
ICANN78 | Prep Week – ccNSO Technical Working Group
Sunday, October 22, 2023 – 3:00 to 4:00 HAM

SUSIE JOHNSON: Hello, and welcome to the ccNSO Technical Working Group at ICANN78. My name is Susie. And I, along with Kim, are the remote participation managers for this session.

Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form, as noted in the chat. We will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of this session. If you would like to ask your questions or make your comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record, and speak clearly at a responsible pace. Mute your microphone when you are done speaking.

This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note, this transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the real-time transcription, click on the Closed Caption button in the Zoom bar.

To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multistakeholder model, we ask that you sign in to Zoom sessions using your full name. For example, a first name and last name or surname. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name.

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.

With that, I will hand the floor over to Eberhard. Thank you.

EBERHARD LISSE:

Okay, welcome. My name is Eberhard Lisse. I'm the ccTLD manager for .na and the chair of the Technology Working Group. I used to be a gynecologist, but I retired two weeks ago, so I have more time for this now. And this is not Tech Day. This is the face-to-face of the Technical Working Group, which is technically a closed session, but everybody is welcome to be bored and remain here. This is booked for an hour, and after half an hour or so, we share this with another working group which will be closed. So after that, you will be asked to leave unless you are part of this particular work group. So, just, you know.

I would like to go through the agenda of tomorrow's Tech Day. Can you advance the next slide? As usual, I do a few minutes of opening remarks. Then we have some research from Maciej Korczynski about the resilient whitelist, again focused on DNS abuse. Then we have got something about Authoritative ID, automated ID checking and so from .se. I haven't met the speaker yet, but one of our members on the group, Cristian, is a member of .se, so that works.

Then we have the host presentation. Then, unfortunately, we have to abide by mandatory breaks, which makes generation of the schedule sometimes a bit problematic because some speakers need 20. Some speakers need 30 minutes. And if you've got 75 minutes for a session, it's sometimes difficult to fiddle with this. But in the end, we are doing it so long with breaks now that I have given up fighting about it.

Then .eu will, again, show a little bit about artificial intelligence and looking at the registrations. Then I think this is the Dutch registrar. Theo Geurts will talk about abuse monitoring on the registrar side, which I think is a good thing because many of us are registries, but some registrars have also some methods of weeding this out which makes the work a little bit less for us.

Then we will have something about a time to live extension on EPP. I haven't really figured this one out yet, but we'll hear about it. Then Peter Thomassen will speak about DS records, some measurements he did. Next slide.

And that leads into a presentation about an SSAC draft about automated DS records, which the draft is circulating. So he's going to present it so that whoever wants to give public comments will not only be able to read it, but also can hear from some knowledgeable people about it, what they think about it.

Then PCH will give us a presentation on how they do DNSSEC. They use hardware [signing] modules, HSMs. And I must confess that we are a satisfied non-paying customer of theirs, for full disclosure. But I felt it's always good to hear how big entities do their DNSSEC. I know that Nominet, for example, does it with secure laptops. So I've asked them if they have a chance of doing this or are interested of doing this on a future meeting to see how it is done in a secure manner.

.tr has deployed DNSSEC, so they will report their experiences. I always like to hear from implementers of switches to DNSSEC—what worked, what didn't work, and what we can learn from this. As you know, I also like to hear from failures. We had a failure of ourselves in .na in October

last year. So I presented this previously that this doesn't happen to somebody else, or if it happens, they know what to do.

Then we have another break. And then this is from ISDN from the Dutch Registry. They also have got some automated checking for registrant data. Sorry, I got the flu, but COVID was negative.

And then Jaromir Talir from .cz will give us an update on FRED. They have made new developments. They also have something that I'm interested in: a command line tool for EPP, which I couldn't get to work on the Mac yet. But they don't use many Macs at that registry, so there's lack of opportunity to figure out what goes wrong. We will work on that. It would be good for me to get it to work, but also for them to have it to be able to offer it.

And then we need to volunteer for the closing remarks. I am looking at you there. You haven't done this before.

NICKLAS POUSETTE: I can do it.

EBERHARD LISSE: So you have been volunteered. Excellent. And that's about it. Anything from the floor? Going, going, gone. Stephen has his hand raised. Stephen Deerhake.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Eberhard. What's it looking like for papers for Puerto Rico?

EBERHARD LISSE:

I have got one for tomorrow in abeyance if one of those presenters were to drop out unexpectedly. Jeffrey Bedser has one on standby, and he has the slides here in case. I'm starting to think it's a good idea to have one in reserve. And for Puerto Rico, if he can't present now, then we have the usual procedure that we then offer them a rain check to the following meeting.

Then Phil Regnauld, who used to be with the Network Startup Resource Center who is now in DNS-OARC, has proposed a topic.

And then the Indonesians had a topic that I found very interesting for how to switch their DNSSEC from different name server setups. But they changed the topic. They didn't say they don't have enough data, and then they changed to a totally different topic, which we in the group felt—or, no. We didn't have a formal vote. We never really have formal votes, but there was more than one or two persons voicing opposition, so we used this open spot to complete the agenda. But I told them very clearly if they want to present it on one of the next Tech Days, basically, they have a spot. And if they can't make it, we have had virtual presenters before. I have managed it [inaudible] remotely while it was in person.

So I feel very strongly that people who have offered and where we would have taken the topic and we had to cancel it for whatever reason, that we then offer them a chance to do it at their convenience. The next Asian meeting is coming up eventually anyway, so if they want to postpone until then, I would do that. But I want nobody having the real feeling that we're not supporting them, especially in smaller and developing countries.

Jacques Latour.

JACQUES LATOUR: So the question is, for this meeting, some members have expressed concerns over the content of some presentations. So that's kind of curation. So we had a stance of not doing any content curation/validation. Now we have some, so maybe it would be good to have a one-pager on what our operation mode is for the group and what the tactic, strategy, or the protocol is to accept or not accept presentations to move it up one layer of maturity.

EBERHARD LISSE: What we've done so far is that we circulate a request for presentations, and then they are sent either to me or to the list. But I'd always say they must be sent to the list. If they're sent only to me, I copy the list in. And then what we usually do is if there is significant opposition, we don't take it. If there is more than one or two—if somebody says, "I want it. I want it"—like, if you said it's interesting and one of the other guys says it's interesting, then we usually take it. It implies that there is no opposition. And that's basically how we've done this in the past.

JACQUES LATOUR: Yeah. So I guess the observation is: it's first come, first serve, first accepted. And the agenda is built first [and approved], I guess?

EBERHARD LISSE: We have very rarely a situation where we had to choose between topics.

JACQUES LATOUR: Yeah.

EBERHARD LISSE: If that situation occurs, then, of course, it goes to the group to decide. Usually, it happens [up until] a week before that we need to fill the agenda. That's usually one spot open. And then sometimes we get—but if we have more presentations than slots, that's something that the group must decide. And I also said so far it has worked out if there is significant opposition or if there is significant propositions, that we then do it like this.

But I'd like to have a consensus in the group, and I think that works out reasonably well. But you're quite right. I can put this in an email to the internal list.

JACQUES LATOUR: So we have a backlog of presentations for the next ICANN meeting?

EBERHARD LISSE: Not backlog. Phil Regnauld approached us last week and said, "It's a bit late. If not, can I do it for next week?" So it's not confirmed, but I put it on my list so that we don't forget. And then if we like the topic, unless there is significant opposition, or especially if there is significant proposition, then we'll take it. If there is not, then—and if there is more papers than we can accommodate, then the group must decide. I'm not going to have any—not much say in that because then it should go to the experts from a technical level to say, "This is what we want."

JACQUES LATOUR: Okay. So I think what I'm saying is we have two modes of operation. Either the presentation comes in and we approve right away, or in the call for presentation, we set a target date of, let's say, a month before the ICANN meeting. At that point, we let the presenter know which ones are accepted or not. And then we pick and choose from the list and build the agenda from there. The DNSSEC workshop operates that way.

EBERHARD LISSE: I'm a little bit worried that this doesn't work like this because we live exclusively off the work of people who come there. So often, if you tell them a month before, then you have only half of the slots filled. So we must find an intermediate way so that we decide what we absolutely want, what we absolutely don't want. And then we'll see that if there is spots left, that we fill it with interesting stuff. That's how—

JACQUES LATOUR: Yeah.

EBERHARD LISSE: —we've done it for the last 50 meetings, and I think it has worked reasonably well.

JACQUES LATOUR: Because it might be a factor of our success. We're getting more and more people that want to present. Okay. That's good for now.

EBERHARD LISSE: If we are starting to get more, as I said, if we have more than we can accommodate on one particular meeting, then we have to make hard choices. So far, we have been able to avoid that, and I would like to. But if we have got 10 slots and we've got 15 presentations, then we have to choose which one we take. And we have to tell people, "We would like to take you on a subsequent meeting, but we don't have the slots."

NICKLAS POUSETTE: Is there a need for a more formal process of quality assuring the presentations [inaudible] for this group?

EBERHARD LISSE: That is for the group to decide. The problem is, so far it worked out if there is significant opposition, I would say. Not consensus, but significant opposition to a certain topic. We had this one topic which was switched on the last moment and which then was more policy than admin. Then we said, "No, we don't want it."

NICKLAS POUSETTE: What I'm thinking of is helping the presenters to do their presentation in a clear and structured way, like doing a review of the content, not the topic.

EBERHARD LISSE: Jacques.

JACQUES LATOUR: Yeah. That's how DNS-OARC does it. They have a maturity level 5 program for presentation. We're not level 0. I agree with you. We need a little bit more validation. So I think the abstract that the presenter wants to do needs to be of good quality enough to understand what the presentation is all about. Some are one sentence, but maybe we need a little bit more on the outline but not too much.

EBERHARD LISSE: I think that's a good idea. So we will put in the draft requests for presentations that are circulated before I publish it that we want an abstract of 10-15 lines. Not much less, not much more. And we don't want it as an attachment in PDF. We want to have it in emails so it is easy to read.

We must also appreciate that some presenters are not native English speakers. Now, for them, it's often very difficult to make the presentations, and we have had very good presentations that were very poorly presented.

JACQUES LATOUR: So part of the call for presentation, we should ask the presenter to give the outline in their own language? And then we will figure out the translation and all of that?

EBERHARD LISSE: No. We must be careful that we don't judge the presentation on the English skills, or the abstract on the English skills. That's what I'm trying to say.

BRETT CARR: Jacques said their own language, not—

EBERHARD LISSE: No. We want to abstract in English so that we don't have to translate anything. But some presenters struggle a little bit with English, so we must be a little bit accommodating on that.

JACQUES LATOUR: So do we know in advance when we have translation services? Like, Puerto Rico. Do we have that or not? I guess that's a Kim question.

EBERHARD LISSE: At Tech Day, I think we always have, now, translation services. Kim, what can you tell me about this?

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Hi, everyone. There is interpretation for Tech Day now in English, French, Spanish, and Arabic. Thanks.

BRETT CARR: But I think the question is: is the translation abilities available in advance so if we get abstracts in a foreign language, we can get somebody to translate that for us?

EBERHARD LISSE: I don't think we want abstracts in foreign language. We can always use DeepL, but it doesn't give you a good thing. And it's a technical thing.

The technical documents, the RFCs are all written in English, so a minimum level of English is required. We must just be careful that we don't kick somebody out because the English is a little bit difficult.

Jiankang from China has made excellent presentations which were just difficult to follow because his English wasn't very good. His verbal English wasn't very good, but the content was excellent. So we must just be a little bit careful on that.

BRETT CARR:

[inaudible]. In the areas where I've worked reviewing presentations in the past, the level of English in the abstract of people explaining what they actually want to present about isn't usually a problem. So I don't think there's a problem there.

I do think, however, Jacques, that I agree with you. Having worked in the DNS-OARC Program Committee [and here], there is a chasm and difference in a way that we are reviewing and operating and working out what we want to be in Tech Day. So I think notching things up a level is not a bad thing to do. How we actually do that is another matter. I do wonder if maybe we should have a call to discuss the drafts like the [programs in DNS-OARC] do.

EBERHARD LISSE:

Yeah. That's no problem. Zoom is trivial to organize. I've got a license. We don't even need to go through the ICANN license, but they will offer support. That's just not [a problem] [inaudible].

So we could maybe set up a soft deadline by which we want to have some presentations and then discuss the ranking order, especially if there is some opposition on the list or some proposition on the list.

So far, I think the selection worked reasonably well. There is not a large number of presentations that we reject. So it's [really not] 50 applicants for 10 spots. If that was the case, I would be much less resistant than I am now. But we can always try to, when we've discussed it on the list, set a date. And then we'll discuss it verbally.

JACQUES LATOUR: I'm just thinking outside the box here. Could ICANN provide us—I am looking at you—a platform like Indigo to put together the agendas? I know you have a super elaborate, automated system for agenda building and everything, but—

BRETT CARR: You could do something basic in Confluence. Right?

JACQUES LATOUR: Yeah.

BRETT CARR: There's an ICANN Wiki, so I'm sure we could make the ICANN Wiki work. I think Indigo's a little too much, basically.

JACQUES LATOUR: Too much? That's too advanced? Yeah.

BRETT CARR: Yeah.

JACQUES LATOUR: So a Confluence—

BRETT CARR: Just make a Confluence page and put the presentations there [inaudible].

JACQUES LATOUR: For us, for the Standing Committee.

BRETT CARR: Yeah.

JACQUES LATOUR: "We have a page. Here's a topic that we're looking at so far." Because going through the email, it's confusing to see what's in the hopper or not for the next [Tech]—

BRETT CARR: Yeah. I completely agree. If we have a Wiki page with the presentations in where we can put comments in—

JACQUES LATOUR: Yeah [inaudible]—

BRETT CARR: And then when we have the call, we just review what's in the page and the comments.

JACQUES LATOUR: I like that. I think that will just give us some visibility on the one we're thinking or not thinking.

BRETT CARR: Sure.

EBERHARD LISSE: As I said, I have now a little bit more time, having retired.

[JACQUES LATOUR]: Oh, yes.

EBERHARD LISSE: Yeah. So I'm not opposed to learning new things, and that would be something interesting. So we'll speak with Kim and with the staff and see what we can do to set up that we can maybe then operated that page: put the topics in and then make comments on that. On the other hand, I don't want internal comments to be visible to external. We must figure this out.

JACQUES LATOUR: For sure. In the ICANN Wiki, we can have our committee page close to us, and then we can manage the [inaudible]. That would go a long way. Yeah.

EBERHARD LISSE: I see Bart nodding in principle.

BART BOSWINKEL: I was thinking what you do—I'm looking at Kimberly now—what you do with the Repository Subgroup. Something like this rating system to effectively look at various submissions to be included in a library, whether it's a library of presentations really doesn't matter. But then all the members can put in their votes and then have a chat about what they do not like.

But this is—I think it was a Google Form. It's a Google Form. The upside of the Google Form is you can control access. Then it's limited to the Tech Working Group. If you do a Wiki space, at least the ones I know from ICANN, they are open, basically.

Kim.

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Yeah. It's actually a Google Sheet. And like Bart said, we can limit access. But there is a way, and I think Jacques knows this from SSAC, we can close the Wiki and just have access to members as well. So, really, up to the group on which mode they prefer.

JACQUES LATOUR: Absolutely. The ICANN Wiki can have access control just to us.

EBERHARD LISSE: I would prefer the ICANN Wiki to a outside agency.

BRETT CARR: Yep, I agree. Wiki is much better than Google Sheets, Google Docs.

EBERHARD LISSE: I'm not talking about quality. I don't want third parties involved in internal ICANN business.

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe you can present or circulate—not now—but, say, look at what you've built for the repository group to rate various things to include or not to include.

EBERHARD LISSE: So I'll draft, Jacques. And we'll talk to Kim, and we'll set something up. That should teach you for making proposals.

BRETT CARR: I'm happy to help [with all of you]—

[BART BOSWINKEL]: There you go.

BRETT CARR: —if you need help.

JACQUES LATOUR: I think it would make it easier for the committee to see what's our next presentation and everything because right now with email, it's difficult. This is a really good idea. Perfect.

EBERHARD LISSE: Good. Let's do that. Is there anything else from the floor? Then I'll call this meeting to a close, and you can stop the recording, Kim.

And now, everybody who is not—

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]