Transcript
DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group (DSSA WG)
09 June 2011 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 09 June 2011 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:
Mp3: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ccnso-dssa-20110609-en.mp3

Attendees:
Greg Aaron, GNSO
Roy Arends, ccNSO
George Asare-Sakyi, GNSO
Sean Copeland, ccNSO
Olivier Crepin-Leblonde, ALAC (co-Chair)
Rafik Dammak, GNSO
Keith Drazek, GNSO
Luis Diego-Espinoza, .ccNSO
Jim Galvin, SSAC
Mark Kosters, NRO (co-Chair)
Cheryl Langdon-Orr, ALAC
Jaques Latour, ccNSO
Scott McCormick, GNSO
Takayasu Matsuura, ccNSO
Rossella Mattioli, GNSO
Mike O'connor, GNSO (co-Chair)
Jörg Schweiger, ccNSO (co-Chair)
Arturo Servin, NRO
Rick Wilhelm, GNSO
Chris Wright, ccNSO

ICANN Staff:
Bart Boswinkel
Julie Hedlund
Patrick Jones
Kristina Nordström

Apologies:
Don Blumenthal, GNSO
Wim Degezelle, CENTR
Mark Elkins, ccNSO
Nishal Goburdhan, NRO
Subramanian Moonesamy, NRO

Katrina Sataki, ccNSO

Coordinator: Please go ahead. This afternoon's conference call is being recorded.

Kristina Nordstrom: Thank you very much (Tim).

Okay. Hello everybody and welcome to this DSSA call today on the 9th of June. On the call we have Mike O'Connor, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, George Asare Sakyi, Rafik Dammak, Rosella Mattoili, (Unintelligible), Jim Galvin, Roy Arends, (Unintelligible), Sean Copeland, and David Conrad and Chris Wright.

And from staff we have Bart Boswinkel, Julie Hedlund, Patrick Jones, and Kristina Nordstrom.

Apologies from Katrina Sataki and Wim Degezelle

Mikey O'Connor: And I have apologies from Don Blumenthal as well to add to that Kristina.

Kristina Nordstrom: Thank you.

Man: Good morning all. This is (unintelligible) joining as well.

Mikey O'Connor: Good deal.

Mark Kosters: As well as Mark Kosters.

Mikey O'Connor: So three minutes after the hour catches a few people as the door closes. Okay, I get that.

The other thing we'll do by the way of sort of get started is give people an opportunity to let us know about changes to their statement of interest. This is a carryover from the GNSO world, but it seems like a good idea.

The objective here is to give people an opportunity to let us know if their employment has changed or their positions have changed. So I'll just take a moment and put that at the beginning of every call.

Dang. I was hoping for a gossip opportunity you know. Oh well. Maybe later. Because you know, Michele is teasing me on Facebook about all the people who are going to change employers and so on at Singapore. I was hoping for early gossip, but no.

The agenda is in the upper right corner. It's actually pretty sparse today. We're going to spend most of the call - I'd say about a half an hour - I don't know how much discussing the work plan as introducing you to the work plan to get you thinking about it. And then we'll take the last part of the call to work through some stuff that we and the co-Chair's group have figured out for what to do in Singapore.

And presuming that that's all right, we'll dive right in. What's in front of you on the Adobe Connect screen is the same document that I distributed to the list a week or so ago. It's called DSSA Launch Version 1.1. So if you don't have Adobe and you want to follow along, you have this PDF in your inbox. And, it's the one that we used last week and it has last week's agenda embedded in it I realized with dismay when I saw it on the screen here. So you can ignore that.

And if you scroll - you all have control of it, so scroll down to Page 24, which is Appendix 1, and this is the work plan that we've developed in the co-Chair's group for your review. The work plan is sort of our - well, it is our first deliverable as a working group, and this is a document that we all need to

feel comfortable with. And so, I'm not expecting this to be the final draft; I'm expecting this to be a fairly mature first draft of it.

And on Page 24, what we've framed here is a slight restatement of the charter, because we felt that the charter was a little bit too much in the passive voice, and we wanted to have something a little bit more in the active voice.

So, I don't think that this materially changes the intent, but that's what this is all about. It's to make sure that especially those of you who are in the chartering group take a look at this and make sure that this is something that you're comfortable with.

On the next - I'm going to just screen through this and then maybe at the end we - but if people have something that's urgent, you know by all means throw your hand up, or if you're not on Adobe just call out and we'll discuss it.

The next page is an organization chart, and actually this may be a little bit out of date. We've in the working - in the co-Chairs group have been working a bit on sort of very process-oriented stuff, primarily because this is a cross organizational working group and we've got different working methods that we all bring to these.

And so we'd started to sketch out sort of who does what, and we're also starting to sketch out, again in the co-Chair's group, sort of the differences between the way that we do these things so that we don't get caught by really different expectations.

And so as we work, you as individual members may observe things too. And if you see things that are going a little bit wrong because we're working the way one kind of organization works and that conflicts with the way others do, not only are we encouraging you to let us know, but - in fact this is really

useful information that we're trying to capture for subsequent cross organizational working groups.

So sort of a non-stated, but I think very useful deliverable of this effort will be to provide some lessons learned for subsequent efforts of this type, and this is one of those kinds of things.

On Page 26, we get to something that I think is pretty important. We talked a fair amount about how we're going to do the consensus stuff. And one of the things that we really want to do is not have consensus get in the way of work where there is consensus. But at the same time, not do the tyranny of the majority problem for places where there isn't consensus.

So what you see here is sort of a particular chart that I drew, and let me try to describe what's going on. On the left are the three sort of major chunks of the work plan. This is very sketch because it's really kind of an example. And it's sort of saying, "Okay. Our first thing to do is identify threats." And in that what we're probably going to wind up with is a series of threats that are in one of three categories.

They're either threats that we have consensus to reject for whatever reason. We'll have threats that we have consensus should be completed in our work. That's the checkmark column in the middle. And we'll have threats that we're still either discussing or which we've concluded we just can't arrive at consensus about.

And the thought that's trying to be conveyed on this page is that we will - if we find consensus around a series of threats, which I'm expecting we will, those will move on to the next stage of the work, while the threats that we are still discussing will not. So this is sort of a - like a sifter.

And then the same thing will happen in subsequent stages of the work. You know as we're analyzing threats, we may have analysis that are rejected. I

hope we don't but we might. We'll have analyses that we say yes, that's our consensus view, and that'll move on to the next stage, and then we will have analyses that are still under discussion.

And you know, the layers of this are not cast in stone, nor is this approach cast in stone, but the concept that we're trying to get across is that we don't want to have all the work held up just because we still don't have consensus at an earlier stage. And you know, we'll sort of try this out, and then if it doesn't work we'll fix it. So that's what this is talking about.

On Page 27 is the summary of the work plan as it stands today. And the phase that we're in right now clearly is launch. And the thought is that Singapore is sort of the end of the launch and the beginning of the rest, and the rest is mostly identify threats, analyze threats, prepare to report and celebrate. I'm a big fan of celebrate. But we may have some readiness issues that we identify, and if we find some we will address those early on as well. So this page is the summary.

And then as you go on to Page 28, this is a list of the launch tasks that mostly the co-Chairs have working on. And we're for the most part done, but you'll see that there are a few things that were not done. And we are going to try and wrap some of that up in Singapore.

An example would be in the middle of that page there's a task, determine criteria and mechanisms for segregating sensitive information. And we're not done with that, but we're going to devote some time to that in Singapore and hopefully at least get close to some good ideas on that.

But that's the - the rest of that page is sort of the kind of thing that the - for the most part, co-Chairs have been working on with the staff.

The - I'm reading the chat.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, Mikey. I'm getting very irritated, sorry.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, you've got - (Arturo) who has no audio, so either someone has to start scribing what you're saying so people who aren't on a telephone can (unintelligible) follow, or we get the AC rooms to function like the AC rooms are meant to meant to. It's not current set up to do that, so I was just - I didn't want to (unintelligible) channel, but I wanted (Arturo) to know that you know, we can fix this for the future.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. That's new to me because - and this is perfect. This is the exact kind of example of the cross-constituency kind of issue, which is that in the GNSO our habit is to do everything with phone and the work at the Adobe room doesn't carry the audio. So I think we'll have to (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If you were in - if you were currently in the policy group's Webinar, you've got the meeting being recorded, you've got the - if a meeting's being recorded then the presenter's voice is being recorded and the presenter's voice recording can go through the meeting room. You also can or cannot have the audio in via the AC phone bridge, which is what we're looking - what we do when some places in Africa are in (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So yes. It's not a hassle, but it's just...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's an enabler. And if we're working globally -- call me fussy -- well, no (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Oh Cheryl, you're fussy, but you're right too. And so we'll take that one as an action to restructure this.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. And would you like to type that to (Arturo) so he knows?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Although if somebody could do it for me, the...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: The aging geek doesn't multitask well.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, it's your (unintelligible) that's the problem there, but...

Mikey O'Connor: Well, I - you know, yes. Actually, I'm ready for men to just exit the stage (unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Back to approach) as long as you've got all your (chucks) in the pan that's fine.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. And do - somebody type into the chat (unintelligible) and that we will fix that for subsequent calls.

Kristina Nordstrom: Mikey, I can check with the tech department to make sure that's done.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm sure they can do it because I've been on conferences like the one that Cheryl is describing. And it...

Kristina Nordstrom: Yes. I think they can - I'm sure too. I just - it's not just set up - it's not set up for this room, but I can ask them to do it.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. That would be fantastic. And again, we still haven't hit the - okay, I'm going to go into the chat.

No I'm not.

Let's see. What am I going to say here?

Yes.

There.

Thanks Cheryl for the heads up.

All right, so on Page - well actually, you know the timing's not too bad. On Page 29, these are the sort of questions that we've been asking ourselves in the co-Chair group about readiness. You know, do we feel like there's a shared view that this is a good thing? Is there good data available, et cetera, et cetera?

And just to take a slight branch off of the conversation here, readiness questions are not a report card. They are simply asking questions as to whether we need to get ready about something. And this you know, ironing out of the process is a great example of a readiness issue, in which it's not a good thing or a bad thing; it just needs to get fixed so that we can carry on at the level we want.

And so that kind of issue is exactly the kind of think that we're trying to get worked out as much as we can in launch.

But at the same time, times a wasting. You know, we've been going at a fairly slow pace up until now, and our goal in the co-Chair group is to sort of ramp things up now and get going. And we'll talk a bit more about that as we go on.

Then on Page 20 - or on Page 30, this is the beginning of the work work, and this is what we're going to kick off in Singapore in the face-to-face meeting. The first major chunk of work is to identify the threats that we want to work on as a working group. And as you see from those tasks, we want to cast the net fairly wide in terms of who we ask. So one of the things we're going to talk about in the second half of the call is how we reach out to experts outside of the working group and get their views about the things that we're working on.

And so, this is the first piece of work work that we're going to start in Singapore. And I'm very hesitant to estimate a time on this. I'm thinking that it's relatively shorter than the analyze threats phase, but until we get into it it's awfully hard to know.

The next page, Page 31, is the I think really most energetic part of the work that we're going to be doing where we'll undoubtedly form working teams around these threats and go to work as subgroups on the threats. And I think this is the meat of the effort; although just the list of the threats is probably not to be sneezed at.

And - but this page I think is the one that will take the longest and will be the hardest work. And one of the questions that we're going to have to answer is how do we use this one hour a week kind of time, given that we're going to have at least several and perhaps quite a number of very busy working groups - sub-working groups.

You know, how are we going to coordinate with each other? How are we going to cross-pollinate our ideas? All of those things I think we are going to sort have to invent as we go. And this is where that's going to get the busiest for sure.

And then the last part of the working plan and the last page of this document, Page 32, is really the reporting cycle. And one of the things that we are still working out is it's clear that we don't want to wait until the very end to get public comment on this. We want I think to provide a mechanism where we go out probably at each ICANN meeting on that cycle we go back out to the community and sort of give people an update on what we have discovered so far and get their feedback and additions to what we've done.

So that's the work plan draft as it stands. And I think I'll pause here and let folks comment as to whether we're on the right track. This is sort of the last process oriented call, and I apologize for that, but the process stuff has been the focus of the co-Chairs, and so we need to sort of share with you what we've come up with and then begin the transition to real work.

But if folks have ideas, this is a great time to voice them.

Cheryl, go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much, Mike. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. It's not an idea, it's just I suppose a slight caution for planning the agenda when we move into our next step the second half of this meeting; just the Singapore planning.

As lively as it would be to think we have finished with the process and the going over it, it is likely that it's at the face-to-face meeting when more of us are all together in either you know, a hybrid teleconference and face-to-face, that we might need to at least do a review. Because I'm very aware of a very different set of people being on each of the calls, and we do need to have you know, a fully established buy-in to the work plan.

So, I suspect that might be the last time you go through processes. It's a good foundation for the process agreement to be wrote out (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. And I am always happy to do process stuff. The reason I'm so cautious is because I get beat up sometimes for doing it too much. So I think by no means do I want to imply that this is frozen in stone or that we shouldn't review it again.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Mikey, this is a very large group. Look at who you have on the calls and who you've had on any of the calls. You've almost got a run two if not three calls to capture everybody's input. So it's (unintelligible), but the - it is what it is.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. There you go. Yes, no that's right. That's right.

And, I think that's a good course correction Cheryl because you know, we do want to bring everybody - well, I think the main message is that if people become uncomfortable with anything, we certainly want to take the time to fix that and we have the time. Unlike some of the working groups that we've all been on, we don't really have a lot of formal deadline pressure. And I think that gives us a bit more flexibility to make sure that we've got things right and that people are all on the same - at the same place and have the same point of view, which I - you know, I'm viewing as a huge luxury.

Anybody else on this one?

Okay. You know, I - this work plan is terribly specific and it's also subject to change, and you know, feel free to think about it and either hit the list or you know, we will touch on this again I'm sure.

But Kristina, could you throw up the massive second document that I prepared?

Kristina Nordstrom: Sure. Just a moment.

Mikey O'Connor: None of you have this one, so let's see - can - Cheryl, I take it that (Arturo) is - well, he must be on Adobe, so he'll be able to see it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: He's in Adobe, which is why I am showing how poor a typist I am (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: You're doing a great job.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...at least some attempt to capture what the hell is going on.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Bummer. That's really too bad. We will definitely get that fixed.

Okay. All right. So let's see. Can we all scroll - I can scroll this. All right. So if you take a look at that second slide, the one with the pink DSSA sticker stuck on my pen next to my computer.

One of the things that we talked about in the co-Chair group was the opportunity for working group members to get to know each other informally while we're all in Singapore together, or at least those of us who are there. And what we attempted to do was to try to figure out a time when we could get together outside of the scheduled meeting and - because the schedule of the Singapore meeting is so fluid and so complicated, we decided that it was virtually impossible to do that.

So I am bringing stickers that look just like that for those of you who want to self-identify as members of the DSSA group. I am demonstrating that sticker on my pen, but my thought would be that we would stick this on our lanyard or anyplace else that we felt like so that as we're walking around in Singapore we can spot people and just walk up and introduce each other and get to know each other a little bit.

And for those of you who find these embarrassing, that's fine. But if you want a sticker, I will be carrying a large number of them and would be more than willing to share with everybody else. So, that's the informal social get to know each other aspect.

And then the last page sort of sets out some of...

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Olivier here. Sorry, I'm not in the Adobe room so I can't put my hand up. I was just going to ask how can we find you, because if you're the one carrying...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: I will be wearing these stickers all over my body.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: If you see a guy with a sort of ludicrous number of these stickers on, that's me. And come on up and I will share. And I will probably share them rather than just one at a time. When the co-Chairs find me, I'm going to give them a handful. And if I find other co-conspirators who would be willing to carry a few extra stickers, I will give those out too so that we can spread them pretty quickly because I have a lot of these.

These are unlike - unlike the buttons which are fairly expensive, these stickers don't cost much money at all. So, I'm going to be there with an ample supply and I will be wearing a ludicrous number of them, at least for the first few days of the meeting, then I may switch over to some other ludicrous form of decoration. We'll see.

Okay, so the goals for Singapore really all week, one of the things that we're going to do right after this call is throw out a Doodle poll that we can just indicate when we're going to be in Singapore so that if somebody wants to track another member of the working group down they'll be able to go to this poll and figure out whether they're even still in Singapore. We thought that would be a useful way to sort of identify who's there.

Another goal of the week is back to this notion that there are a lot of experts who've indicated an interest in this project and would like to help but aren't members of the working group. And I've starting calling them DSSA irregulars sort of after Sherlock Holmes Baker Street Irregulars - books about Sherlock Holmes.

Because I think that broader group of interested security community people, if we can recruit them and organize them, could be a huge resource as we do our work so that - you know, the thought is spend the time in Singapore talking to those folks, encouraging them to participate, understanding how they would like to participate, and then letting...

I think the way to do this is if you as an individual identify somebody like that and they indicate that they'd like to do that, just let one of the co-Chairs or staff folks know so that we can build a little list of these folks.

And then a third objective for Singapore, which we haven't really worked out yet, is figuring out how we can connect and coordinate with the Affirmation of Commitments Review Team who's focusing on SSR. We've begun a correspondence with the leadership of that group, but we haven't quite gotten to the point of knowing what we're doing yet.

I know a lot of us will be attending their all day session, which unfortunately is the same day as our meeting, and we did try to reschedule our meeting so

that that conflict didn't happen, but it didn't work out. The scheduling in Singapore is really tricky, and so we're just going to have to cope with that.

And some people in our working group are probably going to have to make some difficult choices as to whether to go to our meeting or the SSR meetings. And the SSR folks have strongly encouraged us to participate in their meetings you know, when we're not meeting. And I for one will certainly be going to those.

So anyway, there's that trip that's going on, but we're not quite there yet on this one. We'll post more to the list.

And then I just want to give you a quick sketch of sort of the plan for the face-to-face meeting. This meeting is turning the tables where you all will do all the work and I for one will be doing very little of it, unlike these calls where I've been talking at you, and I apologize for that.

But the thought is to do three or four breakout sessions. We'll see if we can get four crammed into an hour and a half. That's pretty aggressive, but we'll try it. And the idea is we'll have flip charts in the room where - and we'll break the group into three or four subgroups and brainstorm around three or four of those topics that are at the bottom of the page. And very quickly draw out the ideas of people, get them written down, share them quickly amongst the rest of us and then move on.

So this meeting will move very quickly because you know, 15 or 20 minutes isn't a very long time to work on something like this. But, the thought is to try and flesh out a lot of ideas and really to get you all out of sort of passive listener mode and into the work at hand.

And what we'll do is for the folks on the phone, they will become their own subgroup. Mark is not going to be able to be in Singapore, and he's going to chair that subgroup. So the people who are participating by phone will have

something more interesting to do than just listen to a room full of people you know, sort of roaring on the phone. They will collapse into their own subgroup, do a similar exercise over the phone in the Adobe room, and then share their results with the rest of us just like the other work - the other subgroups in the room.

The four topics that we've come up with are in no particular order. The four that we've really already mentioned in one context or another. One is this whole - you know, we had a little bit of a discussion on the last call about the need for a mechanism to gather and protect confidential information. We want to spend some time working on that in this face-to-face meeting.

Another thing that I - I can't remember if we've talked about it so much on the calls, but certainly we've talked about it in the co-Chair's group. This notion that we probably would be well served to develop some criteria around the question what is the current level of SSR at any given time?

And so, we'd like to do some brainstorming around you know, what would those metrics look like? What are the advantages? The trick to metrics is that you can have strange, unattended consequences from badly framed metrics. And so, it's not just writing down a list of metrics, but it's also trying to begin kind of - certainly not end, but begin the conversation about what are good ones and what are not so good ones to use?

We'll for sure take one of these subgroups and just brainstorm out a list of threats so that we've got a starting point for the threats work which is going to start right after Singapore, or this is really the beginning of that work.

And then another thing that we want to talk a bit about is sort of how the rest of the work unfolds. You know, do we have weekly phone calls? Do we have - how long should those phone calls be? What kinds of things should happen in the phone calls as opposed to on the list? Should we have phone calls for subgroups in addition to phone calls for the whole group? You know, that

whole conversation is one that we'd like to let you all start contributing to, even though it is a little bit more on the process end of things.

So that's the thought that we've had for the session that's an hour and a half on Thursday starting at I think 10:00 in the morning Singapore time. And that's sort of the approach that we've got for Singapore.

So again I'm done with this. I'll pause and see if there are questions or thoughts or not.

Okay, I bored everybody so much that it's just...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You answered my question Mikey. Cheryl here. I mean, I was going to jump in and say, "What are we doing for the remote participants during the breakout sessions, and you answered me.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So I mean you know...

Mikey O'Connor: There you go.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...you're preemptive.

Mikey O'Connor: Preemptive Mikey-tasking. How about that? There you go.

Well, if - you know, I'm not a fan of using people's time unnecessarily, so if people are comfortable with what they've seen today, that's really all we had for today's call. And if people need - I'm really looking forward to the end of the sort of one-way conversations on these calls and switching over into real

work mode, and that's really the transition in Singapore. So I'm really looking forward to that.

So I'm asking one last time, and then if there's nobody that wants to throw anything in, we'll wrap this call up and look to see you in Singapore with my pink stickers all over my body.

All right then.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think we need a photo of that thought, as well as one on the end of your pen.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I think that's probably going to happen. Wait until - I'm planning to have a good time in Singapore.

Okay folks. Thanks very much for joining us today, and we'll see you in Singapore. That's it for me.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Travel safe. Bye.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Bye.

Man: Bye everyone.

END