

**Transcription ICANN Los Angeles
SSAC Update to the Council meeting
Saturday 11 October 2014**

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/calendar/#oct>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

(David): Yes, all right. Yes. It's ready to go? Okay so I'd like to welcome (Patrick) and Jim from Security and Stability Advisory Committee. You have a brief presentation to go so I'll hand it over to (Patrick).

(Patrick): Thank you very much and thank you for once again for allowing us to visit you and talk - bring you up to date on what we have been dealing with since the last meeting, next slide please.

So as you see this is the actual presentation material you have got is actually the material that we will use on our public meeting on Thursday and that's why you see the timing here.

Now we have a - we've got I think - was it 15 or 30 minutes together with you? And you see that this doesn't really fit, okay. It's like having 45 in a shoe size and you get a pair of 36 and they say please, do some tango. It doesn't work.

So what we will do here is that I'll go - we'll go through quite quickly what SSAC is for people that are not aware of what we're doing and then it's up to you on what we should discuss. My guess - given that what we've been discussing earlier - I've been sitting here for the last hour and a half to two hours and listened to what you've been talking about.

My guess is that you're interested in what we have been doing with the (unintelligible) functions to translation because we have produced a couple of background documents that might be of interest to you but we'll see. Maybe

you're not interested in that topic. Who knows? So but I want to - for you to give an input, next slide please and next slide again. Thank you very much.

So we were initiated in 2001 and began operation in 2002. And we do guidance and to - not only ICANN board but also other supporting organizations and advisory committees, staff and the general community.

We base our work on either direct questions from other entities but also findings that - the issues that we find ourselves. We have been working on domain name locking. We have been working on certificate issues and a few other things.

I reach out to you here that in the work that you're doing in GNSO and I'm working with the people in your leadership where I have requested quite explicitly that I want you and your PDPs to actually send us questions as early as possible because it takes us approximately six months or something to actually be able to respond thoroughly and detailed on various issues.

So if it is the case that you run something - specifically if you do it in your PDP, that you expect SSAC to say actually something about let us know. And the more precise question you ask the easier our work task is.

What has happened is that myself and Jim, we were actually reappointed as chairs for another three year term a couple weeks ago. They didn't want to get rid of us, the other SSAC members. So we are continuing. And we have today 40 - 4-0 members that are appointed by ICANN board for three year terms, next slide please.

So what we have done recently is since London we have published SAC 67, which is an overview and history of the IANA function, doesn't contain any recommendations. It's just a description of what IANA is.

We actually - we're ready today - two hours ago, ready with the next document SAC 68 and that's why it's not on the slide where we've done the

same kind of - similar kind of description of the contract between NTIA and ICANN. And we actually - I do have some material on that document.

It is in the queue of being actually published and made available. So you cannot see it yet on the ICANN website but we'll go through the content.

Then a little bit further back in time we - we're looking at the name space collision issues, denial of service attacks using the DNS infrastructure, and then some issues from search list processing. The search list processing and name space collisions might be interesting because we have the last couple of weeks had a couple of collisions exactly the way we anticipated with some of the new gTLDs.

So kind of interesting for us to see that, yes, not a surprise but we had a couple of incidents. Things happen exactly as we thought. All of us in the community not only us in SSAC, next slide please.

So the question now is whether you want me to go through these IANA stewardship translation issues and if I just see some nodding or some - if that's what you want us to do then I'll just move forward. Any questions so far? Please.

Man: I'm actually more interested in the name collision examples that you've caught in the wild. If no one else is then I'll withdraw.

Man: Any - yes, there's several people interested in name collision that you - yes, quite a lot, absolutely.

Man: We were told that it could be - I'm just editorializing here. We were told it could be the end of the world and we were told it was nothing. It sounds like it's neither of those. It's something but it's not the end of the world.

(Patrick): Okay let me explain what happened. I don't have any slide material on that but let me explain where we are from our perspective. So it was expected

given earlier SAC reports and also the JAS reports, it - and by looking at - specifically the traffic to the room name servers we could detect that certain applied force strings were obviously used in the wild.

And that implies that when those TLDs were actually allocated and existing in the root zone they would get positive responses referring to whatever - whatever is actually the name server for the domain in question, which means that instead of getting an NX domain - no such domain response from DNS it would actually get an A record when clearing for it.

The result of - the board made the decision based on the JAS report and advice from SSAC and that was implemented for the strings that were identified earlier to actually be out in the wild.

So for example it was requested for some registries to respond with the 127.0.53.53 as the IP address for all queries for those new gTLDs.

What happened was that when some of the gTLDs were actually added to the root zone specifically the .PROD - P-R-O-D, that actually did create an issue in a couple of organizations that actually were using .PROD internally.

It created quite a great disturbance in their operations, which basically meant that they lost contact with some of their internal systems. It's a combination of using that TLD internally. They use search list processing and other things that - for example SSAC wrote in our report that using search list for your internal operation as like not a good thing.

But of course the problem with name space collisions as SSAC has pointed out is not that people within our community know that there are new gTLDs. The problem is that we have parties out there that we've not been able to reach out to.

So these entities - organizations were hot. They had to rework that - rework their internal systems. When I personally have been contacted by these

organizations I recommended them to use exactly the process that ICANN has been using.

And as far as I've seen personally the processes that ICANN has laid out that were going to be used were used. And we still have sort of - we're setting here. The Internet seems to still work. Okay.

Whether these issues will actually result in SSAC having a look at this again or whether ICANN will do that is something that is unclear, not decided on. But in anyway this is where we are.

Man: Just to put a cap on that, the headline is name collision is real. It happened. We follow the script that was recommended in the SSAC report and it was resolved.

(Patrick): What was implemented was not what was in the SSAC report. What was implemented was what was in the board decision, which is based on primarily the JAS report because there was some differences between SSAC and JAS.

Man: I'm sorry, that's correct, the JAS report that's translated. So that's huge. That's a good win.

(Patrick): I don't want to put any - I just want to be very explicit here and say that from SSAC's perspective, my perspective, we are not prone to say whether this is a good win or not because, of course, I say we are still sitting here, the lights are still turned on, etc.

But for these organizations it was quite significant. So from their perspective, of course, I think - I don't want to put any value judgment in their thinking but of course it depends on how you measure.

My point is as far as I know they haven't been in a measurement yet by anyone to say whether it was sort of a success or not. I just want to let

everyone know that. So I want to be - to stay neutral on evaluation of the judgment of the situation.

Man: That's fair. I just think it's fascinating we had an actual real world test of the procedure that was developed.

(Patrick): That is correct. We had at least two quite large enterprises in the world that were hit quite heavily by a name space collision, yes.

(David): Do we have any other requests for topics from the council side or the GNSO side? Or do you have other things you want to carry on then and talk to us about?

(Patrick): Yes, I'd actually like to go - if you go forward one - okay, sorry, we're on the right slide here. Let me talk a little bit about IANA, what we've done regarding - related to IANA issues. Specifically some of the slides is in this document that's not yet published but it's public, weird combination.

So you know the background on that, NTIA announced this March 14 and you have talked this quite a lot earlier today, next slide please.

So we have been looking at what is actually meant by IANA and the first thing we're looking at is that the - identifying that different entities mean different things with the term IANA. And if we move forward one more slide, thank you.

So these are at least - these are some of the various definitions of IANA that we have found from SSAC. And the cause of this it's quite important when talking about IANA that we instead of agree on what we're talking about before we are - there are quite a lot of disagreements on content which actually are based on a misunderstanding or non-agreement of what is meant by it when people use the term IANA.

So we have the DNS root zone management that IANA is working with, infinite number registry management, protocol parameter registries, including

the dot (unintelligible) TLD, the .INT top level domain, and a few other things, next slide please.

So SAC 67 was published on August 15 and it tries to describe the various activities which are defined in the IANA function's contract and it's trying to explain what the IANA function actually is because it's quite a large number of things than just domain names.

What is also important to know is that SAC 67 and that - this fits to SAC 68 which was publish - which was ready today is that SAC 67 is talking about what the IANA function is implementing, which is broader than the contract with NTIA, between NTIA and ICANN, okay, while SSAC 68 is looking at what's really based on the contract itself, next slide please. Yes?

Man: Ask this question, it's broader than what it's in the contract within NTIA because also doing functions (unintelligible). Are you or -

(Patrick): No, because IANA has - ICANN as IANA functions operator has taken more tasks than what is in the contract. The ITF protocol parameters are part of the contract.

Man: So essentially voluntarily.

(Patrick): Yes, for example, IANA is currently maintaining the time zone database for example as one of these things. It's also the case that ICANN has actually requested IANA to take care of (IDM) parameters what I think is called - anyways it's a registry that IANA is holding for (unintelligible) (IDM) characters, and that's also not part of the contract. Let's see.

Okay, so what we are also doing in this document is that we're also looking at the role that the - sorry. This is now the document that we finished today which actually is - it's actually named SAC 68. It's the SSAC report on IANA functions contract.

In this report we are looking at explicitly the contract itself, that's the first thing. And the second thing is that we're looking at what role NTIA currently plays with respect to the various functions covered by the contract. And of course, to be able to really understand it you need to also look at SAC - the previous document, SSAC 67.

One of the reasons why we decided that to make this document explicitly is that if we look at the actual contract itself it's actually - like, if I remember correctly 380 pages. And I don't think many people in this room has actually read the contract. We have, okay.

And so if that's actually the case that some of the reasons why we've been looking at this is also that there are some consistency issues like it always is in the 380 page document or something like that - or 300-something, next slide please.

So what we are trying to look at is, for example, is all the values functions which are covered by the contract that IANA is fulfilling, for example roots on management, infinite domain registry management, protocol parameters.

And then we're looking at who are the involved parties and also for each one of them we're looking at what role NTIA has. And what we - so you see here as an example which we have created for some of these things where we're looking at what - who is actually doing what for each one of the things that are carried by contract, next slide please.

So the interesting part has to do with the root zone management because our finding by investigating the contract is that this is the only place where NTIA actually do have some kind of active role.

And the active role that NTIA has is that they are part of the authorization chain - part of the path for authorization for changes in the root zone. And so this is - the action root zone management is sort of a triangular relationship

between IANA, a functions operator ICANN, the root zone maintainer which is VeriSign, and the administrator which is NTIA, next slide please.

So that's that document. We're also working on a third document that we are - that will be published in not so long time. Actually we have done quite a lot of progress the last couple of weeks where we in SSAC - compared to the first two documents where we are trying to describe the situation where we actually go and try to make recommendations.

And the recommendations will hopefully be something that can be received by the community and applied to the current or open RFP that's the coordination group for the (unintelligible) translation has issued. Any questions?

Man: I think we'll look forward to that document.

(Patrick): It is in the queue to be published, SAC 68. I have actually sent a copy to all the SO and AC chairs. So the gentleman that just left the room actually does the version of the document in his mailbox and I don't know what principles you have on distributing that. It's up to you on how you do that but it's absolutely okay to redistribute it.

Man: I do have a question, (Patrick). In 67 you talk about functions. In 68 you probably get closer to analyzing (unintelligible). Now you say you're going to make recommendations on the principles. The principles are going to be about procedures or about the boxes? I don't know - or what should we expect in terms of principles for the third document?

(Patrick): Some of the principles we talked about already in London and they include things, for example, that we in SSAC from a security and stability point, we have a couple of postures that we think is important.

For example the existence of a policy development process that develops the policy that is handed over to a policy implementer. So that's how we view the

- for example the PDP that's hosted here in GNSO, which is gTLD related. You develop a policy that is then handed over to IANA as the policy implementer.

So to be able to ensure that the implementation of the policy by the policy implementer to make sure that that is stable and robust, there are certain characteristics that should be applied to the design of that system containing policy implementers and policy development process. And also to some degree the policy itself must include certain elements and be written in a certain way.

For a certain example it is a possible to audit the policy implementer because the big question is how is it with the accountability, okay, and no one really knows unless you can actually measure and come up with SLAs for the policy implementer.

How do you know whether the policy implementer is actually doing what they're supposed to do? Well, the starting process is actually to have a clear enough policy so you don't disagree on whether the implementer IANA has been doing the right thing based on an unclear policy.

So those kind of sort of - it sounds like motherhood and apple pie but we felt from SSAC that it's pretty important that someone just write these things down as a checklist, let's put it that way.

Man: And in that process you might the solve the policy versus implementation conundrum forever.

(Patrick): Well, we're not going to solve it but what we are going to say hopefully is to say you developed a policy, you should try to make clear what in the policy are objective and what are subjective decisions, and you have to make sure that you know when - during the development process of the policy, who is going to make what decisions? What is the (unintelligible) chain? How do you do disagree? How do you handle disagreements, et cetera?

(David): Do we have any further questions, particular on the IANA related documents?
Yes?

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Steve DelBianco with the BC. And (Patrick), you started to touch on the fact there at the end in analyzing principles you don't look just at the black letters of what NTIA does, that you think about implications about what could happen.

And I think that's very close to what the BC recommended when we came up with about a dozen stress tests, mostly with respect to the ICANN accountability but four of them were really specifically focused on the IANA naming functions management.

So I'll send you a copy of that too as you develop these principles on advisory on that to see if looking ahead how would this new structure handle a hypothetical but plausible stress test scenario.

(Patrick): Yes, that is appreciated. Thank you very much. I'd like to give the microphone to Jim Galvin, the Vice Chair of SSAC because he also - another topic that might be interesting to you, talk you talk about.

Jim Galvin: Yes, so actually I think if go forward a couple of slides there's a new work item slide and next again. No, go forward, new work parties and again. Okay, so right there.

I just wanted to call out a particular work item here. I know that the GNSO has a work item and a working group that's in progress here which is related to something that SSAC is also going to undertake here and we're starting this work now. This new gTLD is the mid-course correction collision timing of next round.

So SSAC is going to undertake to also do a review of the recent gTLD program and this round of launches and such, all the recommendations that

have come out over the last couple of years and a look at the actions that have taken as a result of those recommendations and put together essentially a - well, exactly what we're going to do is still being decided to be honest with you.

But we do want to look at what's happened and then consider if we have a point of view and a perspective to offer to the community about security and stability as it relates to the gTLD program that's occurred so this will also encompass name collisions again, you know, consider the question of should the actions that we're taking today continue or not continue.

And if they should, what are the questions that should be considered as part of making that decision. I just wanted to call that out since, you know, that work is also being undertaken here so we just should be aware of that with each other.

It's also a motivation for - as the GNSO work continues if you have particular questions then there's additional opportunity for you to ask particular questions at SSAC. If you would like specific input, you know, send that question over to us and ask for comments about issues as you find them yourselves - you want considered.

And hopefully we expect that sometime next year, you know, as we charter this work party now ourselves, even that process is only just undertaking but hopefully we'll have a work product that will be available to your group -before the group initiatives and so the timing should be pretty good in that respect, thank you.

(David): Do we have any more questions or should we let (Patrick) and Jim go? All right, thank you very much, very informative as always. We'll just bring that item to a close. Let me know when the recording stopped and started. We'll begin on the next item which - actually which order did we put it in?