ICANN Dakar Meeting
Stability and Security and Resilience review team - TRANSCRIPTION
Sunday 23rd October 2011 at 18:15 local

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.

Man: We will reconvene now with what's written up on the screen which is Stability, Security and Resilience, the review team on that. So please take your seats we'll start that now. Thank you very much.

Coordinator: Recordings have started.

Man: So welcome everyone. This is the second to last session of the day for the GNSO weekend sessions. This is a session on Stability, Security and Resilience.

And we are going to have a presentation by Alejandro Pisanty in just a minute on this, so just bear with us please. Alex?

Alejandro Pisanty: Hello, this is Alejandro Pisanty checking sound. Do the people in the foreign, in the remote connections hear us? Do we have a check on that? No way to check? Thank you.

Good afternoon, my name is Alejandro Pisanty. I'm here representing the review team for Stability, Security and Resilience of the GNS function of ICANN mandated by the affirmation of commitments.

I'm proud to be the chair of this team because it has extraordinary people doing great work. We are blessed with some really good response from the community when needed and from ICANN staff.

We've been doing a lot work for some time; I'm going to report on that. I'm going to try to go through our report briefly, so there's time for questions and assessment of the status. And I will be really thankful for the feedback we can get so that we can improve and complete our work well.

I'll also quick history of this review team. You know that these review teams are formed under the Affirmation of Commitment. We take this work and the team very seriously because we know its substituting for the former supervision of the U.S. Government.

There's a checklist of things that I should be doing under the MOUs and other potentially instrument that existed before the Affirmation of Commitment. We wanted to prove the multi-stakeholder model in its deepest sense.

And, therefore, we are particularly keen to do this work well. This also means that we do it with lots of consultation with our community. Want to make sure that everything in the statement has been vested for validity, for response, for feedback, hopefully also for consensus.

But we also are not afraid of reporting descent. There will be some. The team was formed about these dates a year ago. We met physically first in (Carpahana) meeting on December - around December 5 last year.

We organized to get started in San Francisco - San Francisco meeting we reorganized in a more streamlined manner. I mean initially we only had a very general expiration and a chair and a vice chair.

In San Francisco we divided the work into three layers. One of which is what the rule base for stability, security and resilience for which ICANN is

responsible? What is the policy development? And the third layer is mostly contingency.

In Singapore we set that work, we restructured for streamlining considering the different levels of a liability of the team members in time and hard task. They were actually more able or ready to do the structure of their availability whether, you know, its over weekends, once every four weeks or everyday and so forth.

So we created a core research and drafting team which is working very actively. And the rest of the review team reviews our documents and provides us valuable feedback and information in connections with the community quarterly conference.

We -- from this work we also have a small meeting of this core drafting team in D.C. - Washington, D.C. U.S. We made very detailed analysis of the work you have to do, we have in front of us we created and having front of us the structure of what we think the reports will look like.

The kind of significant findings which we should - at which we should arrive and made work breakdown structure. So that's enough for administrative. I told you twice how time goes in many ways.

The progress that you can report now to ourselves and to you is that we have been intensively gathering information putting together a library of documents and analyzing both documentary evidence and the results of interviews which are ongoing.

The matters at which we have been able to look and start drafting information analysis and in some cases conclusions which are on the way to recommendations are on the governance of the stability, security and resilience of the DNS function within ICANN. A very, very useful and frequent question in the ICANN world which is about scope.

The question less about the scope and the review of course which is always a question, but very significantly about the scope of ICANN's SSR Stability, etc. function exactly about what part of the DNS is ICANN responsible.

The way we split this which is also password down as well within the - within ICANN staff is that ICANN has some areas of direct responsibility. They're very obvious who would be running the L Server; there are a few others, the key findings, processes and so forth.

There are parts of work which ICANN has influence like what registrars or registries do. Of course, what the root servers do, they are not directly under ICANN's command but there's a way to search instruments there.

And then there's a huge area which installed in each individual computer rules for the DNS which is totally out of ICANN's scope. But on the other hand whatever bad that have happened there does reflect on ICANN recreate and a need for ICANN intervention.

So it posed mostly into ICANN's contingency planning. Together with this clarity of the remit to assess how ICANN is performing - it's security, stability, and resilience relate of stats. We're looking at how ICANN is organized and functions for this function --pardon the redundancy.

How document and that comes in terms of how plans are turned into action items. How the annual FSR plan or FSR framework has now become - is translated into individuals within ICANN stuff daily work.

How do you know who is responsible for something and how much work or budget or both go into that. We have found in the process also how project management (unintelligible) internal SSR team and how it's expressed to the organization.

In order again to know how these functions manage and to spot potential weaknesses for risks without entering micro-management or two fine reigns. We're looking at IANA who has extremely useful responses from IANA staff and are looking at more difficult matters there.

This includes managing risks like those risks that could come from the rabbet of the IANA function and with these factors we have been able to build a report frame work.

We'll be working very much on that during our meetings starting tomorrow and particularly on a Thursday which is our full day, you know, lease roll meeting.

An interesting thing that's been happening is that we have had -- I will really say a projected but useful and productive negotiation about what we need to see that would be known this close that's not for public consumption and how to deal with that.

The problem here as you well know is twofold first. If we go after some very important piece of information or something we think is very important for the review and it has to be told to us with only under non-disclosure conditions, then we actually are going to be very hampered and our hands our going to be tied to report on this.

So it could actually pretty bad to have access to very valuable information and tie with that limitation that you can know but you can steal and that would also bench an important value which is that our review would not easily be accountable nor transparent.

And we will rather like to be able, you know, if our review is reviewed or challenged to be able to show in most cases the actual sources of information where we got our opinions so they may be changed.

And the other thing that happens with the NDA is that it is too full, the second part is that several members of the team work for different corporations and these organizations, lawyers will not allow them to sign NDA with ICANN under different conditions.

One of them would require a mutual NDA another will require its own conditions and so forth. So, you know, let these legal stuck where it will be done before and we're trying to make sure that with openly available information we are able to triangulate around the confidential parts and still have candid and useful assessment.

We perceive -- we may be wrong -- but we perceive that during our discussions either by concurrence or by directing to some things have changed in the way ICANN presents manager SSR plans.

And we find there's actually more sympathy between ICANN staff approach and the review teams approach. Things like for example these three circles of influence and so forth.

There's -- we've been able to perform some very valuable interviews within and outside the known item community. But with DNS experts all along and particular last week while their work begins today during the DNS (unintelligible) with the help of a DNS events in Rome.

We are also asking one very important question which we got from the GNSO which is the importance of contract compliance and enforcement with the parties under contract and I apologize for not calling them contractors.

I would like them to be relaxed, but the parties and their contracts. And this was a question that came to us was a GNSO where we're trying to explore that in some depth.

So we have good discussions ongoing within the team and outside, a good library of recommendations and some of findings are ready in the library. What we hope to achieve this week and we we'll be very happy to - to accommodate your needs of time, place, etc. for this pieces of feedback and information from the GNSO council from GNSO members from GNSO plenary, whatever you need. I want to continue little interviews among the important things for this round of interviews are questions about community perception whether ICANN perceived itself as having assigned certain tasks.

The community's perception of ICANN is aligned with those. Or either there's some misalignment that can actually hurt ICANN's ability to perform each function.

Let's say if the community decides I will use an extreme example and just because Bill Manning is here so he can react. Let's assume that the root server community has the perception of ICANN's functions that's completely opposite to ICANN perception of its functions.

If that misalignment is really bad, it's going to be very hard for ICANN to do or cost something to happen in the root server community that's necessary for stability.

So that will be a stability factor, so we're looking for those community perception misalignments or alignments. And we're not looking for what is wrong. This is a technique called appreciative it's a very well-known assistance technique in change management.

And so we're looking for things that people think are right. We're not only looking for things people think are wrong. We don't want to report ICANN - we don't want to fail to report anything where ICANN is failing.

But it has to be understood together with whether -- with (Osfield) where ICANN is actually performing well and whether, you know, its ICANN as a whole ICANN this is our stuff, the council, CSO and so forth.

It's a whole systemic view that you have to report on. Second for these communities in particular, we were met as the review started with division of the ICANN board to remove from the (FFT) the function of creating and managing comprehensive risk framework for ICANN or for the DNS for ICANN.

(Unintelligible), as you well know ICANN has two concurrent ways of bifurcation. One of them is to transfer the function to a board committee from the SSAC to a board committee and the other things was the formation of a community originated grouping which is called a which DNS one in particular has a very significant control.

So we are assessing whether that's the best approach or, you know, how - what to recommend after electing this approach. And we have faced and are continuing to manage a number of questions related to the root servers which are key here.

And as you know many of the original very healthy arrangements for software diversity - operational diversity and so forth of the root server community which have actually served the internet and very well.

Its particularly with respect to stability and resilience besides security some of them have been challenged particularly by the GAC.

Particularly, the challenge made exclusively is that there's no contracts, no service letters, agreements, etc. with the whole of the community. So we're going in what people think there and what are, you know, what's good and what's may be subject to improvement.

So by the end of this week - by the end of Thursday, we'll hope to have a real outline of the draft report with all these components. We are getting information from ICANN staff at size peak on a number of things that we'll have through, have a lot of give and take about how to provide it in what form?

How to provide the most that's possible, that's useful without conditions and so forth. And we hope to get their October adjustments to the structure and functions of the team we need.

And the next phase that's breakdown he shall also report that both the GAC and the address supporting are going to cancel - canceled the meetings that we have scheduled with them for this week.

So we are trying to find a way to still get some views from them without necessarily these views being official or within the meeting that goes as official on the record, but at least get a sampling of their concerns in those comments.

So let the reports open to questions, challenges, critique, everything.

Man: Thanks Alejandro.

Alejandro Pisanty: I have to interrupt you. I want to express thanks to all the team particularly the drafting and research team which has been doing huge high-quality intense work, thinking and so forth, that's Simon McCalla, Jeff Brueggeman, (Martin Hanagan) together with us have been (Bailey Cate) and Bill Manning.

And the support from ICANN staff which also has been tireless and very generous, so sorry.

Man: Thank you very much. Are there any comments or questions?

Woman: I have a remote question from -- hold on one second -- I can't pronounce his name from (unintelligible) and he asked government has opened up IANA contract for open bidding this may be due process, but how would the risk through the IANA functions be handled if a private corporation or an association did support the IANA function as more than the past $6 million a year one way commitment?

If the use government has called for competitive bids, the government is legally bound to give fair and due consideration of the bids submitted, what happens if something unexpected happens during the bid evaluation process? What happens to the security and stability of the internet?

Alejandro Pisanty: Our response is that's a question that we have asked actively and are exploring actively as situation develops. These review teams are not charged with what happens on the internet.

They are only charged with a fee assessing how well ICANN is preserved to manage the risks around that situation and as I said it's part of our ongoing highest priority work.

And thanks for being so attentive, careful and clear in presenting that question.

Man: Thank you. Any further questions? In which case I will thank you very much for providing that update and just mention that we have a 15-minute DSSA update now.

Is Mikey giving that remotely? Mikey can you hear me?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I can and I am going to give it remotely. Do you want to drop the call and restart it or just...

Man: Yes, I will do that just wanted to make sure that you're around. So operator please close this session and then restart for the next one.

END