

---

Alejandro Pisanty: I think we should start. Good morning everybody. You can, if you don't mind so we can see you. I was brought up in a decade in which showing your back to people was really bad manners.

Male: He was making rabbit ears.

Alejandro Pisanty: It seems like I don't manage to educate my children like that anymore, so I don't know if it's generational or what, but I feel very badly. So, this is the open consultation meeting. This is a community input session of the meeting of the Security, Stability and Resiliency of the DNS Review Team of ICANN. Today is June 23, 2011.

The plan for this meeting is, for our day's work, as you know, is first to have this part of the meeting open for public input and then we will go on our internal working mode. The meeting will remain open, you are welcome to stay, but the format does not foresee direct interactions by the community after 10 a.m., or after we close this first part of the session.

I will make a brief presentation of what the group has been doing, where we stand at; it's the same presentation that we've made before the SSAC, the RSAC and the GAC. The SSAC didn't see some of the detail that we put down on paper or on slides after that. Is there – Alice or Olof, do you know if there's any remote participation?

---

*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.*

---

Alice Jansen: We have a bridge open for any remote participants. And Anders will be joining at 10.

Alejandro Pisanty: Yes. There is a bridge open, we don't know if anyone is present there. If there's anyone please make yourselves known somehow. And we have members of the team who will be participating remotely potentially Rodney Jaffe and we know for sure that Anders Rafting has indicated that he will participate remotely from 10 on.

So briefly, and welcoming the people who are not members of the team who are present in the meeting, we're really glad you're here. We hope to hear from you and to provide an ongoing interaction, not finish today, but get more of that going. The team, as you know, was formed in September and met together for the first time in December 2010, we have had two physical meeting before the ones we are having this week here in Singapore and we met in Cartagena and in San Francisco.

We have had, I will move that from some attrition to significant attrition with today's resignation of Atif Nazar who has indicated that because of changes in his job, which include moving from one country to another, he is not able to continue participating and contributing. And I hope you are listening because I am thanking him warmly for his contributions. He really did put in a lot of energy and started us in motion in several fields.



---

We divided our group, for the first stage of work, into three sub teams. One concerned with governance, the other one with implementation, and the third one with contingency; meaning that the first one is going to look at the review, well the first one has been looking at the review of the Security, Stability and Resiliency contributions of ICANN from the point of view of written rules; that's what falls under governance in this case. All the arrangements, starting from ICANN's bylaws and the more significant agreements, like agreements with the contracts with registries and registrars and so forth, anything else that's documented that can be of bearing.

The second one looks at how that is implemented, how that's actually working. And the third one looks at contingency planning and contingency reactions and so forth. Thanks to extremely helpful contributions from ICANN staff, including Alice Jansen, Olof Nordling, Denise Michel, Patrick Jones and more recently Jeff Moss, we have a great collection of documents that have bearing on the Security, Stability and Resiliency of the DNS.

We have been engaged in an exercise of analyzing them in our first reading, which is mostly looking at describing their content and their importance and rating them for relevance, whether they're up to date and so forth; a few criteria. It was a template established by Simon McCalla, which is a particular contribution I want to thank him for. He's leading sub team one, governance. Both that team and the team left by Jeff Brueggeman, which is implementation, have done an analysis of a number of documents



---

and we can start actually now, drilling down into them while we still continue to analyze a few others.

This strategy is very important for the steps that are coming, which will be the in-depth analysis of these documents. And the establishment of a program, and execution of a program of interviews which will look at how realistically things are happening; not only looking at things in documents, that will be too dry and it will not give us a full picture of how ICANN as a whole is responding to its mandates within its scope for stability, etc of the DNS.

We have made an analysis of the scope, this is an ongoing project, as you know, for anyone in ICANN, defining the scope of things is a continuing exercise. We definitely are scoping our work among other variables to be the work that we can actually do instead of being over ambitious and trying to say we'll cover even a small fraction exhaustively of ICANN's scope and then not be able to do that.

We have had a discussion about methods for work. We're all in different degrees, or from different angles or experiences, aware of the formal methods that are used for establishing the security position of an organization and for auditing it, international standards with some oriented with security information or to the management, but there is no commonality in the group and we have also seen that sticking to stuff like IP or [Corbit] or (inaudible) and so forth, would not be a productive way to approach the mandate we have. Because we're not really only



---

reviewing a company, let's say ICANN's corporate operations, which is what those frameworks are more suited to. We have a both broader and narrower focus. So we decided to basically be inspired by these methods, including maturity level use included in some of those, but not sticking to the book formally with any of them.

Next slide. All team members know this, we would like to present it in a bit more detail today. As you know, we have been describing the scope of each of the three sub teams, three subjects, and now we are trying to drill down to be more systematic. This is, what you see on the screen in this slide and the next two ones is work done by Jeff Brueggeman, which I just put onto the Power Point, and thank you very much Jeff for being so systematic and orderly and quick with this. They are really helping the whole group very much.

This could become the index of the report we eventually produce and that's why I find them very important and we'll have more detail about them in a second. But what you can see here is first we are looking at scope. And when looking at scope we are analyzing and trying to make a statement about the scope of ICANN's responsibilities for SSR consistent with its limit of technical responsibilities and looking at these responsibilities in several layers.

One is the layer of things that ICANN actually controls; things like its own staff which is under contract; the operation of the L root which is in its own facilities and so forth; things that are under



---

ICANN's influence which are more like the entities that form part of the ccNSO or the GNSO.

That means, looking at ccTLD operations, risk management, contracts or as there are basically no contracts between ccTLDs and ICANN what we do have are the accountability frameworks, which are exchanges of unilateral documents. Looking at them in this layer, at the documentary level, how much they contribute to reduce or how do they have loopholes or opening that create more risk instead of reducing it.

The scope will be, and the third sphere will be, which is very large, which is beyond ICANN'S direct ability to control or even influence, which is the wide world out there. There are thousands or hundreds of thousands or maybe millions of DNS servers that are operating out there without need of registration, with very hard to achieve even measurements, speak not of control.

And again, a method that's assessed the documentation and the community perspectives on these issues looking at the responsibilities and the description of ICANN itself, and in particular we, one key document that we will be working on is the Fiscal year 2012 Security, Stability and Resiliency Plan of ICANN, looking at IANA and other operational DNS functions.

There's some critical stuff here, which again ICANN doesn't have full control over although there are procedures and contracts that we'll have to see how much in detail they are documented and how well they manage risk, which are things like what's the chain of



---

procedures between ICANN, VeriSign and the Department of Commerce of the United States that produces changes in the root and whether that has been found to be scalable and so forth for the oncoming expansion of gTLD space.

Arrangements with third parties, certainly on IANA operations, arrangements with third parties and their perspectives of community stakeholder groups about what should be within this scope and is not included or what should be left out of this scope. And the next one – we'll look at the effectiveness and the implementation of the plan. This would be the implementation sub team, up to now, and the implementation review task for the whole team.

Here the idea is to look at how effective ICANN's implementation of what's established in the documents of the first slide is. Again, what's the view of the SSR Plan now at the implementation level. The processes to establish the plan, processes that allow to track the status of individual projects; how these each are implemented in the budget, in the strategic planning process, how fit they are to evolve under that to changes in the landscape; and looking at stuff like the SSAC and security staff functions and outcomes. This again, you can look at many of these issues in both layers, so here we will look more at the actual output of the SSAC for example.

And the processes for addressing these issues, including the way the community is finding its ways to express their concerns and to either expand or reduce the ability of ICANN to contend with specific risks. Among other things, we are looking at the DSSE



---

Working Group. Finally we'll have to look at the risk landscape and contingency planning. This part of the review addresses a concern of whether existing and known risks are being managed, but more than that, whether there are processes that are promising enough, if not proven, if they're forward looking and not necessarily proven to identify new risks, quantify them and do all the risk management procedures like identification, ration, transfer and mitigation and so forth.

In a very, very broad perspective here's what we probably will, there will be a scope versus depth balance here, particularly as there is in everything else in our group. And including those risks that can threaten the stability of the DNS, which are not within ICANN's responsibilities, but which ICANN should at least be doing some awareness of these risks and contingency planning if it cannot actually control the way they are produced.

So that's the scope and almost a little index for our work to date. We will expect this index to expand, I would say maybe to twice the present size. We'll probably be adding some more line items. Jeff actually has already done an exercise for that which we will start working on in a few minutes. But that's the way we're organizing our work for now. It will be valuable for this session, for the community input part of the day, if we can go to the next slide Alice with what kind of questions do we think we will be asking people.

We will set up a program of interviews. We will set up one of the outcomes of today's work will be a list of people and entities that



---

we need to interview and some focus on what we are going to look for with each of them. And these are some preliminary questions that will go into standardized questionnaire that will also have to be, at least in the draft form, an output of today's work. This was written by Simon McCalla from the governance point of view.

And we will be asking people like the Department – anybody from Department of Commerce to small ccTLD managers, managers of ccTLDs with small numbers of registrations, let's not call anyone small, just make sure that the size of their operation is determined here. So we'll be asking people whether they believe that they can have a clear and limited scope for the SSR variables; what they understand it is. Then ask whether this remit is correct? Whether it should be widened, reduced, or reshaped in some other way? The next slide.

We would ask whether the people we interview, or the entities we interview believe that ICANN clearly states its goals and whether having stated them ICANN tracks its performance against these, and so forth. So that's a set up and I would now like to open this for questions and participation. We value particularly the members of the community who are not members of the review team; this session is for you guys.

Jim Prendergast:

Yeah, Jim Prendergast. Sorry I was late. I was just wondering is this presentation – I notice on the calendar maker this presentation



---

wasn't listed. Is this going to be available on the SSR Review Team page or something?

Alejandro Pisanty:

Yes it's going to be available. In fact I think you can already access it if you go to the GAC for example, to the GAC sessions, because it was also made, this presentation was also made to the GAC, to the SSAC and to the RSAC. So as much as those have already recorded and available materials, this will be there too. So, we seem, at the moment at least, not to have any questions from the community. Carlos would you like to...? So then I will of course as the Review Team members yourselves whether there are questions or comments you would like to make for the open input session.

And then we'll decide, since we are going to have some slack, whether we dive into our work or wait till 10 a.m. because of Anders and his possible remote participation. Yeah, we're waiting also for Xiaodong also, so probably we won't start that part of the session until 10 because there are members of the team we would expect to join us. So really we have ample time to discuss stuff with you guys. And Patrick Jones has hand up.

Patrick Jones:

Oh he's pointing his finger towards me I see. Hey Alejandro. I wanted to say thank you to everybody on the SSR 2 Team and apologize for abandoning you guys. Rod's nomination and then I ended up going kind of quiet on the mailing list as I was talking



---

with ICANN. I wasn't sure if there was going to be some kind of conflict of interest or not so I figured kind of clamming up was the better form of discretion there. And so now I'm happy to be on the other side and supporting you in all of your efforts.

So I want to offer an open door and if you have any questions or anything that I or my staff can help with, I know we've been helping, but I just want to formalize that again and go on the record to state that. And then we'll try to be really honest with you and tell you our time constraints and resources, how long you can expect us to take to get back to you on whatever the question or query may be.

One of the things is when you're, from my perspective, it would be really helpful when you're making recommendations to keep in mind, like what Alejandro said, sort of the priority. We can't do everything all at once. So, if you can help us set the priority, and maybe the order of precedence in your findings, that will be really useful. You know, you must do one before you can do two. So be aware of that ICANN. That would be really helpful. And the scope, just to make sure it's within our mission and bylaws. And if you're going to recommend something outside of that, that's fine, just you're going to have to recommend that we change the bylaws. So just be aware of...

And then finally how actionable it is. And you spoke about this a little bit. It has to be within our control and it has to be something sort of bite sized I think in these first few SSR teams. You don't want to ask us to boil the ocean when we haven't installed a water



---

heater; first things first. And that would make it really easy for us. So as we're trying to execute and build towards the next SSR team, we can track our progress and show them, the ones that follow on next, how well we were able to implement your recommendations, and if we couldn't, why couldn't we and if we're halfway there, can we complete it by the time, with the recommendation. So it will help us track against your findings.

Bill Manning:

This is Bill Manning. I think that a lot of what, in my discussion with people, that we're coming up with this, were coming up with a lot of observations and not so many recommendations per se. And the ones that we do come up with, in the form of them being bite sized, there probably bite sized. But perhaps the largest value of this first one is the high level observations about strategically where things ought to be headed as opposed to tactical, here's something we can chew in two to three years; there are some strategic directions that might be more interesting coming out of at least this first one.

Jim Prendergast:

Right. No I agree with that. Something from, as a newcomer to ICANN, I'm fascinated by trying to figure out where ICANN fits in eh overall security community. Like what really is our role? And if it's our role can we actually achieve that role or is it sort of an aspirational role that's not actually achievable. You know, best intentions, but not going to happen. So, any light you can shed in



those areas would be immensely successful. Because it seems like many of the challenges we're going to face, or we are facing as a security community are greater than ICANN. So that means we are going to, by definition have to act within the larger community.

And so we have to understand what is that interaction like; is that where we coordinate? Is that where we collaborate? Is that an area where we're operational? And any guidance you can gather from the larger community is much easier than ICANN going to the community, then ICANN the company going to the community. Because you guys can get a genuine sense of what's probably possible and what's not and what the sense of how we can fit in. So yeah, I want to say that the observational are immensely successful on the strategic level. But when it comes to a recommendation, if you're going to ask us to do something, just keep that in mind. Thank you.

Alejandro Pisanty:

I have hands up from Olof Nordling and Jeff Brueggeman.

Olof Nordling:

Thank you. Olof Nordling, ICANN staff. And just a very brief comment since Jeff Moss mentioned the next review. And if so then the Affirmation of Commitments imply commitments to perform reviews, like the SSR review, every three years at the very least. Just for your information.



---

Alejandro Pisanty: Thank you. And Jeff Brueggeman.

Jeff Brueggeman: I was just going to support this part of the discussion I think is very helpful. I do think this review provides an opportunity to put out for comment and to crystallize ICANN's role in security and it's come up in different proceedings, but there really hasn't been maybe that focused community discussion on this. So I think, and particularly as we were saying being the first review on this issue, I think that can be a very helpful level setting. And it may change over time as you're saying, but I think that's an important kind of foundational discussion to have as part of this so.

Jim Prendergast: Yeah we've got to get the temperature of the water here.

Simon McCalla: It's Simon McCalla here. I okay what Jeff was saying. I lay awake in that storm last night and exactly the same thoughts came to me, which is so much of what ICANN has to do is a piece in a much, much larger puzzle. And kind of as I was thinking some of the concerns are, are we going to be able to find tangible goals that ICANN can achieve sits within its remit and scope. Or where it's part of, it's almost kind of passing on a baton each time. I hear what you say. We need to be careful in helping define those goals so that they're achievable and feel meaningful as well.



---

Jeff Brueggeman:                   And if they're goals but they're not achievable that would be really noteworthy; why aren't they achievable.

Alejandro Pisanty:                Any other participation for this stage of the meeting. I would like to ask you if there is any remote participation that we can identify.

Olof Nordling:                    No questions in none, nobody on the bridge for the time being.

Alejandro Pisanty:                So you guys, any particular grudge, itch? Thank you. SO I think then we can adjourn this part of the meeting. And I do think it will be healthy to restart at 10:00 instead of jumping in immediately so that we can respectfully have Anders and whoever else of the team members who are going to be able to join. I see that Rodney has sent us email also. It's not perfectly clear to me whether he will try to participate at some point, but we should be respectful that if he does try he doesn't find us already rolling. So we will start again at 10:00 sharp.

[End of Transcript]

