
ABU DHABI – SSAC Public Meeting
Wednesday, November 1, 2017 – 15:15 to 16:15 GST
ICANN60 | Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

PATRIK FALSTROM: The clock I have in front of me now shows 3:15, so my apologies. In the room here we have -- I'm happy to see so many guests. We have SSAC members here around the table, and maybe we can start from my right and people can just name themselves.

JACQUES LATOUR: Jacques Latour [inaudible].

ONDREJ FILIP: Ondrej Filip, [inaudible] SSAC member.

PATRICK JONES: Patrick Jones, invited participant from ICANN.

MERIKE KAE0: Merike Kaeo, Farsight Security.

GREG AARON: Greg Aaron, iThreat Cyber Group.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

CHRISTIAN ESSELMAN: Christian Esselman, SIDN dot NL.

JEFF BEDSER: Jeff Bedser, iThreat Cyber Group.

JAY DALEY: Jay Daley, dot NZED.

JULIE HAMMER: Julie Hammer, unaffiliated as incoming SSAC vice-chair.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Rod Rasmussen, unaffiliated incoming SSAC chair.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Patrik Falstrom, SSAC chair until the last of December this year.

JIM GALVIN: Jim Galvin, Afiliast, outgoing SSAC vice-chair.

RAM MOHAN: Ram Mohan, SSAC's liaison to the ICANN board. Outgoing next year as the SSAC liaison to the board.

LYMAN CHAPIN: Lyman Chapin, Interisle Consulting Group.

ROBERT GUERRA: Robert Guerra, Privaterra, SSAC member.

RUSS MUNDY: Russ Mundy, Parsons.

JOHN LEVINE: John Levine, multiply affiliated.

BENEDICT ADDIS: Benedict Addis, here for the foreseeable.

GEOFF HUSTON: Geoff Huston, Just in Time.

PATRIK FALSTROM: So what we'll do is that we will go through an overview over SSAC. We'll explain what we have done, what we are planning on doing. And then we'll have some interaction with you.

We are, at the moment, 37 members. They're appointed by ICANN Board. As much as we can, we try to ensure that we have the expertise needed in all the various areas where we need expertise to be able to give good recommendations. We exist to advise the ICANN community and board on matters related to the security and integrity of the internet's naming address allocation systems. Our primary target for recommendations is ICANN Board. We have made 98 publications since 2002.

The publication process consists of multiple steps. We get questions, we find issues that we think might be interesting to discuss. We form a work party, and the work party is doing research, they are writing, they are trying to understand what kind of recommendations can be given to whom to mitigate the issues and make the world better. If it is the case that they find that something actually can be done by someone, there is a document written, and advice written with recommendations, it is reviewed, approved by SSAC as a whole and then published.

In the case that the recommendation is to the ICANN Board, SSAC submits the advice to the ICANN Board. The board acknowledges and studies the advice, it takes formal action on the advice, which can be one of four things. It can launch a policy development process. It can request staff to implement the advice with some public consultation, using the normal

process that staff is using for that. The board can disseminate the advice to affected parties. And they can also choose different solutions, including not following the advice, given that ICANN Board is explaining why they are not following the advice from SSAC.

Nowadays, it is possible to see the status of all the recommendations ICANN, and also, I think, ALAC is also in the database. If you go to My.ICANN.org, there's an ability to look at the status of recommendations on advice to the board.

The work part that we have at the moment include one on management of the namespace and name collisions. One on harmonization of internationalized domain names. One organization review. We have an internal group for internal review of SSAC, and we will talk a little bit about the SSAC review in a bit. We have the WHOIS rate limiting work party. We have one on Internet of Things. And then we have ongoing work parties on the DNSSEC workshop that was running today. And we also have a membership committee that reviews members, both review of incoming members and review of existing members of SSAC that are reviewed every third year.

The recent publications are: 95, it was an advice from the use of emoji in domain names; 96, comment on the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2 draft framework of interpretation

for human rights; 97, advisory board in Centralized Zone Data Service and registry operator monthly activity reports; and then we have the latest, 98, comments on the Security, Stability, Resilience of the DNS review SSR2 team progress.

We also do outreach in the form of a Facebook page. We also have some videos that we have published. We are happy to listen to all different kinds of ideas on how to make our material and our reports and advice more interesting and easier to digest.

We would like to show this, which is a list of issues that we currently are discussing. These are not work parties yet. But this gives an example on various things that we are looking at. We look at signing the NS sets of the root zone. We have been looking at various different analysis that various organizations have been doing around the world. We are looking at IPv6-only internet. Is that really something that is possible to achieve? And what are the implications on various protocols, including DNS? Of course because that's one of the key things we are looking at. We have been looking at some analysis of the WannaCry/Conficker.

We also have been looking at challenges of hosting large domain portfolios, various implications on that. We have been looking at the various proposals for dot internal, and other similar

solutions. We have a review of our documents. We are reviewing whether we are numbering and archiving and identifying our communication and documents correctly, or whether we should improve that. We are also reviewing our internal skills survey that we're using among other times when we are -- we're using it when we are reviewing SSAC members and potential incoming new members. We're also looking at whether we should have a session at ICANN meetings on emerging security issues or anything like that to get with the ICANN Security Team.

So this is an example of things, and this list that we're looking at changes quite often. It changes about every month when we have some presentations or interesting things to discuss. When we have resources and when we do find that something really is something to work on, that is the time when we are moving things from this list to become a work in progress. Then we are doing the work. And just because we do work, doesn't mean that we will come with advice, but quite often we do.

If we look at the milestones, I mentioned these things we already produced. It was second to fourth quarter 2017. We are then looking into quarter one, first quarter 2018. We hope that we already with advisories on these things that you can see on the screen. We hope that we are, for example, ready with our

internal review. The review of SSAC, the external review and review of SSAC have not started yet just because there has not been any appointment of an external reviewer. We were hoping that those things would be able to be simply synchronized, but it has not happened. We will manage that.

We also hope that the advisory of Internet of Things and a few other things that we're working on will be ready, so we can start to take on new ideas. Are there any questions?

Okay. So let's talk about these two, the two latest presentations. SAC097, regarding CZDS. Greg, do you want to speak on this? Geoff?

GEOFF BEDSER:

Hi, Geoff Bedser. The advisory on the Centralized Zone Data Service came about, basically, because we had feedback from parties that access the zone system to get the zones for anti-abuse work. And the process that had been deployed for the CZDS system primarily modified the process by which the data could be accessible. And basically what I mean by that is the original process for the generic top-level domains prior was you signed a contract, you got access, and you had maintained access as long as you do didn't violate the contract.

And in the new system, the registry operators could put a different period of time for access to the zone file that would be anywhere from 30 days to several years; that not necessarily being the issue. The issue was that you could not ask for renewal until you expired, and then you had to go through a period of time waiting for the communications to transpire to get access again, which would give gaps in coverage of knowledge of what the activities were going on in the zone.

So basically, SSAC got together and looked at the limitations based on the system and the deployment and the policy behind how it was designed how it was designed and reviewed and made some suggestions on how to improve upon it. And the status of the results of this advisory, currently, is the board has received the advice we've provided, they've given us feedback that demonstrates to us that they understand the recommendations, and we're waiting for further action.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Thank you very much. Question? Do we have a microphone? You have to come up to the table, that's the easiest.

PINDAR WONG: Hi. I'm Pindar Wong, here from Hong Kong. First of all, just recognizing and thanking all the long-term members who served

on the committee, especially yourself, Patrik. In terms of your work items though that you had before, so this is not directly following one of the previous questions, is this sort of a first-in/first-out system? How do you prioritize among the work items and to manage community expectations of when outputs can be?

PATRIK FALSTROM:

So when we have the work in progress, or what we call work parties, and these run in parallel, each one of the work parties has telephone conferences. Everything from every week to every fourth week. How often that happens depends a little bit on how much time the members of SSAC have to donate because it's volunteer work. We do not have more work parties than approximately this, just because it's limited, not only by volunteers, but also staff. So the work parties do get staff support. And we have, at currently, approximately two FTEs of staff support that is helping us part from the work that we need to have SSAC as a whole.

The question of priorities is a little bit more regarding these new things. So because there are new things that are popping up and unfortunately because of limitation of resources, both among SSAC members and staff support, we cannot really start a new topic unless we are done with something else. Now,

sometimes we do get things that are very urgent and need to be prioritized. And in that case, unfortunately, we need to pass the work party. And in that case, it cannot work on what they are supposed to do.

One example is that the work party on IDN harmonization, we are looking into the various processes within ICANN that work within the naturalized domain names and we are investigating how similar or different, we would do a gap analysis between the various, for example, algorithms that are used for confusability with the various processes in ICANN. And we're trying to evaluate whether there are differences and whether the gaps between them have any impact on security and stability issues. That work is something that we find to be very, very important for ICANN, but that work party has now been passed two times because we got direct questions regarding IDN that we have pushed into that work party. So that has delayed the work a little bit.

So regarding delivery, one can say that a work party -- if it is the case that it's not only that we are reviewing in an open consultation for ICANN, for example, or if we just have issues with something, that's a faster process for us. But, otherwise, work in a work party is normally between six and eighteen months for a work party to produce a result.

Was that answering your question?

Then SAC098, regarding SSR2. We express our concern over SSR2 and the ability for the group to deliver a good result that will be received well by the community. Because review, and specifically SSR2, is something that is really important for us at SSAC. So it's really important for us that SSR2 succeeds. We did send a letter to ICANN Board after we received quite a lot of feedback from various corners of ICANN and also after following the conversations between ICANN Board, SSR2 team, and many others.

So we also passed the information to SSR team via our appointed members, Geoff Huston and Don Blumenthal. Geoff is here, Don is, unfortunately, not here, he is at home in the US, participating remotely. So we passed information to SSR2 team, as well. But we also felt that, ultimately, we had to send this letter to ICANN Board because we found it being important to discuss SSR2 related issues in the community here at ICANN 60. Which, as everyone that follows SSR2 knows, that actually happened.

There's a lot of discussion now, which we find to be extremely valuable. Including various meetings between SSAC, a subset of SSAC, have been meeting with a subset of SSR2 team, including today. There are also discussions between SO and AC chairs, of

course, that have been going on for some time, including discussions between the SO and AC chairs and the board overseeing the Organizational Effectiveness Committee.

Any questions on any of these two documents? Okay.

So, as I said, we have launched our internal review of SSAC. We also are waiting for the external review of SSAC to start. We are eager to start with this, and as some people might remember, we were pretty fast last time, but now the other SO and ACs are a little bit faster than us. So we need to sort of catch up. Greg, do you want to explain a little bit more about the review? No. Thank you.

So anyway, these are questions that we have in this slide deck, which are typical things that we really would like to listen to, so we can do our work better, so we communicate better. We also, as you saw on this list with various topics of interest, possibly need work. Please come to us and add things to this list.

And one way, and I waited to say this, to answer your question, Pindar, much more precisely; how do we prioritize our work? We prioritize what the community asks us to do. That has the highest priority. And the ultimate highest priority, because of our charter, is when we get a question from ICANN Board. But we have gotten questions from GAC, from other SO and ACs, but

very, very few. So this is something that we would like to get some more of, to be able to interact better with the rest of the community. Because interaction can always be better, right? And we always want to improve. So please contact us.

It's also the case that we would like to know more about our publications. You, who believe that you actually are the target for a recommendation or document. If there is a topic that actually is touching something that you're working with, or dealing with, or want to know more about, have we written the document clearly enough? Do you understand it? Should we write it differently? Is the level of detail correct? Do you agree that the recommendations mitigate the findings we have in the report?

Because, as I said earlier, we do describe the problem, we do some finding, and then we look at what kind of recommendations do we give to whom to make the situation better. And we really would like to know whether you think that other recommendations, or different recommendations would have been appropriate. Even though you think, yes, what SSAC said is probably good, but if they added this, it would have been much, much better. Let us know.

So with that, anyone from SSAC that would like to say something? So with that, I would like to thank everyone.

So I'm happy to receive other questions from the floor as well, if there is any. But, given that there seems to not be any, I would like to just -- oh, there is one.

GREGORY MOUNIER: Thank you very much, Patrik. I'm Gregory from EUROPOL, and I had a question with regard to, have you ever been coming back to an issue in which you've already provided an advice that the community has, maybe, not taken up some of your recommendations? And in light of some new developments, you might deem necessary to return to the issue? Is that something possible?

And therefore, depending on your answers then it would tell us whether we need to work on our community to come up with an official question for you to do a bit of research on a specific topic. Thank you.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Very good question. This was actually a topic that I could have talked about, but I forgot. So Jim, over to you.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Patrik. Jim Galvin here. If you look carefully at the slides, we were talking about possible work items. One of them

on the list there was something called SSAC Publication Review. And the point of that work item, what we have actually undertaken, we recently had our annual workshop, and at that workshop we completed a review of all of our existing published documents and made an assessment as to which documents need to be updated or revised in some way.

And so we now have that set of documents, and so I'll phrase it as a background work topic. We're actually going to be picking those documents up that are now in the set of those needing revision, and we will be completing that task over time here. So we're going to be prioritizing that work relative to what's really important right now. So you'll see more of that as we go forward here over the next year. Thank you.

PATRIK FALSTROM: There is another question.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Hi. Asha Hemrajani, outgoing ICANN Board. I wanted to ask about the analysis of WannaCry and Conficker. I think that's really important. I know a lot of small to medium enterprises that were badly hit. But I wanted to understand, what's the timeframe that you are planning for this analysis? Given that by

the time you do it, the next two or three big threats might be along the way and may have hit us.

PATRIK FALSTROM: I'm happy to let Benedict talk on this topic, but let me be a little bit more precise here. This list, current work in progress, are things that we have started to work on. This list, are just topics of interest we're watching. We have not started any, and we have not initiated any work on these issues. That said, Benedict, maybe you can say a little bit about that.

BENEDICT ADDIS: Thanks for the question. So this is some work that's been proposed by one of our members who's not here, Danny McPherson. My understanding is, it's not that -- and there's a good deal of excellent work and research out there looking at the immediate aftermath of WannaCry. And what they're looking at is something slightly different, which is the systemic risks around WannaCry and future risk caused by unresolved compromises lasting over the last 10 years.

So we are certainly not proposing if this work goes ahead, to provide a tactical follow-up to that, but more in some advice to the community about the potential risk of lots of uncleaned up

headless compromises and botnets that have now accreted over the last 10 years. Does that answer your question? Thank you.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Thank you very much. So what I would like to do now is something -- let's see where we are. Thank you very much. But I would like to give very special thank you, one special thank you to Julie. Can you come, please? It is the case that we have had this excellent staff person, Julie Hedlund, that at the end of the year will not work so much for us anymore. So we will lose one of our best staff members. Thank you very much, Julie, for everything you've done for us.

JULIE HEDLUND: Well, don't worry, you won't get rid of me that easily. I'm not going to disappear with a puff of smoke. No, it's a great pleasure working with the SSAC, and I've done so now for, I think, close to nine years. It's not that I've gotten tired of the group, it's just time to do something a little different.

So I'll be working a little bit more with the gNSO, but still you will definitely see me around the SSAC. They've got a lot of important work coming up and so all of us support staff are going to make sure they're well taken care of. But still, I've really, really enjoyed my run with the SSAC and I'm sorry, at

some point, it will end, but it's been a wonderful, wonderful time. Thank you all.

JULIE HAMMER: And there's no truth in the rumor that Julie got tired of hearing, "Which Julie?"

PATRIK FALSTROM: Yeah, we are looking at name collision. It's here. It's serious for us. So over to you. Ram.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, Patrik. This is Ram Mohan. Among the things that I do with the SSAC is that I'm a member of the administrative committee of the SSAC. And this year the SSAC is going through a leadership transition. As you heard, Rod Rasmussen is coming in as the new chair, and Julie Hedlund is the new vice-chair. Sorry, Julie Hammer as the last vice-chair.

JULIE HAMMER: Which Julie?

RAM MOHAN: Immediately giving credence to what Julie just said. But it just so happens -- Lyman and I were chatting -- it just so happens that this is the last public session where Patrik is going to preside as our chair. And I just wanted to say Patrik has really transformed the SSAC in his term and has been just a phenomenal force for good. I wanted for all of us to thank you, Patrik, and to say well done. We know that you're not done. You're going to be here at least through December as our chair and onwards as an SSAC member, but this is the last public forum. So thank you very much.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Thank you very much. Yes, I will not disappear either. I will actually go back and start the real work as an SSAC member. So thank you for that. Lyman?

LYMAN CHAPIN: In the spirit of making it an almost clean-sweep of the admin committee, we have another colleague who will be leaving his position at the end of the year. Jim Galvin has been vice-chair of SSAC since 2011, and is one of the original members of SSAC going back to its formation in 2002. And we're very glad that, although he's leaving the vice-chair position, he will not be leaving SSAC.

I think Patrik would agree that, although it's the chair of the AC who is in the limelight, to the extent that anything that shines at ICANN can be considered limelight, it's the vice-chair who ends up doing an awful lot of the work. And in the case of Jim, the entire committee has been extremely fortunate to have someone so talented, willing to do so much really high-quality work in what amounts to a shadow. And I think we are all extremely grateful for that.

And I'm personally grateful that, again, he'll be staying as a member of SSAC, although no longer as vice-chair. Thank you very much, Jim, for a long tenure of service of vice-chair, and I look forward to working with you as an SSAC member in the future.

JIM GALVIN:

Thank you, Lyman. I very much appreciate the acknowledgment and recognition. It's truly an honor to work with everyone here. I mean, the group of folks on SSAC are truly exceptional people. And very pleased to be stepping down and back into being an ordinary member and looking forward to it. So thanks again, and thanks to everyone.

PATRIK FALSTROM: One thing that you should know that actually Jim is completely responsible for is to ensure that we in SSAC do have really, really good members. Because one thing that he was been doing during the years is to run the membership committee and make sure that good members are appointed, and keep the high quality of the discussions that we are having within SSAC. So that's one example of one of the tasks that I have not had to do anything with. Jim has taken care of all of that, just as one example. So thank you, Jim. Thank you very much for everything you've done.

So with that, I call the meeting to an end and thank you very much. See you at the next meeting as a normal SSAC member. Congratulations, Rod, for taking over. The meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]