Transcription ICANN Dublin
GNSO session Sunday 18 October 2015
SSAC update & discussion
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.
On page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#oct
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Jonathan Robinson: Okay everyone. If I could call the meeting to order please. Thank you. If you could continue any conversations outside the room, we are now about to commence the next session in the room.

Okay. So are we ready to start the recording? Great. We're good to go and for this session I'll hand over to my Vice Chair, David Cake. Our Vice Chair.

David Cake: Okay. This is our regular catch up with SSAC. So those of you disappointed, we didn't get to speak to Patrik at lunchtime. Well he's here in his capacity of SSAC Chair to fill us in on SSAC activities. Always a valuable and important session. So over to you Patrik.

Patrik Falstrom: Thank you very much David. So you didn't get rid of me that easy. And of course many of us think that to be day job we normally do is ICANN is much more fun than the IANA transition even though the IANA transition is important for all of us.

So I actually enjoy also being able to work with SSAC. And inside SSAC probably just like in GNSO we actually - we have a couple of - a couple of

very, very, very good troopers that are fighting with the IANA transition and then the rest of us are trying to do the day job thing.

So what we're trying to - what I'm going to brief you on here is more like what we - the normal schedule on SSAC. So this is the update of ICANN 54. Next slide please.

So as normal I will give you an overview, talk a little bit about the achievements, work in progress, future milestones, et cetera, to give an ability for you to know what we are doing, where - what kind of issues you can - we are happy to start to participate in conversations with you. Either we in the form of SSAC or individual SSAC members. Next slide please.

So apart from of course working on new graphics and a new logo, real important work, right. So the actual content of the slide is also slightly updated triggered by the new design.

So but hopefully this is one of the things that we are working on is to try to make our communication more adjustable so that people understand what we're doing, why we're doing things. So I'm going to spend a little bit more time than last - the last couple of meetings on these introductory slides.

We are at the moment 35 members. And by the way, one of the reasons why I would like to go through this in more detail is of course that the role and the participation of all the SO and ACs is of course at the moment just discussed in CCWG. So we feel from the SSAC perspective it's important for us at SSAC that you hear our story of what we are doing and what our mission is.

So we're appointed by the ICANN Board although we do have a Nomination Committee that is separate from the ICANN NomCom, which do the nomination for the membership. But that after that nomination period and process has terminated, ICANN Board is appointing the SSAC members.

Our charter that we find is real important and that we are falling back to all the time is to advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the security and integrity of the Internet's Naming and Address Allocation Systems.

Very specifically we do not include here that we are overview for example ICANN operation just like we are not overlooking any other organization's operation unless of course there are implications from the organization's operation on to the security and stability of the Internet Naming and Address Allocation Systems.

So of course where ICANN as an organization just because ICANN in their IT operation is dealing with so many of these kind of things, of course we are looking and working quite extensively with ICANN IT and Security Team. But we're doing that not because we belong in ICANN.

It has to do with the fact that ICANN IT operation is dealing with these things. It's also the case of course, as you can see here, that we are not just working with DNS and domain names. And you will see that later on.

So the expertise is something that we are working on trying to ensure when we approve new members that we have the complete expertise within a number of areas.

And the areas which - where we do have - do find that we need expertise is changing over time. And we're trying to look forward over five year schedules. So during the next five years we do believe that these are the kind of things that we need to have a pretty good skill set in.

We have added a couple of things the last couple of years. For example, cybercrime issues and also addressing and routing issues have become more important on our agenda while of course domain names and DNS has

been pretty important the last couple of years just because of the addition of the new gTLDs.

We have 73 publications since 2002 and they are in the form of both reports, advisories and comments. And then we are trying to - together with the ICANN communication team we are working on doing as much outreach as possible where of course we rely on new communities to also pick up the reports and advisories that you find being interesting and helping us distributing that information in your communities or at least flag for us that you would like to get some help from us.

We have pretty good cooperation with ALAC where we have done some experiments on doing outreach together. We're also working on trying to find an effective way with ICANN fellowship program and which we are trying to support to the best way we can. Next slide please.

What is important to - the next thing that is important to look at is the ICANN mission and core values. So we have our charter, which says that we are looking at the stability and integrity of the identifies.

We are then matching that with the ICANN mission and core values, which include that ICANN is there to ensure this stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique identifier systems and to preserve and enhance the operational stability, reliability, security and global interoperability of the Internet.

So the chain here on - between what we are doing and actions by ICANN is the - our work, our charter and how that is connected with ICANN's mission and core value and as you also see in this picture to the right how ICANN Board is to take advice from any advisory committee but specifically SSAC in this case into account.

So there is a dotted line there. So that is how the piece of the puzzle will fit together. And this is one of the explanations why those of you that are active in the CCWG you might be surprised that we in SSAC are like don't really now how we are going to handle a potential membership for voting or whatever is discussion regarding membership model. That is not how we operate.

We - our operation and what we are doing in our advice is based on our charter linked to the ICANN mission, linked to the ATRT to recommendation that the bylaws should be changed so that ICANN Board must take advice into account. That is how sort of things are connected together.

So the publication process that we have if you look at the bottom left you see that we are forming a work party on an issue that we find being important to look at either triggered by internal events, external events or direct questions we get including of course we get questions from ICANN Board or any SO and AC.

We have not gotten any questions actually from the communities. We have got a few from GAC that have been very effective where we also believe that we have been able to help GAC by giving advice on some questions from them.

We form a work party. We do some research and writing, which is internal. We do review and approve and if it is the case that the research has resulted (of) deciding that we're actually going to give some recommendation if it is the case that is - it might be the case that work we're doing and research results in not deciding that no there's nothing to send, nothing more - nothing to say here. So it might be the case that we decide to just close without publishing anything.

And then after the review and approval from (unintelligible) including the ability for SSAC members to declare a (descent), which you can see in the

documents which have that, we publish the document to make them available.

If it is the case that the publication include recommendation to ICANN Board, then we move into the specific post-publication process, which you see to the right that we submit the advice to the ICANN Board. The Board acknowledges and studies the advice. And then ICANN Board takes formal action on the advice that either is to inject our advice in the policy development processes.

It might be to request staff to implement it together with of course the public consultation according to whatever process is appropriate. It might be to disseminate the advice to other affected parties, which might not be ICANN. It might be other organizations that ICANN in one way or another has a relationship with.

Or of course it's also the case that the Board might choose a different solution. But in that case we actually have an agreement with the Board that the Board in that case should explain why they did not follow the advice. And one of the recent cases where the ICANN did not follow the (rights) from SSAC was regarding namespace collision issues. Next. And that's why we in SSAC actually did t-shirts. Yes. And now we'll move to the next slide.

The work parties we have at the moment include the new gTLD program review that we spend quite some time on just like many others. We had a work party on registrant protection that I will talk a little bit more about. We have the DNSSEC workshops both for newcomers on Monday and also quite extensive DNSSEC workshop on Wednesdays.

We have a new work party that's starting up on our (dutiful) address exhaustion, which is actually really worrying. Let me put it that way. We also are looking very carefully how to track the Board advice because there's

certain advice we have given, which has not really had any affect, as it should.

One example is that we gave from our perspective pretty serious advice regarding Trademark Clearinghouse. And we received the written response or explanation today - sorry, yesterday, okay. The advice for Trademark Clearinghouse and the problems with - potential problems with Trademark Clearinghouse and very (unintelligible) internationalized domain names, we issued that in June 2013.

The whole idea was that our advice was supposed to give input to the design and operation of the Trademark Clearinghouse and having feedback coming back now is maybe not optimal.

And this includes if it is the case that people on the Board find that our advice is wrong and people choose a different path; note that. We're not saying that people must follow us. The important thing here is that we gave advice 2013 and up until now we can have a discussion what to do with our advice. And the sunrise is almost done in many of the - many of the other cases.

Okay. So the Board tracking - tracking is something that we feel and the Board feel is needed. So we're really trying to pick that up because we need to keep better track on these kind of things because of course this delay from 2013 to 2015 I'm not saying it's the error of the Board. It's not the error of staff. Is not like there of us. We just need to do a better job here to keep track of these kind of things.

And then we have the Membership Committee that is overlooking our membership, the skill sets needed, et cetera. So that's what we're doing at the moment.

So the recent publications the last one was (SAC) 73, which are comments on the root zone key signing, key rollover plan. I will explain that in a minute.

(SAC) 72, comments on the Cross Community Working Group and on the naming related functions proposal. So of course many of our last recommendations has been on the transition itself.

And then you have a couple of links there including of course we have started to do videos where we try to explain our reports. So we're trying all different kind of new things, not only new logo, which you see down to the last we're doing video. Anyway. Next slide. Any questions on that on generated SSAC related issues?

Carlos Ampuero: Are you going to go back on your position in terms of the transition?

Patrik Falstrom: I think you should use the microphone so everyone can hear in the room.

Carlos Ampuero: Sorry. Carlos Ampuero. Are you going to come back on what you mentioned on the previous slide on your position of the transition mechanism?

Patrik Falstrom: I can mention a few words from that. Yes. But I will - we actually have (Julie) here that is doing most of the work for us. We can come back to that if you're interested.

Carlos Ampuero: Thank you.

Patrik Falstrom: Yes. So let's start by going to our work in progress. So these are sort of the more broader list of the issues that we're working with where the new things have to do with the (I feel) for address exhaustion. And let's see. Yes. That is probably the most interesting. And the other things you have seen. Next slide please.

If you look at our goals you see that we now - nowadays we've set these milestones so you can - we can keep track of these kind of things. We actually have reached our goal so far.

We envision that the advice on registrant protection that I will describe in a minute will be published shortly. And then we will come with an advice around the new gTLD program. Really that's the next thing we see in the pipe. (SAC) 73 was just published. Next slide please.

So if we look at (SAC) 73, it's actually a very simple report. Next slide please. What we - what has happened there as some of you might know is that ICANN launched a root zone KSK rollover, going to change the trust anchor for DNSSEC in the world.

And it was actually the case that SSAC has produced the document, (SAC) 63 already that has pointed out these are the various things that we think must be considered. And then when we are looking at the plan that was proposed and published, we don't see that the design team has looked at our advice. We don't see any trace in writing.

So (SAC) 73 because (SAC) 63 discussed key management in the root zone, what duration for this rollover, various risks, various (mechanisms) that are available and also try to quantify the risk of failure just in case that the rollover did not work. Next slide please.

So what we are doing in (SAC) 73 is that we note that (SAC) 63 contains five recommendations for ICANN and the root zone management partners. But we don't see the list that we expected ICANN to do that goes through that list of our recommendations and tell us no, you're completely wrong or yes, we did not think about this or this is OBE because of other things or whatever. We're addressing this.

So what we are doing is that we are simply asking ICANN and the KSK Rollover Design Team to look at (SAC) 63 and please come back with - go through each one of the recommendations and provide directionality just in case that they are not addressing that. So that's (SAC) 73. Any questions?

This is actually - we're changing the trust anchor of the root zone. It's actually something that is pretty important. But as of now if that goes wrong, it can have some secondary affects, which are not very fun. But we cannot not roll the key. So we just have to do it. Next.

So registrant protection. Do we have (Ben) or Marika here?

Man: (Yes).

Patrik Falstrom: Marika is not coming. (Ben) is not here. Okay. Anyway. So let me go through it. So this is something that we are working on. We have presented this before. One of the reasons why we are presenting it is that we have wanted to have feedback and we are - we have been able to discuss with many registrars. We got a lot of good feedback. And this has been - the document has been updated accordingly. Next slide please.

So what we have been looking at are the various attacks and of course the various attacks we have - we do have very good people that are plugged in and see what kind of attacks go on. But on the other hand, one thing that we discovered that we did not have enough skill set within ICANN is to see what registrars and registries actually did to mitigate those attacks.

So we've - because we were sort of on the other side of the fence trying to deal with these issues. So what we have done is that we of course we have pretty good view on the background behind the problem. And then we have (interviews) and discussions and really good input from, sorry, participants in ICANN specifically from GNSO.

We have got a lot of feedback of like what do you do - what do you guys do regarding two-factor authentication? It's easy to say you should do this and that. But it's not so easy in some cases. Developing countries depending on what software, problem with the (PHP) libraries, what not, blah, blah, blah, blah.

So we have actually managed to go through and hopefully we're going to be able to get recommendations, which are not academic but really talk about this is a real practice. This is what you can do and this is what we suggest should be done. Next slide please. Yes please.

Man: I didn't know if you were taking a queue Patrik.

Patrik Falstrom: I was taking the queue but after each one of these things. But I'm happy to have you be the first in the queue.

Man: I will put my marker down to wait until you - hold my questions till you get through this section.

Patrik Falstrom: Now I'm curious. Ask the question.

Man: Now I'm just going to let you down. The three events doesn't work in my favor. So it's just a question of, you know, there is a note or a comment in the RAA that registrars must -- I'm paraphrasing here -- provide notice to ICANN of any data breach.

And I think - is the goal or one of the objectives of this report -- if you can't answer, you can't answer -- but to give us some guidelines around what would trigger that contractual obligation with the size of the breach, the nature, whether it's systemic versus a one off?

You know, I guess what we're looking for is - look, when you get to a certain size, you know, some level of breach is just continuous. Somebody forgot their password, somebody guessed at their password, somebody's kid broke into their parents' account, you know, or something. You just - you constantly have these issues. At what point do we cross the threshold and say no, this is now a reportable event?

Patrik Falstrom: Almost but like not yet. The discussion we have had with ICANN legal and when we investigated specifically that part of the RAA is that we have investigated to start with whether it's possible for, and I'm saying ICANN but I really mean ICANN and the contracted parties that are covered by the RAA, whether those parties together at least will be able to release statistics from the breaches that are reported if you understand what I mean.

So what we have checked is like what is the ability to actually get some information from that because lots of that report - what we discovered was that a lot of the information reported back is reported to ICANN and then what.

Like we should not force people to report data that is not - that there's no use for. So we need to turn it the other way around. And that's what we are trying to describe.

What might be important is to come up with some best practices or changes in trends. Now given that we have that kind of goal, whatever it is, what kind of information would in that case be important to report? So we discovered more that there was in there - oh, reporting is important and then we ask why. And like no real response.

So yes, we are trying to maybe - hopefully we are writing something that can be the beginning of a different kind of dialog there but no we will not be able to answer your questions because we didn't want to go that far because we immediately encountered that there were some - there were some issues in the language there or whether to (date) even what you call (anonymize) statistics and counters; maybe even that cannot be shared if you see what I mean. And the fact that that was unclear is something that worry us a little bit. Was that good enough explanation?

Man: Thank you. No, those are the same - it sounds like you're running into the same issues that we are as well, which is, you know, how do you report

something that the reporting itself could, you know, even create further vulnerabilities. But I think what we ultimately - and maybe this is just a task for registrars just work with ICANN and SSAC to kind of develop some guidelines and best practices like you said. Thanks.

Patrik Falstrom: Exactly. And it's not only the registrars. Also registries and like - because we find it being quite important for parts for like everyone to know approximately what's going on and to be able to do that there is the need for some kind of reporting. Other question is how to do that so it's still effective. Because compliance is one thing and that might be one thing but we're here talking about a different thing.

Okay. Oh, it's 3 o'clock. So anyway. So that's actually it because the rest of the thing is - the rest of the slides is just as normal. We don't mind getting feedback of what we can improve, what we should do better. So please reach out to us.

Man: Yes. One thing that comes to mind when I read the registrant protection is not only the protection from data breaches but also the protection from legal data breaches so to speak; i.e., Whois harvesting and issues like that.

Does your report also deal with these legally possible infringements of the rights of a registrant; i.e., the storage of historical Whois data by certain companies that monetize them and do not remove those data even if the data subject requests that this data is removed?

Patrik Falstrom: No. We are - if I remember correctly, we are not going into that detail. We're more looking at the - if it is the case that data is stored in the registrar or registry, what kind of best practices exist to ensure that the data is only passed to whoever - a positive decision has been made that the data should actually be passed to that party.

So what we are trying to look at whether data can move around without anyone knowing or making decision on it. We're not going into - if I remember correctly, the actual - what implications are for like making decisions like (that if you know what I mean). So it's more normal traditional data breaching were breaches we're looking at.

I think. I'm looking at some SSAC members here that are nodding or shaking their head or something. But anyway, that's where we are. And I think most people that actually - for example, in the registrar community, whatever you call it, they - we have been in close contact. Yes, I'm sorry. Move on.

David Cake: Yes. We should meet with the GAC in (let me think) 12, 13 minutes or something. So we should probably - probably about only five minutes more discussion. I have a - currently have a queue of Stephanie, (Heather); I was going to put myself in the queue and then (Tony) and we'll have to leave it there. And please everyone be very quick. Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin. Many of us Patrik are a little bit concerned about the giant all things Whois PDP that's coming our way. And I was wondering obviously there are security implications behind any restructuring of the Whois database. I wonder if you had any thoughts on how you were going to participate in that upcoming juggernaut.

Patrik Falstrom: We have participated in two ways. We have defined for the community what taxonomy we think people should do. We participated with individuals in the - in work that was behind much of this restructuring of the Whois work.

We have been then looking at this report and we will probably say whether we do believe that people have followed our advice on how to restructure the discussion. When we look at discussion going on at the moment, we don't think people have read our earlier reports.

David Cake: (Heather).

(Heather): That's very much Patrik. A quick question or a quick comment first and then quick question. Comment is this. I think your slide is fantastic, the first one to get the community a bit more aware of what you folks do. And I'll say in line with that I just came out of the leadership training program earlier this week.

And I think it's a fantastic thing if you folks can continue to send someone to that. Russ Mundy was there and I think you now have 20 people walking around ICANN who have a much better view of what the SSAC does. So I thought that was really fantastic.

I had the opportunity to ask Russ a really sticky question and I'm going to be cheeky and ask you as well. What keeps you up at night Patrik?

Patrik Falstrom: Yes. (Unintelligible)...

(Heather): And I must say - I must say I asked...

Patrik Falstrom: ...keep me awake. But that was not what you're thinking...

(Heather): I asked Russ. I said what's the one thing that keeps you up at night and he (flinched) and said, "Only one?" So there you go.

Patrik Falstrom: No. What keeps me - this is of course - is not doing any SSAC thing but also me personally is that just like Mike Goodell that I've been working with that said once upon a time - upon a time the only thing we have to worry about is scaling.

And what I'm worried about is I still see so many business models that people make regarding investment I do not understand in what speed the Internet grows. And then people of course say what do you mean by growing. And I say pick any parameter and it grows exponentially too.

David Cake: Thank you. (Tony).

(Tony):   Yes. Thanks. So Patrik, coming from a part of the community that shared your frustration certainly with the name collision issue the way that was received and hearing you say today that with the Trademark Clearinghouse you waited all that time, knowing you Patrik I wouldn't for a moment suspect that you would just leave it there.

                   That's a problem that needs to be fixed. Is there anything we can do from a GNSO side to help make sure that situation doesn't occur again?

Patrik Falstrom: One of the things that I always think is important is that you for example in your reports explicitly reference our documents regardless of whether you agree with them or disagree. So you also and when you are saying things you tell also ICANN staff or whoever, ICANN or someone in the community, how you prioritize whatever we are recommending compared to all the other things that you have to prioritize.

                   We have an SSAC we have started and finally believe it or not, the last ICANN meeting - the previous ICANN meeting was the first one since I started as the Chair that SSAC has started to have meetings with ICANN Board. And Tuesday will be the second time with SSAC. So normally we don't even get a time slot with ICANN Board, which makes sort of a little bit difficult to even have the discussions. But now we are and so things are getting better.

David Cake: Thanks. I was just kind of a last question, which is I saw a couple of things in there that particularly talking about the Trademark Clearinghouse that clearly are going to interact with GNSO work. I think we are due to review rights protections measures.

                   We've been doing a lot of work in the last year about how to work more effectively with the GAC. How would - do you have any advice on how we

can work more effectively with SSAC to ensure that your advice is incorporated into our work, which we are - I'm sure we are very keen to do.

Patrik Falstrom: I think there are two things we should try to do. The first one, which of course easy for me to say, whenever you are working on some kind of thing in whatever workgroup you have, I'm happy to - we produce about eight documents a year.

I promise sitting by this table that out of those documents eight, I promise that one of them will be answer to you question from GNSO if you send us one, which means that you can take the - you can tell us what we should say that then helps you.

Secondly, when we are producing these documents, I think maybe there's a case that we should actually try to not only have 30 minutes when we are blah, blah, blahing as normal; we should maybe have one hour where half an hour is that and we take half an hour with the report that we just published so we are sure that you have understood what we wrote and why.

So for example, the question with the registrant protection that we actually do go through that - walk through that document and have a special session with that for the parties that are interested.

David Cake: That's valuable advice for future meetings they have. (Volker), you want to say...

(Volker): Yes. I think that would be a very good idea to also increase interest in the session, i.e., not have the introduction of the SSAC, which everybody could look at at the Web site and rather delve into the depth of the matters that you're currently dealing with, have just (dealed) with on your schedule. So we can get involved better as well.

David Cake: Yes.

Patrik Falstrom: No, as I said, I intentionally - the last couple of meetings I scaled down the description of SSAC but just because it's a new way we were presenting it and we are in the midst of discussion of CCWG. We from SSAC made a conscious decision to access that almost them almost all of the time on that. But I promise it will not happen next time.

David Cake: Thank you. And as we are now fairly short on time to get to the GAC, I think we're going to have to leave it there. And thank you again for this very useful report Patrik.

Patrik Falstrom: Thank you very much.

Jonathan Robinson: (Yurof), go ahead.

(Yurof):   Yes. I unfortunately will not be able to be at the Council meeting on Wednesday. And this is actually - so it's my last time around the stable. I just wanted to say thank you for everyone. It's been four years a interesting experience. And I got a lot of very good friends from this - being on the Council. So good luck for the new Councilors and thank you.

David Cake: Thank you (Yurof).

END