whether it was in the SSAC schedule, wouldn't you?

Julie Hammer: I haven't seen the SSAC...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, you know, actually the SSAC members will just attend the session on Thursday so that will be their update.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh okay.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, because those that are interested will just plan to be there. And in fact we're all in the same room so basically the SSAC meets from 8:00-9:00 and then the SSAC members who are interested, you know, will just stay on.

Mikey O'Connor: Great, all right so we've got that one covered. Well we probably need to circle around to Mark and Jörg and see sort of what the plan is. I would be surprised if they haven't got something on the ccNSO schedule too. Anyway we'll tidy that one up on the ops list.

Olivier, is that a new hand? You want to talk again or is that left over from before? Oh, left over. Thanks.

Okay that's it then for today. I'm happy to give back some time. Julie, go ahead.

Julie Hammer: Yeah, Julie Hammer for the transcript. Mikey, did you want to mention just the idea we had about perhaps needing to weave into the report something about the numerical calculation generation by the worksheet - weave that in somewhere?

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, yeah. I didn't think that was a...

Julie Hammer: Oh...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: ...but, yeah. One of the points that Julie raised in the correspondence that we've been having is that when you pound numbers into the worksheet you sometimes get some gigantic results; over a million.

And my immediate thought on that, Julie, was to just put a little disclaimer in the front of the worksheet that says be not dismayed by the numbers, these are just relative scales and they can result in some horrendous multiplicative effects. But this is fairly typical for these kinds of valuation systems.

Because of the way they're structured they wind up with huge swings in the results. And in our case it could swing from something like 10,000 to 10 million I think so I thought I would just put a little - I need to go back through that worksheet and update it one more time for the public release anyway.

I think probably putting it in the report there's no really good place to stand for that because there aren't any indications in the report that will scale those.

Julie Hammer: No, I agree. I think the worksheet would be a good place for it to be.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. Yeah, I should - I've got an action to go through and tidy that up. Okay then that's it for me. Any other business from anybody else? Going once, going twice. All right then. Thanks, all, for hanging in all the way until the end. And we'll see you in Prague. And to send you out show you a picture of me in my current state. Exhaustion.

And with that, Nathalie, I think you can wrap up the call. (Tim), thanks a million for managing all the phone stuff as always. And we'll see you all in Prague either in person or on the Net, except for you ops people; you guys get to meet next Monday, sorry. See you all later. Bye-bye.

Julie Hammer: Bye, Mikey.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Bye-bye.

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

END