

Transcription ICANN Toronto Meeting
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) Meeting
Sunday 14 October 2012 at 09:00 local time

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. 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.

Stephane van Gelder: Operator please look to start the session and let me know when the recording has begun.

Coordinator: Thank you. The recordings have begun for this session. Thank you.

Man: Thank you (Amber). The time is just after 9:00 am and we're going to begin the SAAC briefing.

Stephane van Gelder: Okay, good morning everyone. Welcome to the second day of the GNSO weekend working sessions. We'll start the session with our traditional meeting with the Security and Stability Advisory Committee.

We have the Chair of that Committee, Patrik Faltstrom, and the Vice Chair, Jim Galvin, sitting next to us here. Thanks gentlemen for coming in and spending some time with us. And I know you have a presentation so Patrik I'll let you get on with it.

Patrik Faltstrom: Thank you very much Stephane and thank you for inviting us. We - from SSAC we will report from myself and Jim. We also have other SSAC members in the room.

So what I will do is that I will first quite fast go through an overview of SSAC and our activities. And after that we have three different more deeper deep dive into three of the topics that I've been working on lately: dotless domains, advice on impact of DNS blocking and comments on WHOIS Review Team Final Report.

What we could do after I've gone through the overview I will ask you either we continue with a brief walkthrough of those three, or we can sort of skip 2 and dive deeper into 1.

So while I do the first overview please think about what you - how - what you would like the layout of the rest of the session will be. Next slide please. So SSAC formed in 2001-2002.

We decided what - decided to start in late 2001 and started to operate in 2002. We are doing guidance not only to ICANN Board but also to the rest of the ICANN community.

Next please. We have 38 members. I should follow the slides myself as well. In 2012 we added - we add four members and we have three departing members.

In 2011 we had four new members and four departing so you see that we approximately stay at the same size. The Bylaws were changed in 2010 to appoint members on the three year terms, and we started by appointing them in one, two and three years just to ensure that we are reviewing 1/3 of the members every year.

Next slide please. We do have a couple of - the very - the subgroups of SSAC that we use to do work is something that we called work parties or work committees.

We have a couple of internal standing ones that help SSAC do its work. The Membership Committee - we do work on registration data validation. We work on identifier abuse metrics and we are looking at root key rollover DNSSEC related.

So these are the work parties that we are - that we have up and running at the moment. A work party might result in the report but also might not, so this is more a display of - and to show to you what we are working on at the moment.

We also participate in Working Groups and - that are more cross constituency like. The DNSSEC program committed to plan workshops and begin the sessions where the DNSSEC/DNS session is tomorrow and a DNSSEC workshop that we normally host is on Wednesday, the Domain Name System Security and Stability Analysis Working Group, DSSA, and who also are members of the Board DNS Risk Management Framework Working Group.

Next slide please. So at this meeting just like the previous one we do have briefings to various Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committee that has - also has questions or requested our presence just like this meeting.

We also have meetings with - regular meetings with law enforcement agency representatives and we will - do have that also tomorrow. We also meet other community groups as requested, including ICANN Board and other organizations that either happens to be at an ICANN meeting but also in some cases we do participate at other meetings also outside of ICANN.

We do manage a session at the Internet Governance Forum in Azerbaijan in a couple of weeks. Next slide please. This year has been very successful. It's one of our more productive years.

I actually started to hear some complaints from some other SO and ACs that we now produce this quite a lot of work, so they have a lot of work to do to actually read all of this.

To some degree that's of course positive but we have to ensure that - and one of the important things that we are looking at when we're looking at our success - it's not the number of reports, the number of words we are typing.

It's rather how these reports are received and what people think about them. If it is the case the - on a very high level one can say, "We are happy if what we are producing is helping other people and parties in their work."

So if we go back in time the reports we produced is the advisory on impacts and content blocking a domain name system that was released Friday - yesterday.

Is it Saturday today? Sunday - it's Sunday today. I'm sorry. Rough and the week has not even started. We had the SAC 55 comments on the WHOIS Review Team Final Report.

We have 54, Report on the Domain Name Registration Data Model, 53, Report on Dotless Domains, 52, Advisory on Delegation of Single-Character Internationalized Top-Level Domains and then we also had comments on the fiscal year '13 budget impact on SSAC productivity and a comment on the ICANN draft roadmap to implement SAC 51.

And now we have three choices so (Julie) can you back to the second slide please? Thank you. So it's - we can either go through these three, the SAC

53, 56 and 55 or we can dive into one of them. Stephane should we do something or ask people what they want?

Stephane van Gelder: We can ask people. My personal preference is on dotless domains because it's one that I found generated the most questions with me. But what do you want to do?

Do you want to appoint a winner, do a straw poll, ask someone to do a dance? Jeff's going to do a dance.

Jeff Neuman: Yes I'll do a dance. Actually I would ask if we could start with Number 4 because it relates to a Council topic because we also are - we have comments as well on the WHOIS Final Report.

And then I would go through dotless domains because Stephane's interested in it, and the blocking if we have time.

Patrik Faltstrom: Okay. So let's go to the WHOIS Review Team Final Report and I'll leave the microphone to Jim Galvin.

Jim Galvin: Thank you Patrik and thank you to GNSO. So this is just a little bit of a quick look at the timeline. You probably already know this. I mean, the WHOIS Review Team submitted its Final Report and recommendations, and of course the Board has been reaching out and asking the various SOs and ACs to provide input and that's what SSAC has done.

Next slide. I think probably the most important thing to take out of the SSAC comments is we put something in front, which was outside of what the WHOIS Review Team addressed.

And we made the case that the foundational problem, the critical problem that really needed to be addressed before anything else in the WHOIS Review Team comments and recommendations was to understand the purpose of

domain name registration data, knowing why we collect that data, what problem we're trying to solve by collecting it, where it's collected and ultimately where it's stored.

And this of course would then drive escrow activities, okay, and it would automatically set the stage for understanding what's available for other kinds of activities, for example the directory services, the replacement for WHOIS and addressing those kinds of questions.

Once you know why you have the data and where it is, it makes it a little bit easier to look at the issue of what you're going to do with it and who's going to get access to it after the fact.

I think it's essential and we're very interested in people's comments about this, because it is something that we put in there in front. We do feel very strongly about this point, and in fact we believe that the answer to this question needs to come before any other recommendation.

It is the one single activity which needs to be completed before anything else is done. Next slide. And so the next this is what we did with the WHOIS Review Team recommendations is we took a look at all the recommendations.

It's fair to say that we essentially supported really most of the recommendations, and we added some comments about a few of them. We took them and divided them into three levels: a high level, a medium level and a low level, the intent being that each of the levels feeds into the lower levels.

So the results of the high level recommendations would feed into the medium ones. Results in the medium would feed into the low. And so first we have a look here at what are the high level recommendations and the first ones that we pulled out.

And so we do agree with the WHOIS Review Team about creating a authorized committee to answer these questions about the - oh and derive the universal policy from those recommendations.

The - I'm actually forgetting what's on the next slide, so let's go ahead here while we see what we did. Yes. Okay, so yes it's the second point here that I wanted to get to.

The one difference that we made with the WHOIS Review Team in this particular issue was the WHOIS Review Team had suggested that there needed to be - the CEO needed to be directly involved in this committee to create this universal policy.

And the comment that we had about that was that the CEO really should engage the highest level of executive management into this process. The CEO should not really be involved in the execution process.

He should be involved in the oversight process, and so we drew that distinction against what the WHOIS Review Team had done. Other than that we do believe of course that the Board should clearly state that the development of a registration data policy is a critical priority, and that there should be a committee as a high priority that will address the question of a universal registration data policy.

Okay next slide. And now we have our chart which is the summary of all the various activities, and I've already talked about the first two. The compliance issue, which is also high priority issue - we do agree that compliance is of significant importance.

The observation that we make here of course is that there need to be metrics that you can apply inside of compliance, and we tried to focus that with respect to the WHOIS activity.

There've been a lot of discussions about compliance, and at some level the WHOIS Review Team recommendation seemed to comment more generally about compliance and the need to do that.

And we wanted to focus on the WHOIS activity and the registration data accuracy activity and observe that as part of the development of the universal policy, you need to establish the metrics that you want compliance to deal with and you want compliance to follow through on.

Next slide. So we move into some of the medium-term activities. Of course we do agree that there should be a data accuracy policy, and we didn't have any additional specific recommendation with respect to privacy and proxy services.

And in fact I think that you could make the case that once you have a policy which tells you what the data is for and why you're collecting it, it's much easier to look at privacy and proxy services and what their responsibility should be and how you might implement them.

That was the primary reason for pushing this down to a medium priority after the development of the universal policy, and of course after creating the purpose of the registration data.

Next slide. And the last point, which is in the Medium category that I'll address here, is internationalization is covered in two of the recommendations in the WHOIS Review Team.

And our principal comment there is just that internationalization should be supported by default - actually must be supported by default. And we express explicitly that it should not be called out separately.

The real focus in internationalization insofar as there's something to be addressed is to go back to the IRD, Internationalized Registration Data Working Group, and look at its second recommendation that was in that report, which addresses the question of where and how translation - transliteration or translation should be done in the system in the directory service system.

Once you've decided that you're going to have access and you're going to display the data, there is a question of whether that data should be in a single universal language, if it should be presented in local languages, scripts that should be used - that's an essential recommendation that was completed last year in the IRD report.

And we'd like attention to focus there if there's anything to say about internationalization. Other than that it should just automatically be included with anything else that's done.

Next slide. And that's it for the WHOIS recommendations. I wasn't going to address the low ones. They didn't seem important to just bring up and talk about unless anybody has a question. Thank you.

Stephane van Gelder: Any questions on that?

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: Yes. Thank you very much. Well that is an interesting suggestion from your side of coming up with that kind of high-level committee and to implement that.

So I would like to know about - want to know about a little bit more of the idea and I think your - sorry, discount service within the SSAC. I understand though all these questions you raised here, okay.

They are very necessary though to bring in more transparency in the overall - , I don't know what - WHOIS ICANN. So the question behind is that if you - if

those questions could be answered from such a committee and could be - brought more transparency into it, what is then going to be behind that?

So I would like to know what is the timeline that you have in mind behind that? It seems to me that bringing in the new committee will take time, and there's a need not to implement from our point of view for example through the ISPs and we'd implement - to start implementing those recommendations as soon as possible.

So the question is behind what is your idea with the timeline and with regards to that committee?

Jim Galvin:

In general we tried not to be - especially not to be overly prescriptive about when and a timeline for getting it done. We want to focus on the fact that it's important, and it should take whatever amount of time it needs to take to get done.

WHOIS discussions, and I use the term WHOIS in this case very - quite broadly to refer to all of the various topics, have been going on for, you know, more than ten years in the ICANN community.

We quite firmly believe that understanding why we collect the data and what we're going to do with it is critical. It is essential to the success of WHOIS. We really see that as the major gap that has been one of the issues that has prevented closure on many - on essentially all other issues.

It's never been addressed. You know, the purpose of registration data just sort of came into existence for legacy reasons, and we sort of adopted it and moved on and never really asked ourselves the question.

So part of the response to provide is that, you know, moving forward from it should take as long as it takes, I think however long it takes, whatever the delay is it's time well spent.

You're comparing it against the ten-year slot during which we really have reached very little closure. Now having said that I do think the job could be done relatively quickly in comparison to any other task.

If you get the right set of people together I think that the basis for what the purpose of the data is, you know, could be drafted and succeed.

Man: Thanks Patrik and thanks Jim for the - actually a follow up on what actually Wolfgang has just asked in the creation. But the potential creation of the CEO committee on the WHOIS Review - does that also echo what you had updated us in the last meeting in Prague about the - kind of the standardization and also the harmonization.

I remember the term that you used last time in Prague about the cross of the gTLD and the ccTLD WHOIS policies that - the intention of creation of that particular, I mean, the committee?

Jim Galvin: So I believe the work you're referring to that we talked about in Prague was the registration data model, correct? Okay, so the registration data model is a natural follow on to once you understand why you're collecting the data, now you can go back and look at the data that you are collecting and create a data model for putting all that data together.

In fact, I mean, that's what SSAC did in its publication, The Registration Data Model. We provided a framework in which that could be specified so that you could have a uniform specification for what data is collected once you understand why you're collecting it.

So the uniformity comes in more from deciding how you're going to represent the data, because an essential component of the framework that we had put out is that you only include data that you have to have.

We weren't trying to be prescriptive about what data to collect. But that would be a natural next activity to immediately follow understanding why you collect the data and what purpose does it serve.

Man: Sorry but I'm just trying to get a quick answer so the creation of the CEO committee is not - are you saying it's directly or indirectly related to the harmonization and the effort or it's actually related or not?

Jim Galvin: It is related, yes.

Man: Okay.

Jim Galvin: Yes. Sorry. I'll try to be quicker here.

Stephane van Gelder: I have Wolfgang then Chuck and we've got five minutes left.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: And now I have a different question. You said in the - in your slides that the privacy issues are of medium priority and will come later if the policy is clear.

So on the other hand, you know, we have very, very, you know, complicated problems with the compliance with national jurisdiction and WHOIS policy as you know from the letter from the Article 29 Working Group where they state very clearly that it relates directly to the RAA contracts, but that certain provisions are unlawful under European law.

And the CEO has reacted to this and saying, you know, "We could consider a differentiated approach." What is your position and your recommendation for this?

Jim Galvin: I've - rather than a recommendation or position I'll simply observe that one of the things that helps the EU requirements and process is knowing why you have to do something.

So if you address the question of what is the purpose of the data, you have a major part of answering the question, answering the privacy concerns that come up under the EU directive.

Patrik Faltstrom: And another - let me just add that another thing that Jim mentioned from the beginning is that one thing that we are very explicitly pointing out is to separate the collection of the data with access to the data as two very different things.

And when we - and that's why we also think it's very important to do things in the correct order, understand why things are collected, to what purpose, what data is collected and then the access, otherwise you cannot move forward with even privacy discussions.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks and thanks Jim for the good report and a good summary. Want to come back to the internationalization and you prioritize that as a medium and I understand that, because some of the technical work needs to happen to support that.

But I think it's correct to conclude that you're not saying that that shouldn't be expedited, and if I understand correctly there's chance - good chances I think that in the IETF there will be good progress in terms of protocol, the data model, everything next year.

So coming back to a Council motion that's on the table this week to request an Issues Report on this second IRD recommendation on transliteration and translation, it seems to me that it's very important for the policy work to happen in that regard in parallel to the completion of the technical work that's going on so that they hopefully can both finish about the same time, and therefore would allow us to move forward in internationalizing the registration

data as soon as possible. Does that make sense? Is that a reasonable approach in your opinion?

Jim Galvin: Yes, an Issues Report to address Recommendation 2 in the IRD report would be a good thing to start in parallel with all the rest of the work.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks Jim. Looks like we've run out of time. You were right to suggest that we would only have time to go deep dive into one of these. But perhaps we can continue the conversation at a later stage.

Is there anything quickly that you want to say on this Patrik or shall we close it there?

Patrik Faltstrom: I can actually say a couple - clarify a little bit about where we are in the - where ICANN is in the process regarding dotless domain names. Let's see, it's - can you go forward to let's say next steps, whatever slide number it is?

Yes here. So let's just - I just want to repeat where we are, that SSAC wrote this report and what then happened was that - let's see - is that ICANN Staff opened a public forum on the 24th of August to request community input on the SSAC recommendations.

We understood that there was some confusion and people believe that it's SSAC that is running that. It's not. It's ICANN Staff. This comment period closed on September 23 and then the reply period closed on October 14.

And to answer where we are we in SSAC are reviewing the comments and we are currently looking at what we're going to do with it.

Woman: I'll just note that actually the reply period has been extended, so there is time for - additional time.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks to you both. Do you want to - do you have any closing remarks?

Patrik Faltstrom: Thank you for inviting us and obviously we should maybe have a little bit more time next year.

Stephane van Gelder: We'll try and schedule that in. Thank you very much both of you, Patrik and Jim, for coming in. And we'll now close this session and jump straight into the next one in five minutes, which will be on fake renewals. Operator this session is now over. Thank you.

END