
BRENDA BREWER:

Good day everyone. This is Brenda speaking. Welcome to SSR Plenary #87 on the 16th of October 2019 AT 14:00 UTC. Attending the call today we have Ram, Danko, Kerry-Ann, Russ, Žarko, Naveed, and Eric. Apologies from Norm and Alain. Attending from ICANN Org is Jennifer, Negar, Steve, and Brenda. Technical Writer Heather has joined. And today's meeting is being recorded. Please state your name before speaking for the record. And Russ, I'll turn the call over to you. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Okay, thank you. So, the first thing we want to do is make sure that everybody has the Sessions for Montreal on their calendars. We have a face-to-face Working Session on November 1st and 2nd. Our hopes are that coming out of this week we will know what all of our recommendations are going to be and so those days will be putting together the slides to share with the various people at the Montreal Meeting and then working on the findings portions of the document.

We have an Engagement Session on the 3rd of November. We'll use those slides then, and perhaps other places. And we are trying to schedule a Session with the Board Caucus. We have not found a slot for that yet. So, I know for myself, I have received my tickets, but I have not yet received my hotel room reservations. I assume that others are in roughly the same place. If that is not the case, please speak up so we can get somebody to help you. And I know at least one of the people has had trouble with a Visa and I know Staff's trying to help them out. Is anyone else having trouble with Visas?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Hi Russ? This is Kerry.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: My office [inaudible] going to the Visa on my own ordinary passport, so I submitted my official passport yesterday and they promised I should get it in five days but I'm going to follow up tomorrow again to make sure they sent it to the Canadian Embassy.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, you think you're okay.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: So far. They told me that I should get it automatically with the official passport, but I'll see.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Alright. Not hearing anyone else. Hopefully the one Visa issue will get straightened out.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Russ, Žarko just raised his hand.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh, sorry. Go ahead.

ŽARKO KECIC: Yeah, hi. My Visa is approved but I don't have Visa yet in the passport and it will be done when I get back home next week. And they promise they will finish that in three days, three working days. So, I'm all set with that. But I still have problems with airplane tickets, and I believe I will sort it out today or tomorrow.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Are there any other hands, Jennifer?

JENNIFER BRYCE: No other hands. Ram has just posted in the chat, "Hi. I have an issue with the Visa." And you noted that earlier, Russ, and Ram, we're following the emails and your exchanges with the Travel Team so hopefully it gets resolved and we'll do what we can to help you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, we also have a face-to-face meeting coming in January where the plan is to deal with all the feedback we get in Montreal and then produce the final report. So, I know that I've been contacted a bit from ICANN Travel to start that process, so others should have received something from ICANN Travel, Constituency Travel, regarding that trip. If you've heard nothing, please let Staff know so they can fix that.

Okay, the next thing on the Agenda is the meat of today's call. We have three recommendations that needed work last time we talked, and Eric and KC got together and talked about them and have put text in the document for us to discuss. Let's see. These are... Jennifer gave us the link in the Agenda and we're looking for Recommendation 24, 25, and 26, which begin on Page 9. So, Eric, are you the one who's going to lead us through this?

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

So, KC and I talked and KC was nice enough to pick up the pen on it and I think the gist of it is people really need to, anybody who's got interest in those particular recommendations really should just read the text because the long and short of it, rather than having to do reading for the group which I think might not be the best use of everyone's time, unless everyone wants me to, is that it looked a lot of these recommendations grew by accretion, and KC and I felt like we were having trouble understanding aspects of the motivation and what they were trying to convey.

So, we took a whack at cleaning them up. In some cases, we had to break them out. I think in one case we wholesale suggested the removal of one of the recommendations. It had become diffuse enough that we didn't think it was actually clear what it was recommending. So, for those that are focused elsewhere, I'm not sure that it's really worth their time to sort of do this but I'm open to suggestions, though.

On the other hand, anyone who's interested, just take a look at the text because we tried to clean it up and refine and make it more precise.

And so, like I said, we had to split, I think it was the first recommendation out and then after that, Recommendation 3, we mostly sort of just tightened up the wording. So, you know, KC and I kind of came to the same place. I think it wasn't clear if we were on the same page or not from before, but I think we are now. I'm not sure if KC's on the call but if we're not, she can say that we're not. But I think we are. And we sort of, I don't recall that we had any questions to the group but because we made changes to something that was a group product, anybody who has perspective on these recommendations should take a look. Does that make sense, Russ?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, by split out, you mean the four bullets?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, let me just get...

RUSS HOUSLEY: I just want to make sure I'm following what you're saying.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, no, I'm sorry. I have many windows and many tabs open and so I've defeated myself again so I'm trying to un-defeat myself. Just bear with me please. So, Recommendation 3, there's a bunch of modified text there that people are seeing. We broke it out into 3B, and then initially 3C, but then we sort of nuked the chunk, this section out there.

So, we were sensitive to the fact that there was some disincentive to making more Recommendations because we had tried to sort of reduce the number, but I think, speaking for myself and I think maybe KC, but just for myself just to be sure, I was really concerned about the need to reduce number of recommendations at the risk of making the recommendations less clear or less actionable. So, we didn't want to, say, turn Recommendation 3 into like two brand new ones, so we have 3 and 3B, because we really felt that it looked like two things that were separate got put together and it made it hard to understand what was going on, so we split it.

So, people should take a look at 3 and 3B. We would propose those should be separate recommendations in general, going through the beginning. So, I guess I'll just go ahead and read. "ICANN should fully implement SSR1 Recommendation 11 to address Strategic Objective 1 and 2 and 4.1." And then we felt this recommendation was basically saying what SSR Recommendation 11 was saying. And so rather than restate it and say... It said something like "fully implement" and there was some concern that KC raised that if you say fully implement, is there a partial implement? Like it just opened a weird door, so we just dropped in the quote from the early recommendation.

"Finalize implement measures of success for new gTLDs and IDN fast track that expressly relate to SSR related program objectives including measurements for the effectiveness of mechanisms to mitigate domain name abuse to ensure effectiveness of." And so, that was basically saying we had SSR1. They recommended that you do something. We found that it wasn't implemented, so now we've gone forward and said our recommendation is do it. And maybe the Team has a different

perspective about that, but we felt like we were literally just saying do 11, so we dropped in a quote from it [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so what does the “to ensure effectiveness” part mean?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think that was just, I’m not sure because KC kind of put a footnote at the bottom, or sort of a placeholder at the end. I think it was just to sort of tie up the recommendation, but I don’t want to put words in her mouth.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, it looks like a sentence fragment to me so I’m not sure.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, I mean I think it was literally just why are we quoting another recommendation, is to ensure that it gets done, I think. I mean, that was my take on it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think we should just drop those words at this point.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

But, okay.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

But 3B, previously the Recommendation 3 said to address Recommendations 11 and 15 and there was separate recommendations. So, 3B is now focused on Recommendation 15 and Recommendation 15 was a little bit of a different situation. So, the “act as a facilitator in the responsible disclosure and dissemination of DNS security threats and mitigation techniques” is a quote from the earlier recommendation from SSR1.

“ICANN implemented a vulnerability disclosure process but there are no public statistics or other information on how often such a process has been invoked or it’s impact, therefore it’s not possible to assess the process if that the process is functional and effective. ICANN should implement coordinated vulnerability disclosure reporting.” And so, this is mostly text that was there before with just some modifications to keep it flowing.

Again, we basically excised two separate things from each other and sort of tried to reconstitute them. I think one of the rubs with Recommendation 15 was while it did seem to be implemented, I think this is covered in our SSR1 Section, but while it did seem to be implemented, it looked like the statistics stopped being reported in, I think it was 2013. And so, I believe what this one’s trying to do is say, you know, don’t stop doing that or start doing it again.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Give us the statistics again.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, basically. You were doing vulnerability disclosure. You clearly got it, but then you stopped. Don't stop. But rather than just saying something pedantic like that it sort of forms a formal Recommendation. "ICANN should implement coordinated vulnerability disclosure reporting including a clear communication plan for reports and produce regular and timely reporting of metrics", which is what's been missing, "on the vulnerability disclosure process. These disclosures must include processes to directly notify all relevant contracted parties in cases of breaches at any contracted party and in cases of key vulnerabilities discovered and reported to ICANN."

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, does anybody have concerns with the new 3A and B, and 3C's been deleted?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, because it was basically... There were three things in there and we looked at what would've been C and it didn't say anything. "ICANN shall be empowered to conduct or fund research into important abuse and attack vectors that are relevant or related to the above considerations." So, basically it looked like a fragment of framing text I had used in a couple other places, just kind of hanging by itself and it gets woven in later on to other things that by itself here, we just couldn't see how it was a self-contained recommendation or how it enhanced the above

two. So, we just nuked it but it's still there in case people want to bring it back.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: This is Heather. I have some, a couple of questions. First, just looking at the text there where it says it's been merged with 37, is that a request to do that? What do you expect to happen with regards to saying merge with 37?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I inherited that comment. I think probably that's why there are multiple... I think that's why when KC and I looked at this text, we felt like it had to be essentially probably unmerged. I don't know which one was 37 before but my guess is either 3 or 3B was the recommendation previously known as 37.

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, I believe what happened is the text from 37 was merged into 3.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: And I think maybe... Yeah, I don't recall what 37 looked like.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, I think we can delete that. It's been done.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, Eric, what's the... I'm sorry. Go ahead.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I was going to say I had also, I mean, I had spent some time looking at the Recommendations 24, 25, 26. I'm not quite sure how we jumped from that to Recommendation 3. I missed the connection.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Oh, I think 3 was one of the ones that was I thought in that list we were going to... I think we were going to go 24, 25, 26.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That was my next question, Heather, so we're okay.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Good. I was like how did we get to here?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Oh, were we not supposed to cover 3? Oh, okay, sorry. KC and I both thought we were starting with 3.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Not a problem. So, what's the next one you touched?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think it was 24.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: It's been a heck of a month. Sorry if we got confused.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. We're good. 24.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: 24 was much more of a sort of a surgical editing. So, I think our changes are tracked so you can see there was much less surgery done. We mostly tightened it up and there was a couple places where I think some of the concerns that KC had wound up being addressable by just adding in some more clarifications. So, you can see metrics was one of the first

things that we wound up discussing on the call earlier and again yesterday.

And so, she added a single page on the ICANN website under Open Data. She basically wanted to tighten up what we were talking about with the metrics and where they go, and then take out some things like increasing transparency and simplifying PDPs. So, there were a couple of places where I think we found that the language wasn't as precise as we wanted it to be. And then with the transparency PDP comment, it seemed to be a bit more of a stretch than we thought was supported by the rest of the recommendation text. So, we just made some small edits here and there. I think if you look at the tracked changes you can see it wasn't really heavily substantial.

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, but what you did in essence is basically said define the metrics that you're going to, that SSR3 is going to be used to measure this, right?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's what the new first orange sentence really says.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Works for me. Anyone else?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: This is Kerry. I had read it. I was fine with it. The only thing that I wondered about was where we spoke about the metrics for the health, are we defining it somewhere in the document? What is good health [inaudible]? I was wondering if we wanted to put like a definition or to actually see what we mean by health. I know what we mean by health but just to make it be something more specific.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, so, I guess I have a handful of hats sitting in front of me. I'm not sure which one to put on. But, I think sort of like just grabbing them in general. It's difficult to know how to define metrics and if we call them KPIs in this document or metrics or whatever else, it's just hard to come up with like what the canonical right version is. And even saying ICANN should do that, it's hard to say who the right group of people is to come up with the canonical set of metrics of health.

And I know there's ITHI and all these other initiatives going on. And at one point, I can't remember if it was in the document or it was just sort of in the air or whatever, people were talking about we should have the Community come up with it. Then there was a question of which Community. Now there's been discussion about like maybe we can do something with Peer Review, and I think there's a disconnect of what's reasonable to expect from a Peer Review Process and what isn't.

And so, we had a hard time sort of basically saying who should come up with those and how should we get any kind of agreement on it and what would constitute the right set because metrics is a really difficult space. You know, I could come up with a really controversial set of metrics and they may be rigorous, but they may not be accepted. So, it's hard for us to feel like we can get a lot of traction with defining our own metrics. We also felt like it wasn't reasonable to say ICANN should necessarily do it or how ICANN should commission it because it's just kind of part of this sort of scientific process, everyone's going to take a different path and agree to disagree in some cases. So, the long and short of it is, I'm not sure how we do that or where. But, I mean, we could decide as a group what we want.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think that you went much further than her question was about.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Oh, okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Her question was what does health mean? Not how do you measure it.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Thanks, Russ.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I don't know.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah, it was just about we should probably... Because when you say health, I know like for the persons that does the green health thing, I know persons don't automatically go to that website to see, okay, the health of the DNS is this based on, you know, they do that comparative analysis with the health sector and you have different websites that is doing it. So, I just wanted to make sure that when we use the word health, is that person going to automatically draw to cybersecurity websites that are using health metrics and automatically see, okay, we're going to use that one.

So, it's just to see if you have like CyberGreen, which uses that health concept. So, I wanted to see if we wanted to say that reflects the security of that service instead of the health. I know what we mean by health but just that it's not very... It's the crux of the recommendation in terms of what it's being measured against, whether or not the system is [inaudible] or not. So, it's just to see if we could replace that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, based on this conversation, we should definitely replace it because I don't think we should be directive on where the recommendation should lead ICANN to get this data from. If they use an established portal, obviously some people will like it and some people won't.

I think our general belief was that there should be a set of statistics and metrics that are at least just selected somewhere and used consistently. And yeah, so, if the word health brings with it some baggage, we should

probably find another word because I'm not comfortable assigning to ICANN which set of metrics they should use from the work we've done yet because I don't personally know what they would be. So, maybe choosing a different word. How about this? [inaudible] One second. I don't know. That's probably not right either.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, somehow, I think words that came to my mind were availability and responsiveness. I mean, those are the kind of...

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I agree with Russ with that. That personal status, you can probably put in bracket those two words that Russ used. So, that would kind of clarify where we're heading to just give examples.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Availability and what was the other one?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Responsiveness.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, I mean, that at least lets people go, "Oh, okay, let's when we're defining these metrics figure out which..." Anyway, responsiveness

comes up later and so on. So, it seemed based on reading this the correct direction it may need. Any other comments on 24?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Žarko is in the que.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go ahead.

ŽARKO KECIC: I found this recommendation pretty much confusing to me and it is written in such language that it's very difficult to follow and to understand. And I believe that we have to be more specific in some issues and I agree fully with Kerry-Ann that we have to explain what we thought and what ideas we had while writing this recommendation. And I also have one question. How does CZDS Database relates to SSR issues?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Which database?

ŽARKO KECIC: CZDS. Beginning of recommendation and you're pointing to exact database that I don't see any connection to SSR.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Okay, so let me try and take a whack at this. So, to start, this is one of the things that, I guess I'll just sort of go on the record, I think slamming a bunch of recommendations together has caused this problem and so I'll try and support the text that's there but with the caveat that I think this was clearly a scene in the title, Rec 24, 25, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34. This was a bunch of other recommendations that were all very precise and specific, and they were all slammed together.

I think that's a mistake. I think the result is your comment and comments like that. Not to point at you, but I think that's a fair comment and I think that's what you get when you say, "I'm going to take a bunch of precise measurements that may seem a little bit repetitive but are looking at different things", and say, "Let's do a general set of measurements." And then people say, "Well, that's too general and I don't understand." So, I agree. But, based on what's there let me explain.

So, the CZDS is essentially talking about those top-level domains that are delegated and under the purview of ICANN as an organization and as a Community. So, the first chunk of this recommendation is saying paying attention to the TLDs and doing some conscientious measurements and archiving of the data is important. The second paragraphs says the same thing should be done for the root zone itself. The third paragraph says the same thing should be done for alternate routes, and I'll stand by for tomatoes when I get done with this. And then, the final one down below is about the IANA Registries.

In other words, I think it was on a call I was not on or on a set of calls I wasn't on, but I'm presuming that there was some consternation about

hey, we're proposing that you measure all these things and the proposal to measure them looked very, very similar. So, let's make one recommendation that says do some measurements and here are the things you should measure. Which direction as a team we take is subject to what everyone wants to do, and I'll be supportive of that. So, that's why there's sort of like a whole bunch of different things going on in this one recommendation. But, to your direct question, why are we talking about the CZDS? Because that is the mechanism that exists for people to be able to have transparency into how the TLDs are running and that is, I think, part of SSR. Is that any clearer or was that making it worse?

ŽARKO KECIC:

No, having a zone file doesn't tell me how they are run.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

It tells you some of how they're run. You can see turn, you can see their size, you can see the way in which data is... Well, turn, you can basically just sort of blow that out. You can see how things are added and taken out. You can observe things about the rate. You can observe things about the nature of the things that are in their zone.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

I see Danko and Steve in the que as well.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Danko, go ahead. And then Steve, you're next.

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Okay, thank you. I'm part of the team but also [inaudible] but this is basically come from me personally trying to understand some of the issues better because I haven't been with your work from the beginning so I might ask some things that you all already know only because I don't understand fully. So, first of all, short comment about the number of recommendations. It was mentioned, of course, when we worked together in Marrakech by Chris and people from the Board, the number of the recommendation point, as far as I understand it, is about implementation.

So, we are looking for a set of recommendations that will be implementable and in that sense, we are currently facing challenges with a huge number of recommendations that are coming from different sources. But, if there is a recommendation that has number of things below it and each of those is a separate task or sort of separate project, I would say that it will have to be sort of renumbered to be able to implement it. So, I'm not saying this is the case in this recommendation but if you are fitting in a couple of things under one hand, it's different things.

So, about the measurements, first of all, my understanding is that in CZDS, Centralized Zone Data Service, I'm not sure if there is currently but I understood there are also some CCs that are voluntarily in this database because it's used for various things, it's not only about this. I'm not 100 percent sure but this is my understanding.

Second thing, reading this recommendation, I was not sure I got this explanation, if it is about the content of the root zone or the content of the TLDs there, or is it about the serving of the root zone? If it's about serving, it's about root server system and we are currently trying to build a governing system to that. So, it should be like even more clear to the people who are reading it for the first time. And speaking about the management of the root zone and the [inaudible] regarding of that, I don't see the Customer Standing Committee being mentioned because the number of the KPIs to analyze the responses in changing of the root zone is done by CSC. So, just [inaudible]. I don't know if it helpful but thank you for the time.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Eric, do you want to respond, or do you want to go to Steve?

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Oh, I thought there was someone else in the que. I thought Steve was in the que.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Yeah, but I assume he has a different question.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Yeah, so I was trying to decide whether I should go hunting through my tabs to open up my CZDS portal to see if there are ccTLDs in there or not, but I know that .net's in there for example so there could be. I imagine ccTLDs if they wanted to be in there could be. But, you know, I

think there's a handful of meta comments in here and I'm not sure if I'm answering Danko's points clearly or if I've got them clearly, so maybe I'll be on the wrong page, in which case please correct me.

But, to sort of dovetail Danko and Žarko's comments, CZDS is how people can sort of understand a certain level of transparency and knowing how well it works, and there have certainly been some anecdotal comments that it's been difficult to use and I can sort of relate to that personally, I think what we're saying is since it's become a staple and it's an important part of how people expect that they can have transparency into the top-level domains that are in the root, that the service itself is subject to being assessed by the Community. And understanding whether it's actually fulfilling its role in letting people have the necessary transparency is something that would be measurable and that therefore it should be measured and tracked and published. So, I think that's sort of Paragraph 1.

Also, sort of maybe jumping back to I think Danko, I think maybe the first thing you said was about whether we should have one recommendation or n recommendations and break them out or not. I think resonating possibly some of the things I said. One of the things that I mentioned yesterday on the phone to KC in kind of a stream of consciousness moment that I'll repeat now is if we wind up with a lot of recommendations, and I sort of picked the number like 300, like if we have 300 recommendations and it's just a daunting pill for anyone to swallow, but that some of them, like in this case, are heavily related and could be accomplished with a common mechanism, like for example, if this broke out into four recommendations but they were all implementable by the same logic or whatever else, it'd be four recs but

only one work item, one of the things we might want to think about in our report is a Candidate Implementation Suggestion Section, where we don't say a recommendation is therefore directive, this is how it must be implemented, but some advice.

I'm saying Recommendation 24, 25, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34 could potentially all be implemented seemingly by the following mechanism, blah. So, that way we can keep our recommendations focused. We can keep our recommendations concise and self-contained, even if there's a lot of them and then we could say, "Where they could all be implemented, where several of them could be implemented together, here's some advice on how you might want to do it." And then it's up to ICANN Org to decide if they want to follow that advice or modify it or ignore it.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

So, I'd like to respond to that thought because my memory of Russell's which is where we did this merge was that one was, for example, root zone measurements and another one was TLD measurements, and we said, "What if the Board does the TLD measurements but not the root zone measurements, will we really learn what we think we're going to learn?" And so that was what led to the combining. We thought these should all be done or not.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Yeah, I mean it's a team project so yeah, I mean whatever the team wants.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I just wanted to since we were voicing the why the one direction is a problem, I wanted to voice the pro. Not just the con.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I appreciate it. Yeah, I didn't realize that before, so thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Danko any follow up or should I go to Steve?

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Thank you for more clarification. I just wanted to bring up a little bit different point of view. CZDS is important service and if the team thinks it should be measured, I agree to that. Maybe it will be, to define those, maybe it should be in cooperation with the Customer Standing Committee, but we'll see. Generally, thank you for the discussion.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Steve?

STEVE CONTE: Hi, Russ. Thanks. I wanted to talk about the alternate root zone bullet so if there's further discussion about CZDS I'm happy to pause and wait for that to finish. Okay, I'll note it paused and before I make any comment, Eric, can you give me clarification on that bullet which is the alternate roots. Are you saying to just measure the deltas or are you saying inherit the KPIs from the root zone and in addition, measure the deltas?

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

So, yeah, this one, I can't claim that I recall KC and I are on the same page there so this just being my perspective. Ideally, I think we would want to do both, and I recognize that this is a little more open ended than some of the other things that are in there in the sense that how do you even know you have any kind of a comprehensive set of alternate roots and what's the point. If I stand up an alternate root in my lab at Mason, does ICANN therefore have to track it? And I get that. And we may or may not want to keep this one. I can only really kind of explain the motivation behind its inception and whether we keep it as a team I think is subject to discussion. And again, I'll be supportive of the team's perspective overall on this one.

But, the idea would be if we have KPIs for what it means to be a root and we have the ability to see how contents in these root zones, one or more, evolve, that that should be tracked across both the ICANN managed official root and anything else that has risen to the level of scrutiny like Yeti or something else. And I think the reason would become clear as soon as any of them started to diverge or develop to a concern, there would be people looking for a canonical dataset of how these things have been treated, how they've been moving forward, and I actually think it would be helpful to ICANN Org to have been tracking these things. But that's just the strategic perspective that I think either needs to be supported by the team or potentially have this part excised.

STEVE CONTE:

Okay, thank you. So, you hit my first question on the head or my first point of definition and threshold of what an alternate root is and when ICANN should pay attention. The other thing I ask the Review Team to envision is with the root zone KPIs, we have a direct hand, we ICANN has a direct hand on one of the root servers, so we have access to KPI data off of that and we have collaborative relationships with other root zone operators.

With alternates, those relationships are either much more informal or don't exist and so I ask the Review Team to envision how some of these metrics would be captured. Are we looking at RIPE NCC Atlas level probes around the world for availability and responsiveness or how do you envision ICANN to capture some of these KPIs in a meaningful way that's not cost prohibitive?

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

So, I think that's a question generally to the team. And so, to maybe seed any kind of a discussion, which Russ, I don't know if you want to try and have this now or punt it for later, but I do think we should decide as a team whether we want to embrace this bullet, address this initiative or not.

And then clearly if we decide it's something worth keeping, explore the questions that Steve has raised which I think are good ones, whether there has to be the same level of resolution as there is for the ICANN managed root zone or is there some other level of resolution that can be used to track alternate roots or whether it's just deltas, which has a much lower lift than actually doing KPIs, etcetera. I think the first thing

is do we still feel like we have appetite to put this in there and if not then we don't have to answer the second question.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, I guess the question to the group is who wants to speak for keeping it and who wants to speak for removing it?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Russ, KC is in the que.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go ahead KC.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, yesterday on the phone with Eric when we went through these I spoke for removing it. I just think, again, I'm watching a lot of recommendations fly by and I don't see how this is going to get to a priority level for ICANN that gets it in on the table. And I mean, I'm on the fence about whether it's even ICANN's responsibility to even do this. But, the bottom line is I think it would be good if our recommendations focused on the data is under ICANN's jurisdiction and control. So, yeah, that's it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so KC's speaking against. I kind of took Steve's comment as against. Anyone... Eric's spoken for.

STEVE CONTE: Sorry, Russ, just to be clear, I don't have an opinion. I can't have an opinion in the room chat. I'm offering...

RUSS HOUSLEY: But you had some important points.

KC CLAFFY: Well, okay, I'll repeat some points then because really, really I mean, what do we want ICANN to measure here? And I think even on the things where it's in ICANN's control like the KPIs for ICANN's root, it's not obvious to me exactly what we want ICANN to measure. And some of these recommendations have gotten sufficiently vague that I'm frustrated because SSR3 is going to have a harder time than we are in terms of how do you really prove that one, the recommendation's been implemented and two, that it's been effective.

So, I don't, again, if the alternate roots get to a point where ICANN really has to worry about them, measurement's not going to help. And to the question of how do you know whether they've gotten to that point, I just don't think there's an answer to that question. Like, what would ICANN do about it anyway?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Does anyone want to speak for keeping it?

DENISE MICHEL: Hey, this is Denise.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL: I'm having a little bit of trouble, and maybe because it's seven a.m. here, following all the details of this discussion. Before we make a decision to drop a recommendation on this phone call, would it be possible to have the proposal and the reasons for dropping put in the email list? I think that would also help those who weren't able to be on today's call to weigh in on it?

KC CLAFFY: I'm happy to do that. KC.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so KC, you're going to send a note?

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, I'll do it right now.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Or happy to have the discussion? Great. Thank you.

KC CLAFFY: I sent a note to the email list right now.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Alright, thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, so then just to sort of, I don't know if I'm going to go too fast but I'm conscious that we're coming up on the ten minute mark. So, the final two sub-bullets in this recommendation were, one of them was to basically have some kind of measurement sense for how long provocation delays are to get regional contents out to other authoritative name servers and the other one was to do some measurement and archiving of statistics about the IANA Registries that ICANN has purview for. And so, the text, I think, and KC can correct me if I'm wrong, but I don't think we made a lot of changes to those two paths where we had made some changes I think during a Plenary Call earlier. So, those two kind of exist as they were for the most part.

KC CLAFFY: It's KC. I think that's right.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, I'm not hearing anyone want to speak. Are there any hands?

JENNIFER BRYCE: No hands apart from KC, which I assume is an old hand.

KC CLAFFY: Oh, I'm sorry. [inaudible] fix that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so since we're almost out of time, let's jump to Recommendation 26. It looks like you made one small change and that's it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, and this one, I don't know how many people are, which list, the KSK rollover list, just got a sort of a foreshock of upcoming release of information about the next round of KSK Rollover. So, this was basically talking about procedure issues around future key rollovers for the KSK. So, I don't think KC and I really changed... Did we change any text here KC? I don't know if we changed anything here. I think it was more just clarification but the fact that we had to clarify means probably other people may want to take a look at it to see if they have any questions about because it may or may not be completely clear what it's talking about, but it essentially says that we need to have a more rigorous and transparent process around these sorts of things.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Kerry-Ann is in the que.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go ahead.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

Hi Eric and KC. One of the things that when I read it, I was just thinking about practical implementation. When you said, “to include the posting of the procedure for public comment and Community feedback must be incorporated.” Usually the key rollover has like a specific time it should happen to ensure the security. So, I was wondering is it that we’re saying this should happen six months before, five months before, given how long they usually take to notify. Sometimes it has a set time, sometimes it changes.

So, I was just trying to see that when we recommend for the posting of a procedure for public comment and Community feedback, what timeframe were we thinking that they should do this and do they really need to wait, for the transparency aspect, do they really need to wait back for public feedback or is it that they just need to post the procedure in advance, so persons have the opportunity or not? So, I was just trying to see if we could actually tighten what exactly we’re hoping to get out of it because while the public feedback is not anything significant, do they have to wait like a long time to get that and delay the process even more?

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Hey, Kerry-Ann. Yeah, so that’s a good clarifying question. So, I think what the recommendation is trying to say is not that the process should have Community feedback at various stages. It’s that the process should be codified. It should be basically a program, and a program should be vetted by the Community. It should have exception legs, it should have responses to what happens if, and the Community should be on board with this is a structured program that describes the procedure, including

error legs and everything else, of what it means to do a KSK Rollover. And after the Community says, “Yes, that’s the procedure we’ll follow.”, it can execute just like a program. And when it gets to a branch...

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

[inaudible] So could we write that exactly how you said that, because the sentence that starts with “verification to continue”, I think that is what, exactly how you described it, is what we probably need to state right there. Because as it looks now, from an outsider looking in, I would read it as every single time, they have to do this process, they need to post it and persons need to commend.

It’s not very clear that it’s the general, as you said, the procedure that needs to be institutionalized, and it’s the procedure that needs to commend from the public to be institutionalized. Once it’s institutionalized, it kind of runs itself. So, probably we could tighten the language there just to say exactly what you just explained a while ago.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

I’m happy to do that. I’m not sure. I think I’m having...

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

The sentence starts in “verification of the key rollover process should include posting the procedure for public comment.” It’s like, it’s not clear that what we want is, in the case as you said, an established procedure and that is that this established procedure that should have the program added. So, just to make sure that it’s clear that it’s only

that one off time, and then periodically it could be opened back for review, but it just needs to be... I don't know if I'm any clearer.

JENNIFER BRYCE: KC is in the que, also.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Sorry, the first sentence is "To address it," blah, blah, blah, "ICANN should create or use a formal process modeling tool and language to specify the details of feature key rollovers. Such an approach would increase..." Yeah, okay, so I'm just trying to figure out where the text that's there, like I said, I'm probably close to it, so I'm probably accidentally expanding words that mean something to me that are not clear to everyone else. So, I think maybe... Okay, let me try this.

KC CLAFFY: It's KC. I thought Kerry-Ann's just saying there needs to be a margin between the, make there be enough time for the public comment to occur and for it to be integrated back into the plan. My impression is that that's not been a problem. So, I'm comfortable not specifying that aspect of this recommendation.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Oh, should I stop typing?

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, because you're in the wrong sentence anyway, unless I misunderstand what Kerry-Ann is asking for. But Kerry-Ann...

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Let me finish.

KC CLAFFY: If there's a wording to say, "Post the comment, post the plan for public comment with enough time to integrate the results back into the plan.", would that cover your concern?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Hi KC. It would but I think it's just to make sure that it wasn't clear whenever I read it. I mean, what Eric explained made it very clear to me but how I read it the first brush, it wasn't clear that what we're asking for, it's not every single time there's a key rollover, but more that as an established process, we want this done as a specific item.

KC CLAFFY: Right.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: And then after that, the key rollovers will just follow that specific procedure. That wasn't clear to me. So, you know that every single key rollover would have this review process, this review procedure, and then it would happen.

KC CLAFFY: Oh, so maybe we word [inaudible].

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: It wasn't very distinct [inaudible]. Yeah, it was a one off procedure approval from the Community that we wanted and then that process is followed thereafter. It just seemed like every key rollover this would happen.

KC CLAFFY: Right.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: That's how it read to me.

KC CLAFFY: Okay, I hear you. So, if you just added the phrase, and where is it, 26, I'll just add it in here and try to add it. If you add the phrase "would be followed in the future", like?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Probably even at the beginning. "ICANN should create or use a formal [inaudible]." I could probably put there "establish a formal...", like something at the beginning of the sentence. Create or use, instead of create or use, I think we should say should establish and delete the create or use and just say establish.

KC CLAFFY: Well, they're probably not going to establish it. They're probably going to use something that exists in the world, let's hope.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, I don't think you want them to try and establish a modeling tool. And it's a modeling tool.

KC CLAFFY: I think this is easy to fix offline so why don't we take it off.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: But one [inaudible] it's just to make sure that we distinguish, it's not every key rollover that we want this to happen, but we want it to be something where more formalized process established instead.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. And so, I think if you use words like "should establish a process to use for future key rollovers", period. And then say, "This should include all modeling language", blah, blah, blah.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah, something like that. Yeah, that would fix it.

KC CLAFFY: I can take a pass at that if you want and then you guys can have your way with it in Montreal.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

KC CLAFFY: I think to say about this recommendation, I expressed my concerns about it last time we talked about it. Eric more or less convinced me this would not be that much overhead. I mean, I was just concerned about one, the level of overhead and two, my concern about the rollover last time was not that it didn't have a modeling language, but it really didn't, as far as I could tell, it didn't have a public checklist of here's the things that need to be done.

I mean, ICANN did a bunch of stuff, a huge amount of stuff, that made I think a big difference in the success of the rollover. But it wasn't like a pilot's checklist as far as I could tell, so when it got thrown in front of SSAC at kind of the eleventh hour, let's just say, because other people had expressed concern by the public comment process, really SSAC was in a very awkward position about well, how do we determine that it's ready to go?

So, I thought, you know, public formal modeling process aside, can we just get a checklist that everybody's agreed on if these things are checked, it's a go, rocket launch. And then Eric said, look, this will be even better, this formal modeling process and maybe a checklist like

thing would be incorporated into that, and I should defer to him because this is not my area of expertise.

And I would be frankly curious to see what OCTO or whoever has responsibility for this piece inside of ICANN, how they would react to this sort of thing. Do they think this would make their job easier, do they understand exactly what we mean by this recommendation, is there anything else we can add? I mean, the goal is of course to make this whole thing go smoother, so we're not caught in this kind of drama that we had last time, but I'm looking to do that with a minimal amount of work for them that makes sense. So, anyway, maybe Steve has something to say there or maybe we just have to wait and see. It would be worth another round of socialization of this thing with people at OCTO for you guys to do that in person because I won't be there in Montreal.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

And while we have the focus on this, let me just add in a couple of other things. The last KSK Rollover was a great illustration of why I think we need something like this. Because it wasn't just... The case of a pilot's checklist is a great analogy, KC. It's exactly right. And when everything goes well and you've got the board is green, you launch, and that's good. The problem was there was a problem, or at least there might have been a problem. There was something that was at least perceived as a problem and what was not really well thought out because it wasn't formal, it was anecdotal, was what to do if there's a problem. What to do if there's an exception.

And part of using a formal process model is you're forced to think through all the exceptions of what you'll do so that when one happens, you procedurally follow what you already decided to do and there's not a lot of consternation and delayed equivocation. You basically say, "Well, we agreed that if this ever happened at this stage happened, we would follow this leg, and this is the checklist of what we do now that we're in exception leg."

And that's what I think we badly needed last time. Whether you believe there was a problem or not, there was a point at which we put things on pause, we were in an exception leg, it would have been very helpful to say, "This is what the playbook says to do now." So, that's what the recommendation is, is build up that playbook with those exception legs.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Okay, we're out of time. What I propose we do with this point is get the text from KC, she's going to make it in pass here and at one other. She's going to raise the should the alternate root bullet be dropped. And then we try and get this finalized over email hopefully by the beginning of next week. Okay, Jennifer, Action Items.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Thanks Russ. I think you pretty much covered everything that I had noted there in terms of Action Items, mostly for KC to make the edits and then for the team to review the edits ahead of next week's call.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Okay, thank you. Sorry we ran late today. Thanks for all your help.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks everyone. Bye.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Bye everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]