

**Transcription ICANN London
Update on SSAC
Saturday 21 June 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/#jun>

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

Volker Griemann: And now I would really like to move to the next item on the list which is the SSAC update and discussion although I think we'll have more updates than discussion at this time because of the lateness and limited time available of the SSAC.

I would therefore like to ask Patrick and Jim to come forward and present their update.

Patrick Folstrom: Thank you very much. So Patrick Folstrom, Chair of the Security and Stability Rights Committee. And to the right of me Jim Galvin my vice chair. We also have a number of SSAC members in the room. Can they stand up please?

Okay there. It's you at least. Anyways so we have the standard update that we do. Given that we are a little bit late here we have very limited time. Can we go to the second slide please?

One of the sort of unfortunate things is for you is that you're the first group that we are meeting which means that for example we - the text that the slide with the agenda is what the slide is including.

On the other hand we also - it's an old version of this which sort of explains a long time we think it takes to discuss each one of the bullets.

And if you add up the amount of time you all see the first of all it's much more than - it's about an hour which of course is (unintelligible).

So I think we - you have the slides that we for some reason cannot see.
That's a bit unfortunate. What's happening.

Okay.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Patrick Folstrom: Oh yes I know my fault, our fault yes.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: It's the Internet. We have trouble with managing file transfers here.

Patrick Folstrom: It's probably some stability problem there right?

Anyways my point is that all of the issues that we have presented that we have suggested talked about apart from the recent achievements and other things have to do with the recently released document SAC 66 on which is SSAC comments on the JAF phase one report which is related to namespace collisions.

There will be a full session on name space collision tomorrow afternoon where I will present. So that's one sort of point of information to you.

Sorry Monday afternoon. It's not tomorrow. Monday afternoon Monday 1700 to 1830.

The other thing that we have here is an update on where we are regarding the IANA function stewardship transition where we don't have a document. We have a work party that is ongoing but we promise to give it an update on that which we also will give them our public session on Thursday morning.

So the question - or we can just given that - if we have some issues here we could just move into question and answers as all of you should have already looked at our slides and probably have tons of comments right?

So maybe we should just move into question and answers as we have some issues with the slides.

Volker Griemann: Yes this is really unfortunate. Unless the slides can be brought up shortly. Okay we'll just bridge the time with the first question. Go ahead sir.

(Ruby Q): Hi Patrick. This is (Ruby Q.) for the record. I was reading through SAC 66 regarding namespace collisions. And one of the recommendation which is Recommendation 5 it says ICANN should provide clarity to registries on the rules and method of allocation of blocked names after the conclusion of the test period.

That looked to me more like a rights protection issue than a security and stability issue. So I wonder why it does SSAC got an interest in that topic which is rights protection (unintelligible) after security stability issue or am I missing something?

Patrick Folstrom: It can potentially be interpreted as a rights protection issue. That is not how we looked at it.

We do believe that any kind of unclear instructions of what actually would help and is something that unclear instructions and unclear rules will create problems regarding stability if it is the case that for example you have different decisions and different unclear events based on for example when you - when certain events happen.

We see the for example if we look at the PDP that the various TLDs have gone through where we and SSAC have, the individual SSAC members have pointed out. And we have been approached by parties saying that this is one

example of where it is unclear what the actual action would be given that certain events happen or the other way around.

So no we do not see it as a right protection issue. We see it as clarity that is needed to be able to move forward in an efficient way. Jim?

Jim Galvin: So Jim Galvin for the transcript. Just to add to that I mean another thought to think about in this is it was something which wasn't really specified in the Jazz report.

If you go back we had a name collision mitigation plan right? You could've had the alternate path mitigation and so you have a bunch of existing names out there.

And that there's those that have chosen that path what we're asking for is that ICANN in particular resolve what's going to happen with them versus the TLDs that are about to be delegated.

So essentially the implementation plan that staff will now derive given these two reports will be addressing new TLDs to come, what do you do about the ones that have already passed and gone? And that's a point that we're trying to make.

(Ruby Q.): Okay. Thank you.

Volker Griemann: Okay next question please anyone? Come on there must be something.

I think once we see the slide the questions will pop up. But please stand by while we repair these technical difficulties.

Man: Could we get them emailed to the council and we can just bring them up on our laptops?

Man: Yes they are accessible from the bridge.

Man: Okay.

Marika Konings: So the slides are up in Adobe Connect and they're also posted on the wiki page with the agenda. We can see them there. And we apologize for the technical difficulties.

Patrick Folstrom: So now when people start to pick up the slides the question is which one of these items do you think we should go through because we cannot do all the slides? It is up to you.

Marika Konings: And this is Marika. Maybe to help because the slides have basically one overview, two recent achievements, one SSAC 66 SSAC common and JAS reports, phase one report and two work in progress of future milestones, three IANA function stewardship transition working party, three possible new working parties and four interaction with the community.

Patrick Folstrom: And the numbering is great right?

Volker Griemann: I must say I Patrick and Jim I wouldn't mind any update on the stewardship transition work party. Yes so thanks Avri so we we're on the same page I'm sorry if I jumped in ahead of you.

But any of your thinking on that and also maybe you might like to comment on the very recent I know invitation from the - to triple my cross community working group and how that might - any thoughts on that?

Patrick Folstrom: Yes so let's start by jumping into the first of the two number three bullets.

So this is Page 16, so Page 17 the background, you know the background at Department of Commerce announced that they intend to end the longstanding IANA function contract solicited proposal for assuring both proper operation and oversight of IANA in the absence of US government.

Next slide, Slide 18. So what we did in SSAC as we announced at the previous meeting that we established a work party to consider postulates principles and technical consideration relating to the transitional stewardship of the IANA function.

This work party is focused only on the security and stability of the IANA functions during and after the stewardship transition but you're only looking at this from a security and stability point of view.

Next slide, Slide 19.

So the SSAC will the - it's out of scope for SSAC to provides conclusions or recommendations concerning operations of the IANA functions except when such mechanism do have direct impact on security and stability issues.

Next slide, Slide 20. So the work party to be able to gather information the work party it's conducting an analysis of the roles of NTIA, ICANN as the IANA functions operator, VeriSign of the context (unintelligible) to routes on maintain and related to the IANA root management function and the root server system as it pertains to the IANA functions.

And this analyzer that we're working on is actually I must say personally I'm very happy with that where that is going.

We also - we all have also looked at the IATF and the NRO as policy providers to the IANA and then we go to the next slide, Slide 21.

So one of the most important things that we have done is that we have developed a terminology to try to describe the various roles in the system like this that manages policy and is specifically IANA function as one of the examples of such normal policy management systems.

The primary roles that we are talking about and discussing is that policy providers that hands over policy to the policy implementer for implementation.

And the second one is the policy implementer which is the party that accepts and then implements the policy developed by the policy development process handed over by the policy provider.

Next slide, Slide 22. So on this flowchart you can see that you have a policy development process that hands over policy to the policy provider.

The policy provider requests the policy implementer to implement the policy and the policy implementer then either accepts or rejects the proposed policy. It is also for later implementation.

It can also be the case that the policy is such that the policy requires and what is called we took the term appointed expert from the ITF interaction with IANA.

So it might be the case that the policy provider also a point and appointed expert that take care of for example various evaluations that are objective and not subjective.

So when that is set up you have a policy PDP, a policy development process, a policy provider, policy implementer and appointed expert.

When this is set up a request might come in from a requester that turns in the request to the policy implementer.

It might be the case that the policy implementer has to pass various questions to one or more appointed experts depending on what the policy says.

The result is given back. It might be the case that the policy implementer is requesting a third party for some action.

The action results in a response and then the policy implementer in turn is then responding to the requester giving back some results.

So this is an overall sort of taxonomy and flowchart that this workload is working on. We of course are happy to receive feedback on that one. And if we'll go to the next slide.

So Slide 23 so what we are doing is that we are providing an update on the progress at the meeting. And that's what we're doing for example now.

And our goal is to publish the principal document in Q3 2014 and also work on technical issues document that are related to - that that are direct impact to security and stability and specifically the IANA function and IANA implementation of the flowchart that we saw in the previous picture.

So that's the update.

Volker Griemann: Thank you Patrick. Any questions? I think Brett wanted to be in the queue and anybody else just signal me.

Brett Fausett: Thank you Patrick. Brett Fausett from the Registry Constituency. I was hoping you could jump to Slide 26 and talk through the five items that you all have coming up on your agenda?

Patrick Folstrom: Sure. There. So the way we are work - doing work is that we have various issues that we hear that we have heard from the community that - or discovered ourselves that it would be interesting to see SSAC's view on these things.

The actual amount of resources we have in SSAC is to do approximately six work items each year. And that means that we have all the time had a backlog of issues that we called pending.

So this is the current work parties that are pending assignment. So we cannot really even start working on these unless we are finishing another document.

But it's also the case of course that this list of pending assignments might change all the time - all the time until we actually decide to start work on something.

If it is the case that we have a direct question for example from GNSO from the board from GAC or one of the ICANN constituencies than normally that we of course have to give that question and that work item higher priority than picking something from this list of pending assignments. And so that is how we do the prioritization.

So the actual privatization of work items doesn't happen until the day when we actually have an open slot for something to pick up. And at that point in time we decide what we're going to work with.

So one of the reasons why we're presenting this list is to let you start to think and say well wait a second we think number bullet number three is extremely important or number four or whatever or you think something else is really important or and you give me that feedback or you even go so far as you send us a formal - a question that we would actually should respond to.

And the more specific the question is the easier it will be for us to actually deliver.

Volker Griemann: Brett you want to follow up on this?

Brett Fauset: Yes I was actually just also hoping for a little bit of context. Maybe you can just give me a sentence or two on three and five? I was particularly curious as to what issue was there and if you could give a little more detail on that?

Patrick Folstrom: Actually from the top of my head I cannot personally say much about number three because I don't really remember the details.

Is anyone other SSAC member in the room that - otherwise I'm happy to help you and bring you in contact with the person who brought it up regarding five. Jim?

Jim Galvin: Yes. So Number 5 unfortunately always hate phrasing things this way but it's kind of a catchall work item because there are a number of activities related to Whois.

I mean if you think about what's happening now I mean the expert, the directory services expert working group has just issued its final report.

So we use this work item and we keep it here because as things progress given, you know, a couple of years ago when we had the implementation plan that had come out from staff and they're moving through work parties and such we know the work is going to come up here.

This is just an opportunity for us to keep in front of us that as those things, we have to evaluate them each time and decide what to do.

Thank you Jim. And next in queue was Avri and I think (Tony) wants to come in as well so after Avri, (Tony).

Avri Doria: (Tony) was you're of follow-up on that one or okay.

If you could go back to the slide of the DNS - I mean not the - the IANA states I wanted to ask a question on that. But I forget what page it was unfortunately.

Patrick Folstrom: Was it a flowchart?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Patrick Folstrom: Twenty-two.

Avri Doria: Okay. Yes I guess in the relationship between the policy provider and the policy implementer and, you know, the functional separation there what I wanted to understand is sort of the loop between those two, there's a delivering of policy and I guess and what you're saying is that the policy has been accepted.

Is there no other interaction? I mean because I look at that and I'm seeing a very limited interaction now. I definitely, you know, I'm happy to see them separate.

But I'm also wondering is the only other possible interaction between them is with that appointed expert like the ITF does as opposed to in a construction where there are city, state, you know, the IETF appointed expert is because the working group is normally blinked out of existence and so there needs to be.

In a situation like here where there's a steady-state existence between that do you really see it as constrained to always go through the appointed expert or would there be a more dynamic communication path between a policy provider and a policy implementer? I'm just trying understand that relationship.

Patrick Folsom: Yes. That's actually very good question. Let me try to explain this a little bit more detail.

What we have tried to describe here is what from our perspective from a security and stability point of view in a very generic flowchart for how these things should be set up.

Exactly how the interaction between the policy provider and policy implementer is is something that from that can depend on it's up to the policy development process to sort of explain how that should be set up, how the interaction is happening, et cetera.

The important thing with the policy and acceptance is that it's really important that the policy provider can measure whether the policy implementer is doing whatever the policy implementer is doing.

So it must be clear what kind of things the policy implementer actually is doing. So clarity on what the actual let me phrase it this way.

At the end of the day the instructions for what the policy implementer is doing must be clear okay? And the more subjective the various decisions the policy implementer is making if they have to make any decisions at all the easier it will be.

So this is exactly what we are discussing in the work party at the moment. But if I to some degree sort of take on my personal Patrick Folstrom hat here and if - and I hope everyone can sort of recognize that and say that now I'm not no longer talking about sort of SSAC chair in the work party.

Let me put it this way. The more subjective decisions are made in the policy implementer and the more objective things are pushed appointed expert to some other external function -- and we see this with extremes from the ITF the easier it is to measure and ensure that the policy implementer is doing what they're supposed to do and nothing else. So I'm using it sort of looking at the ITF terminology.

Exactly what - how the work party where the work party's going to conclude in the discussion on how to do this but it's still unknown and I'm happy to see that you interact with various SSAC members.

But the important thing is that at the end of the day after the interactions that you are talking about the instructions from the policy provider to the policy implementer what the policy implementer is doing must be clear. That is something that we see as important and that's how far we are.

Avri Doria: So in other words there's also a loop we don't see there that's sort of a feedback loop where the policy provider and the policy - I mean someone is monitoring something and...

Patrick Folsom: See it as a descriptive and not prescriptive. It's also the case of course that you can make a flowchart however complicated you want with or there's how do you do for example we decided in this flowchart not to have audits. We decided to not include how to do appeals and a few other things.

But we don't think it is possible to implement those things unless it's clear who is actually providing the policy and who is implementing the policy.

So and that's also why we in SSAC we are trying to do in this work we're trying to describe a model and the terminology that that makes it possible hopefully for the community to talk about the actual issue in a constructive way.

Volker Griemann: Thank you. Next in queue is (Tony) followed by (David).

(Tony): Patrick your list of five items that you had I just wanted to check my understanding of the second one. Is it secured instability indications of transfers when you're talking about IPV for markets? Is that where that's focused?

Patrick Folsom: There are multiple different kinds of things that is happening when you have a growing IPV for address market.

It might be the case that you see a higher, also higher value in an interest in for example hijacking of IP addresses that people are announcing and using IP addresses that other parties that actually that belong to other parties.

There might be all different kind of - they're all different kinds of things that is happening when you have a shrinking set of resources available.

(Tony): Just a quick follow-up on that. So does that cover the policy implications of that as well?

Patrick Folsom: That is unknown because this is the work party is not chartered or anything. This is something - this is once again I want - we want to hear from you whether you think it should be included or not it's not instead of the other way around.

We cannot tell you. We want you to tell us where the policy should be included.

Volker Griemann: Does that answer your question? Any follow-up? No? Then last in queue is (David) unless anybody else?

(David): Just a, you know, a quick catchall question in case it got missed is there anything SSAC thinks the GNSO should be more carefully tracking or should - could usefully be doing? Do you have any advice for us about ways that we - things that we should be concentrating on?

Patrick Folsom: No I haven't heard that. What I have talked with - ah, okay actually good point. Can we go to...

((Crosstalk))

Patrick Folsom: Yes. Can we go to the second to last slide please?

So one of the things that we would like to know from you in a generic way is is feedback not only the last bullet there which is what we start talking about, what topics are missing and even on this topics what should we actually look at if we start to work on it.

So the more you ask us things the more likely it is that we will actually talk about things that you are interested in. So we would like to - we prefer we really like if that sort of the initiation of work (unintelligible) starts at yield.

Part of that is something that I've been talking to (Jonathan) about. And that is the fact that we in SSAC only do - or we do only have resources for to work on six ICANNs a year which means that we really would like to do things that are useful for the community, specifically useful for you.

And we would like to be able to do really work at things as early as possible.

So whenever we are saying things and writing a document on a topic so what we are on saying is actually something that you can take into account wherever you are in your processes.

So I would like to see more interaction between SSAC and GNSO early in your process for example that we get a question really, really early in your process so we between three and six months later can report something and write a report that actually helps you.

That will actually be I think a much better way of working together than sort of catch up mechanism that we're using today.

(Tony): That's very useful feedback and also goes along quite well with similar discussions that we had with the interaction with the GAC so...

Volker Griemann: We are already quite over the time and you just said you had limited time. Is there still time?

Patrick Folsom: Yes. I see SSAC was sitting and jumping a little bit but anyway so one more question then.

Volker Griemann: (Tony) go ahead.

(Tony): Thanks. Just an example follow-up from that SSAC 66, my understanding is that now you've done that you've trusted out that your work is finished. But for

the GNSO it's up to us if we want to follow-up and build on that we'd have to take that up separately as GNSO. Is that right?

Patrick Folsom: It's actually case that I think regarding the namespace collision JS report I think ICANN has moved a little bit further than that. So I think we should follow the discussion what's going on this week.

And I see (Francisco) sitting in the back in the room that is actually running the session on Monday evening.

And I think all of us should follow-on what we're taking up as work as related in namespace collision so we make sure that whatever we are spending time and effort on actually whatever we're spending time and effort on that results in some kind of output so that the output is useful for wherever the process is.

So I just - so I encourage everyone to just take that into account. Thank you.

Volker Griemann: Thank you Patrick. Thank you Jim. I think we've taken away a good piece of information here and some pointers for future interactions where we are - should focus our discussions on in the future and how to involve you earlier in our policymaking processes and get back - and ask your input on stability and security implementation - implications in the future. so

I think this is important work and we are - would be good - well advised to lean on you a bit more and earlier.

Thank you for the time.

Patrick Folsom: Thank you very much.

Volker Griemann: And I would like to hand over to (David) for the last two sessions.

(David): Thank you. Should we stop the recording on that one and start on the next one?

