ICANN Transcription
GNSO Saturday Session
SSAC Update
Saturday, 5 March 2016

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

James Bladel: We'll turn this over to our guest from the SSAC, Patrick, and Jim.

Patrik Falstrom: Okay. I'll start anyway. There's some slight discussions going on in the room but the speakers are a stronger voice than the mumbling anyway. I'm Patrik Falstrom. I'm Chair of SSAC.

((Crosstalk)

Patrik Falstrom: If it is the case that you want side discussions can you please leave the room. I do understand that there are more interesting things than SSAC things but it's a little bit distracting for people, the few that would like to listen to us. So anyway, to my right is Jim Galvin, my Vice Chair. I also in the room do have a number of SSAC members and also SSAC staff.

So next slide please. Who is running these slides? No one. Thank you. One more. Can the people that, the person that run this slide just wave so we know approximately where the person is. Oh there. So thank you very much. Have a little bit of eye contact. That makes both of our lives easier. Thank you.

So the secure (unintelligible) the advisor committee today consists of 30 members, 30 members who are appointed by the ICANN Board. And what we do is that we advise the ICANN community and Board on matters related to the security and the naming of the internet's address allocation systems.

We have as of today 80 publications since 2002 when we were created. Next slide please. We base our work on these two missions and core values of ICANN to ensure the stable secure operation, of the internet's secure systems and preserving and enhancing the operation's stability, reliability, security and global interoperability of the internet.

You also see at the bottom left the publication process we use. We have a formal work party. We do some research and writing. We review and approve and then finally publish the document. If it is the case that consideration of SSAC advice, I the advice can contain specific recommendations to the ICANN Board, we have four different paths of implementation of those recommendations.

Either it is something that is passed to the policy development process or it is something that is passed to staff for implementation with public consultation. Or it is the dissemination of advice to affected parties. Or the Board might take a different, take a different solution and then explain why the advice is not followed. And this is something that could be interesting to look at and also understand our response to the (season) of review work regarding accountability.

Next slide please. The current work parties and issues we're working with have to do with the namespaces, IDM harmonization, auction proceeds and then we have ongoing work parties on the (DNSF) workshops at the ICANN meetings, tracking Board advice which also has to do with the accountability issue of course and the membership committee that is reviewing membership of SSAC.

Next slide please. Oops. Next. There. Thank you. So as was mentioned in the slide earlier, we do have at the moment six different works in progress of which three are sort of temporary work parties and then three which are ongoing. Next slide please. If we look at the milestones we have, we have this quarter published SSAC 77 78, 79 and 80. And I will give the ability to you to choose whether I should go through each one of them or just one of them.

And then we, the further milestones we have is not until third quarter 2016 which we do believe, that we are, that we are done with some work on IDM harmonization and potentially the namespace issues. Next slide please. So if we look at the publications since ICANN 54, we have been quite productive by publishing everything from (SSAC) 74 to 80.

On the other hand, many of those are very short so they have not been so much work behind them. But I would like to point out, for example, one which I was not thinking about describing SSAC 75. The interesting thing here was that we got the liaison statement from ITD regarding creating of certificate authorities in developing countries which we responded to in December 2015.

And many of the publications as you see had relations to the CCWG accountability work and also the CWG work. Next slide please. So if we look at the recent publications, I'm going to mention each one of them and then you can say whether we should skip it or whether we should just sort of browse forward and we'll ask for some feedback. Yes, James.

James: (Unintelligible).

Patrik Falstrom: Yes absolutely. So let's start by, with questions.

Woman: Sorry Patrick. No I would say this is a guess. I think it would be very useful for us to hear about 80, about SSAC's views on accountability. Thanks.

Patrik Falstrom: Thank you very much. So let's go to the next slide. I actually think that this slide shows all the texts that SSAC wrote. I think it's the complete document. Basically we approved the, literally we approved the (Workstream 1) recommendations. There is of course SSAC documents behind this. There's a lot of description on what we do believe, from our perspective, what IANA is doing, what is in the contract between ICANN and the NCA. And we also identified sort of the gaps between the contract and what IANA is doing.

And we also recommended on how to look at those differences between what IANA is doing and what the contract says. It is also the case that just because our charter, as I mentioned a couple of slides ago, is very much routed in the, in the bylaws of ICANN regarding security and stability. We very, very early in the process developed before even any, more or less before the text was written.

This is the ability, the process we used internally at SSAC was that we created our red line sort of issues regarding the accountability and then we managed to have two SSAC members, Julie and (Lanre) also sitting in the back, be the (FMI)/SSAC appointed SSAC members that are participating in the CCWG work.

And they have literally been following the work in detail and ensure that whatever has been discussed has sort of stayed within, stayed on the right side of those red lines and brought back to SSAC when it was the case when something was sort of coming close.

And Jim points out to me that we actually have two Julies in SSAC. We have our support staff, Julie Hedlund and then we have Julie Hammer which is also (liaison) from AALAC to SSAC which is together with (Lanre) and Julie that has participated in CCWG.

I don't have anything more to say about this but I'm happy to receive any questions that we could answer regarding our participation in CCWG and encourage (Lanre) and (Julie) to maybe move closer to the microphones as they are prepared to answer any questions. Please.

(Vittorio): Thanks Patrick. (Vittorio) speaking. Just a question about how was the process? What was (SAC 80) about the proposal or how did you...

Patrik Falstrom: We reached consensus within SSAC the way we deal with consensus for all documents. And we declare consensus on the document and in every time SSAC, every time we inside SSAC have a document that the, that SSAC is behind including this one, SSAC members have the ability to file a descent or a diverging view that they can have added to the document itself.

In this case, as you see if you look at the document, there were no such statements filed which means that the document, that SSAC as a whole is behind this document. Any other questions? Did that cover your interest of knowing more about SAC 80?

(Vittorio): Yes please.

Man: If you could go back to slide 7, I had a, or was it just questions about this or questions about the whole presentation?

Patrik Falstrom: Okay, I have a couple of others, let's go back to slide 7, current work in progress. Yes please.

Man: I was hoping that, the first two bullet points are a bit broad. I was hoping you could drill down a little bit and give us more context about what you're working on in the namespace and the auction proceeds?

Patrik Falstrom: Yes, regarding namespace, that is not so hard actually. Let's see. Can we, to complicate things, can we go forward do slide 17 on (SAC) 78.

Man: There you go.

Patrik Falstrom: Yes thank you. So next slide please. So regarding, resorting, the namespace issues, we actually published (SAC) 78, even to explain what we are doing. And (SAC) 78 is to raise an awareness that in in SSAC have discovered which is not a surprise that there are multiple uses for the namespace that we use for domain names.

                This includes, for example, the various things that look like domain names that end with .onion that is used in the (tour) network. You have domain names that look like, for example, end with .local that is used in the bonjour apple, apple bonjour and the DNF protocols. And multiple other things that look like domain names but probably should not be used by domain names. Instead in these two cases the (TLD) were what is the right most token.

                And the domain name indicates how the resolution is to be used and that is not DNF. That is something that the ITF is working with but also ICANN of course is working on allocating (TLDs) and from And from an (SSAC) perspective, we have discovered and what we want to look at more carefully is what is this whole namespace saying anyway, how to handle overlaps and how to ensure and what kind of risks (unintelligible) do multiple organizations allocations are of the same namespace, et cetera. (James), do you want to add anything to that now?

(James):   No.

Patrik Falstrom: So the work party itself is actually going to look into these issues that are described in (SAC) 78. So that's the namespace issue. Yes, and then the next, if you go back to slide 7 again. Thank you. The second one regarding auction proceeds. We in SSAC, we have accepted the invitation to point people participating in the ICANN work regarding auction proceeds. And the work party that we have created is something that, it's more the case that we

in SSAC need that according to our internal processes because it gives an ability for the, by SSAC appointed members to the ICANN group to be able to go back and ask whether SSAC do handle you or not on issues that are raised in that external process.

So regarding auction proceeds, that's a support function for the SSAC appointed participants in the ICANN process. It is not an independent investigation that we're doing. Okay? So in that case, let's go to slide, what is it? Slide 14. Next please. Here we have an advisory on IP address, on the change of the rollover IP address space.

We have looked at the change in role of the IP before addresses that is caused by the increase scarcity and the (XO) and then the (unintelligible) of IP before addresses. As many people in the room know, the RARs have run out of addresses, everyone except (unintelligible). So the implications and our conclusions is that we are saying that an IP before address do not necessarily identify an endpoint anymore. That an IP address alone may not be sufficient to correlate and internet activity observation with an endpoint. And go to the next slide.

The specific recommendations based on those findings is that network operators could accelerate plans to deploy IPV 6 and consider the consequences of deploying IPV 4 continuation technologies such as network address translations prior to the deployment. So basically translated (unintelligible) we think it's better to deploy IPV 6 than start address translation things.

(Unintelligible) another like technical people are laughing and yes, we said so for about 25 bazillion years so what's new. But anyway, it's still said. And the last recommendation is - the second recommendation is that device manufacturers should accelerate plans to support IPV 6 as well as or better than they currently support IPG 4. Yes. We have a question from (Stephanie).

(Stephanie Paris): Thanks. (Stephanie Paris) for the record. I have a couple questions actually. Now you've got me worried about your document 78 with respect to the RDF activity. Is that going to complicate our live? If I'm understanding this correctly, those domains are performing a technical function of some kind. They see onion (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) for example, you mean .onion?

(Stephanie Paris): Yes.

Patrik Falstrom: Well, one could say to simply the matter, this study that we are starting, it would be a little bit complicated if the, for example, the internet (unintelligible) task force had the string to this special reserve list that ICANN creates at a TLD. That would be a conflict that would be pretty easy to identify. But there are more complicated (gray stone) areas that needs to be identified and that is what we are doing and what we are looking into in SSAC. (Jim).

(Jim Galvin): (Jim Galvin). (Stephanie) could you say more. I'm gathering you have something in mind about a perceived conflict and I'm curious if you could say more about it or maybe we could talk offline a little bit more. It's not obvious to me that there's any particular conflict here between these two activities. But I'd like to understand what's motivating you to ask the question.

(Stephanie Paris): What's motivating me to ask the question is we already have a pretty complex (RDS) project ahead of us. We've been doing some outreach to try to make sure that we have no gaps in the people that are on the rather large committee already. There, it has been said well, we don't have SSAC. And I have said well don't worry. They're there. They just haven't identified as SSAC.

Now my second question. You might want to think about naming some poor soul to be the SSAC rep on this so that when we do have questions about technical ramifications, we can have them answered. I mean, you know, there

are several guys there who I know are on SSAC. So that was my other question. Why aren't you naming yourselves as SSAC?

And but I don't quite understand what the ramifications of this DOC 78 initiative are and we're all already getting questions at, you know, about the technical stuff. So it would be helpful if we had maybe a presentation on it once you have something to present.

Patrik Falstrom: When we (unintelligible) from here, yes, when we have something to say, we will say it. I promise that.

(Stephanie Paris): That's all I ask.

Patrik Falstrom: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Patrik Falstrom: So the more important thing here which is actually something, which is another issue that I would like to try to explain to this group which is sort of what you asked for is that SSAC, they explicitly do not participate in any PDP - full stop. Okay. We get questions about once a month, cannot SSAC please participate here, blah, blah, blah, blah. We are not doing that.

SSAC can be asked questions that we will respond to or we might review documents or proposals or whatever and we might review and based on the review, we might reach conclusions that we are sending in. But we're not participating, okay. So to answer your question, cannot SSAC participate? No. (Edmond). Okay sorry. You round them up. Sorry.

(James): (Tony) you're up and then (Edmond) next.

(Tony): Yes Patrick. I don't actually have a question but I would like to comment specifically that that first bullet point up on the screen is very close to my

heart. My day job is building internet exchanges in Argentina. And it may be interesting for councilors to consider that in Houston we have a problem with IPV 6 deployment. We can't get hundreds of ISVs in that environment to do this. I tried to come up with a program myself to stimulate this and to help them, some sort of a help desk organization but I'm a little frustrated. I haven't got very far with that.

But basically this will translate into there will be, let's say internet communication or traffic interconnection and flow problems that come from this coupled with the fact that there might be more IPV 4 addresses available and we are pretty far behind with IPV 6 deployment. In Latin America it's under 5%. So I think this is interesting to flag as an issue. I mean ICANN has overview of let's say names, numbers and protocols. That's not operational intervention but they do have an overview mission and this lack of IPV deployment will I think be bad for internet services and traffic in general particularly with internet of things coming up now. Thank you.

Patrik Falstrom: Thank you very much (Tony). Let me add - explicitly I want to say that what we have to remember in this room, we normally talk about domain names sort of only. The reason, one of the reasons why we wanted to bring out and write this report is that people should be aware of this issue with IP addresses but we all have to remember that the RARs, that's where the policy development process for IP address applications and usages is done.

And just because of these implications, it's even more important that sort of what normally is ICANN is not overlapping with the work that RARs do. It's actually the other way around. We, in sort of this community, which normally deals with domain names, should support the work that the RARs do as much as possible via the (UMA) agreement that we have through the ASO and the MRO.

Okay but we are saying here in SSAC is sort of between the lines. It's even more important that we don't have sort of confusing actions or whatever that

it's happening here instead. We need to reach out and listen to the work that is done in the RARs because obviously as you mention, we need to work together and help each other and help these sort of ISP and sort of normal IP address communities to ensure that we get rid of these issues. Thank you.

(James): (Edmund).

(Edmund Chung): (Edmund Chung) here. Building on what (Stephanie) asked, I guess two questions about 78. One is kind of a comment and question together. Would, should you consider, would the SSAC also think about the IANA database and how, you know, as we go down the path of RDS, we're going to, one of the issues might be reserved.

We always, we're not quite sure whether reserve name should be in the, who is or not. And in this case, this is a reserved TLD. These are kind of reserved TLDs in the IANA and whether it should be reflected in the IANA database. And so people can get a better sense of what TLDs or what this community considers TLDs would be kind of reserve names in some sort.

The other, the second question is also that on 78, do you see and what (be in a) relationship with names collision. Would there be, would that be touched on as well in the report?

(Jim Galvin): So (Jim Galvin). Let me respond to your two questions. With respect to the first one, you're asking actually an interesting question about whether (special) relation to the RDS in (Stephanie's) question. You know, should reserve names be part of the RDS. And should there be some sort of director's service associated with them, I don't know the answer to that but let me just say we'll take that question on board inside of SSAC and we'll make sure that we address that inside of, you know, whatever we're going to say. We'll have some discussion about that.

And I think with respect to the second issue, I would say the same thing. We have already, you know, commented to ourselves in our discussions about what's the relationship with name (collations) and more to say, there are not. So they'll be some comment about that. And if there's something to say, we'll definitely add that in a recommendation in the fuller document that comes out later. So thank you for both of those questions.

(James):   Any other questions or we'll proceed to presentation. How many more slides".

Patrik Falstrom: Up to you.

(James):   Okay.

Patrik Falstrom: So we can actually talk for five, ten more minutes but it's up to you. It's now way after time. So should we briefly mention the others?

Man: (Unintelligible) kept you waiting a little bit so.

Patrik Falstrom: Yes. Okay. So let's say, let's go to slide 19. So what we, what SSAC did in (SAC) 77 is that we looked at the proposal that was out for open comments, for comments, on a global, on a (health) index on the detailed process. And what was proposed to use for that (health) index, what we concluded by looking at what was proposed is our conclusion is that ICANN is approaching the KPI problem backwards by starting to look at what data exists and then exists or is available.

And then even if that data is available, there are claims that from that data you can derive certain conclusions. What SSAC is saying is that and there are specific recommendations that basically involve more text around it that that is not from an SSAC perspective, how you develop a KPI. Instead, you start by looking at what kind of conclusion you want to sort of be able to draw from whatever data you have and then you decide what data you need to be able to draw that conclusion.

So we are supporting all these kinds of proposal on security numbers, all kinds of breaches et cetera but from our perspective, the cost of what we're saying, we're saying that there are a lot of values that actually are needed to be able to draw the conclusions that ICANN do believe or suggest that one can sort of conclude form the data collected.

Next slide please.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Patrik Falstrom: Yes but I want to show the next slide first. So slide 21 first. Yes. Thank you. So we also suggest that a couple of things that ICANN could look at, other kind of data that could also be possible to collect. And also, and those are values that also think it's data but it's also needed to be able to draw little conclusions that ICANN seems to want to draw. Thank you.

Man: So it sounds like you are recommending ICANN follow some sort of scientific method which is crazy. Just might work.

Patrik Falstrom: Well one of the, yesterday I explained to (Yuron Martin) the incoming CO and others what SSAC was and one of the ways I explained it was that we are the ones that tell the communities that speed of light is finite and one part of the sort of (life) if short and you should not look into the laser beam with your remaining eye, et cetera. So those are the kind of gravity goes downwards, et cetera.

And more seriously what we are saying here is not that ICANN or that the community should deliver data that for various reasons they cannot deliver because of contract (unintelligible), privacy issues or whatever. But we're saying is that ICANN should not lie to itself trying to draw certain conclusions of data that in reality from which in reality cannot draw those conclusions.

That's what they're saying. So given that you have a certain amount of data, be very careful of the conclusions you draw from that. And if it is the case that you really would like to draw certain conclusions, look at what data you need to be able to draw that conclusion compared with the data you have.

(James): Thanks. I have (David), (Carlos) and (Stephanie). (David).

(David): It's been awhile. I don't remember what I was going to say. It was such a long time ago. Actually all I really wanted to say is that leadership of one very notable working group I very much appreciate the SSAC - you know, I understand they do not particularly directly very much appreciate your, how you do operate and we'll be talking to you directly. And I would very much like to see SSAC involved more in day-to-day process even if you're not directly participants.

And also I very much appreciate the input of various members of SSAC. Also the participating members, I know it's unofficial but it still helps a great deal. But that was a long time ago. Thank you.

Patrik Falstrom: Yes and there are actually three people involved I think that are actually SSAC members but that's something different, as you point out, from having SSAC participate. Regarding the - we don't mind, once again I repeat as I know, (David), you and I have talked about so many times. We don't mind having you guys sending us questions. Please do. Okay? Thank you.

(Carlos): This is (Carlos). For the record, the talk was very interesting. These reports, you make (decisions). This is also very relevant immediately for the consumer, for the competition, consumer choice work. The (unintelligible) review is based on a long list of KPIs that was developed by the community under the implementation advisory group (unintelligible).

So my question is, have you also looked with the same glasses through the annex to 66 KPIs that the advisory group recommended because in the

review team now we have kind of a conflict staff. Seems to prefer their healthy index. There is no data for the 66 KPIs. But the good news is there is a tremendous budget to be spent over the next four months before the current fiscal year runs out to settle on data for this review which is a review of the deployment of the community TLDs. So I question, how can we work on that. Thank you very much.

Patrik Falstrom: So we looked at the health index proposal only. On the other hand, what we did was that we, in the report, we explained the methodology that we in SSAC do believe should be used when you develop a KPI. And that said, I think that from our perspective, it's part of the sort of PDP and the process that you in the community is following to actually draw the conclusions on whether things are good or bad and right and wrong. So we suggest a methodology that can be used.

(Carlos):   I beg you to look at the other list as well please as a request. Thank you.

(Stephanie Paris): Thanks. (Stephanie) for the record, well I think procedurally on the RDS group we'll, I for one will be asking for questions to be directed to SSAC on a regular basis. Secondly, I'm wondering on this same question of the KPIs, we just had a presentation from (Zavier) over lunch on risk management among other things. And it seems to me we don't' have the appropriate KPIs for the risk management assessment. And I wonder if you folks have had a go at that or are you in conversation with the (unintelligible) about the risk management indicators? Thanks.

Patrik Falstrom: We are in general conversations with ICANN regarding risk management folks regarding the (unintelligible) group rollover and the kind of processes. And also folks when we decided to starting (unintelligible) on the added IPV 6 (unintelligible) records for the DNS et cetera. I think that I can safely say that in most of these cases the SSAC doesn't, we don't really care what the risk calculation is. We want the community to have done a risk calculation. Okay, that's the important thing.

That the risk management process is in place. So if it is the case that something happens that is bad, that it's already known what the decision making process is to decide whether that thing that looks like it's bad is bad enough to be able to do to force a rollback and what that rollback thing is.

So normally when we are asked by the ICANN Board and ICANN sort of operational team in (GDC) for example. So what is the threshold, dear SSAC, what is the threshold? We will not respond. Instead we just want to know that there is a (lamp). The community has developed a (lamp) that is red when it is bad enough. And then there is a level that can be pulled when the (lamp) sort of is red. We don't care why the (lamp) is burning, right. We want there to be a (lamp) that is developed.

(James):   Okay. Thank you. One last question from (Jennifer) and then we're going to have to wrap this up.

(Jennifer):   Thanks (James). (Jennifer Stanford). Patrick, could I ask you to elaborate a little bit on the external sources of information related to the DNS (SAC), bullet point one on the slide?

Patrik Falstrom: We are looking at, so what we are thinking about, what we have been looking at is, for example, is looking at the number of, the number of (signed) domains, the number of request for (signed) domains, where the drivers are coming from? In detail these and other TLDs. So there's not, there are many parties in the community that had run their own scripts every night to look at - what is signed, what is not signed. What is broken? What is not broken?

And for example I know on the tech day on Monday there would be a presentation done by one or two individuals that have been connecting this data that, for example, look at how many of the (CTLDs) that are signed by (DNS) that actually have errors. How long does it take to mitigate the error

and et cetera? So more operational, operational related issues that are related to DNS.

Jennifer: Just a follow-on question real fast (James). Appreciate it. Does that report also contain registrar data and if so could you share that with us?

Patrik Falstrom: We are not that specific.

(James): Okay, well thank you councilors for giving up our break. We're a little behind schedule. Thank you of course as always to Patrikand (Jim) for their presentation for addressing the questions. And the SSAC members in the audience. There was plenty of room at the table. You could have joined us. Keep it in mind for next time. We do appreciate your staying a little bit extra to make up for the fact that we kept you waiting while we had showed our CCWG issues which will not be resolved in a single sentence, unfortunately, spoiler alert but anyway, thank you very much for coming.

END