
Brenda Brewer:

Good day everyone. This is Brenda speaking. I'd like to welcome you to SSR2 Plenary Call #81 on September 4th, 2019 at 14:00 UTC. Attending the call today is Ram Krishna, Russ, Boban, Danko, Kaveh, Eric, Laurin, Kerry-Ann, Norm Ritchie. Apologies from Alain. Attending from ICANN Org is Jennifer, Negar, Steve and Brenda. Technical Writer Heather has joined.

Today's call is being recorded. Please state your name before speaking for the record. I believe we had someone just join. KC. Thank you, KC. KC is also in attendance today. And I'll turn the call over to Russ. Thank you.

Russ Housley:

Thank you. So, over the past two weeks we have asked people to raise any objections with the Recommendation text that is in the Google doc. We have received no concerns so we're assuming those are all fine. And today we're going to get a readout in the direction that the Sub-team has been working and hopefully we'll get those into the Google doc shortly after. So, I'm going to turn it over to Laurin to walk us through what the Sub-team has come up with. Thank you.

Laurin Weissinger:

Hi everyone. This is Laurin. I know some people who have also worked on this are on the call and I will likely forget some stuff. Please just interrupt me if that is the case. I'll be going in the order we have stuck in the Google doc that we are working on and essentially give a quick overview to start with and then I think other people can also jump in with the important points.

So, essentially what we've been working on looks as follows. We're essentially looking at some key points we're having, so I'll state those first, which is we believe that a fundamental change to the Compliance Regime is required and that goes in the direction to empower them to act on systemic abuse, abuse harboring, [inaudible]. There needs to be a change that has to do with the changing of the Compliance regime as well, can change of how DNS Abuse is approached. So, what are the definitions that are used, how are things tracked, how are things... Someone has a baby?

Policies and Agreements with... I'm sorry. I can hear a lot of noise. Can you hear me?

Russ Housley:

Can hear you just fine.

Laurin Weissinger:

Okay. I had a lot of sounds on the call. Okay, I'm sorry. Where was I? Yes. So, we're saying well some of the definitions, the reporting and tracking of this has to change and the Policies and the Agreements of the Contracted Parties need to have a meaningful impact on how DNS Abuse is being mitigated. So, you can see it kind of always comes back to the same stuff.

We then go through our findings. Essentially there's a lot of stuff going on in the realm of cybercrime and other types of abuse where the DNS can be used as a tool by attackers and essentially, we're saying there's a lot ICANN could do to actually mitigate a lot of these problems. And we're going through a few numbers here in our text, which is how is malware developed, what's going on with Digital Certificate fraud, phishing, email compromise, scams, botnets, spam, DDOS, etcetera,

etcetera. And as we all know all of these are usually increasing in number and have been increasing in number in the past few years as well.

So, what we're trying to say here is this is a problem that's become more and more serious and stuff needs to happen. A lot of these elements of cybercrime in particular do rely to some extent on the DNS so we all know that, right? So, that's also fine. What we're saying needs to be done is that... Let me just scroll down. On the Recommendations, right?

So, we're saying, again, Compliance has to fundamentally change. There has to be changes to the contracts in the first place. So, abuse needs to become a key element in these contracts right now. It is not, so when we had the calls of Compliance we were essentially told, "Yeah, we cannot really do something on that front because there's no contractual language so there's nothing to enforce, nothing to deal with." So, obviously that's number one. These procedures have to first be integrated. Then it needs to be proceeded to address Systemic Abuse in Registrars and Registries. Again, a lot of this is definitions and a lot is just contractual language but then there needs to be a move by the Board to empower complaints, to react to certain complaints. So, one of the key cases here we have in the text obviously outlined. Essentially, it was a very clear cut case but there was just nothing that could be done until they abruptly stopped paying.

So, our key thing here to kind of sum up the Compliance part is the Compliance should more prominently serve the public and trust in what they do. So that means they should have clear [inaudible] should fully inform what's going on except complaints and have maximum public exposure of what they're doing. Obviously not everything will be always available.

To match that, obviously again, we need a different type of how DNS Abuse is seen, defined, tracked, and reported. So here we are saying, well number one, obviously CCT Review Recommendations should be looked at and implemented. Then take into account current abuse definitions plus the Convention on Cybercrime. This is something where, for example, the SSAC could perhaps take the lead.

We're saying ICANN should establish and permit to maintaining a single complain portal for all complaints and that should automatically direct whatever the complaint is to a relevant party. The idea behind this is to just simplify the way complaints are being dealt with. And the only kind of upstream flow would be some metadata so it's possible in a kind of style like fashion have a report on like how much is coming in, what is happening to these complaints. So, for example something might be taken down or a Contracted Party might come back saying, "We cannot actually act upon this because in the legal system we're in this is not something we can deal with."

And then we're also looking into some data reporting so when possible there should be some level of public reporting that I have just explained, and [inaudible]. This is somehow, at this point, because it was also about data there should be fewer limits on the same type of data, data rate limiting that's currently in place.

Now, I'll go over more specifically the Policies and Agreements of the Contracted Parties. So, as I said before, one of the key ideas is to update key Policies and Practices that impact on security threat mitigation. So, this essentially means that because of current events, so for example the US going dark but also a few other things in the past few years, it's just problematic to get information that's needed. So, this will just be an overhaul of these. Again, data access is one where pulling this data as

[inaudible] described in a blog post, usually works sometimes it doesn't, timelines are different, etcetera, etcetera.

This is the incentive for Contracted Parties to mitigate abuse and security threats. So, we're touching on what happened in the past year, right? So, you get a reduction in fees if you do certain things and we just think, well, if you do well in security you should celebrate it, that's two. Obviously, the numbers in the exact Policy's, while we do have text in this, I don't want to go into this. I think that part will take forever. And then, obviously, a key thing that I mentioned...

Russ Housley: Laurin, can I interrupt, sir?

Laurin Weissinger: Yeah, absolutely.

Russ Housley: I mean, it seems to me that that's got to go through the Policy Development Process so we can only recommend a starting point, right?

Laurin Weissinger: I would assume, yes. And I think it's also... So that's why I said I'll kind of jump over this because how much of a reduction should you get, etcetera, etcetera, even for us recommending something that might be something we should sit down with the...

Russ Housley: But the bottom line, the Recommendation is go through the Policy Development Process here.

Laurin Weissinger: Yes.

Russ Housley: Here's a straw man but we've got...

Laurin Weissinger: Yes.

Russ Housley: Okay, good. Thank you.

Laurin Weissinger: I believe so.

Kimberly Claffy: But guys, the whole thing would have to. I mean, everything that Laurin has said from the beginning of the call would fall under that.

Laurin Weissinger: Yeah, most likely.

Russ Housley: I think that's probably true but this point, I don't know, was like a throbbing sore thumb in terms of it's clearly got to go through that process, but yeah, thank you.

Kimberly Claffy: Yeah, if you're going to mandate it but I believe that some of the Registry's already do this. Like .org might already have some financial rebate for certain behavior on the part of Registrars. So, we should reach out and [inaudible]. I mean voluntarily they do it. So, we should point that out. In fact, one of the things we could recommend that wouldn't necessarily go through a PDP is to have ICANN publish the status of all such pricing strategies that already exist in the ecosystem. But anyway, go on Laurin.

Russ Housley: Okay, thank you. That's a good point.

Laurin Weissinger: So, yes. So, I think that this is also something we touched on, maybe not the last two or three calls but before that [inaudible]. Significant changes, so effectively I did not mention that. Incorporate measures to mitigate DNS Abuse in agreements with Contracted Parties, this I mentioned many times that we recommend that the contracts going forward should include clear language on DNS Abuse, what is it, what do you have to deal with, what is required or suggested where requiring is not possible, and what can happen to you as a Contracted Party if you fail to actually do that.

And then obviously this touches on service level agreements. So, what is the level of service that is required needs to be given. It's essentially in effect that there where one has to develop indicators, etcetera, etcetera. That's how this works. And then we're saying there should be more institutionalize training and certification for the Contracted Parties and Key Stakeholders. So, you know, what are common methods of abuse, what are mitigation efforts, etcetera, etcetera.

This is something that OCTO is already doing but it is at least as far as I understand, correct me if I'm wrong, much more on this level as well we offer it and then if you come, you come, and I think the idea for this would be a bit more along the lines of you must at least take note of what's going on.

So, this is essentially a very quick overview of what is currently a 12 page working document. I probably forgot some stuff, so the people on the call who have worked on this, I'm not sure who exactly is there, please make additions, point to all the mistakes I made running through this, and everybody else obviously are welcome to ask any question you would like to ask.

Kerry-Ann Barrett:

Hi, this is Kerry. I think the only input I probably, I think just to summarize what Laurin kind of presented is that I think that the general feeling of the Subgroup is that there are mechanisms that are available. That's the message we want to bring on to these Recommendations, that there are mechanisms that are available and have been available and have come from several other groups, and our main focus was to try to highlight those, ensure that persons understood that we're not trying to duplicate some data's existence, that the Community is available to provide support.

And it's more to send a message that it is our belief that ICANN may be unwilling without saying it outrightly. It's just a matter of the willingness to be able to leverage the [inaudible], put measures in place which are not going to cost them more than what they probably have, that there are some developers who just use what they have. They need to pretty much not just think about the income stream that they're getting from Registrars, but to see how they can use that to make the internet more

secure and I think that's the main message without trying to say that outrightly.

And I think the text that we do have outstanding is trying to see how best to summarize some of those suggestions we can think that these mechanisms could look like without saying, recognizing that it's still ultimately the Board's decision. How to give the suggestions without it being an ultimatum to the Board so that if it doesn't happen it would seem that the Recommendation failed. I think that's a challenge that we would have in crafting our finalizing the Recommendation. Hello?

Russ Housley:

I heard you Kerry-Ann.

Kerry-Ann Barrett:

I don't know if that helps. I think once you guys see the text itself it will be easier like in terms of the supreme text but that's our main message and all the research that we've done is to either we state the obvious or we omit it. But the idea is that we want to state the obvious and just ensure that some of the things that we're recommending, it's not that we want a Recommendation to fail when you put the suggestion, but the suggestions are, these are our ideas. This is how you guys could do it. Are you willing, are you have the appetite to stand up and do it or not?

But we don't want the drafting to be [inaudible] the drafter looks at it. It's the idea that is how can we make these suggestions without making it that the Recommendation fails? How can we pull out what the high level impact we want, which is that we want you to put firm measures in place? These are some ideas. These are not the only ideas. So the drafting would have to be able to reflect that but we don't want people

to pick it out and say that okay they didn't set up a compliance, they didn't do the external audit, and they didn't hire a firm, but they pretty much, audit systems have been put in place, there is a report mechanism, they have used the teams, they have user ports that have been issued by the Community to feed back into their compliance mechanisms. That's our main goal, I think. [inaudible]

Russ Housley:

So, I think a Recommendation that says make sure this data is available to the Community is something that is Board actionable. Start the Policy Development Process to see how... That's a harder one, because it's really not the Board's action to do that. That's the part I'm struggling with.

Laurin Weissinger:

This is Laurin. Yes. So, essentially as hopefully of you, Kerry-Ann, I'll just say this is a complicated issue in particular because I'm not sure how we make this into a multiple kind of functional Recommendations that on the one hand, according to what we have said before, you know meet at least some of the smart criteria so there is some way to actually see what's going on but at the same time convene the spirit of what we're trying to achieve or what we're trying to do as Kerry-Ann said. I think this is again one of those where a face-to-face to really polish and get the language right on these Recommendations might be in order. At least I struggle to do this via calls, and I feel I'm not the only one.

Russ Housley:

So, one thing I'm not hearing is people saying that they think is going in the wrong direction. Am I hearing that right? Okay, so we need a report from the Sub-team, and we need to then figure out how to write a

Recommendation that says start the Policy Process or tick it off or whatever and we need to figure out how to do that. I think that is actually one of the things that we have asked for assistance from a consultant so I'll reach out and see if we can get that in time. I also hear that we probably are going to need a face-to-face to sort the last parts of this out. We had a discussion that maybe January was the right time for that. Does anyone have suggestions in terms of places that would work or times that would work so that we can put together a Doodle Poll?

Laurin Weissinger:

This is Laurin. Quick note because I said the face-to-face thing. I was thinking of the face-to-face in Montreal to do it. Not to say that we shouldn't have the face-to-face in January because I do think we need to that, too.

Russ Housley:

I agree. I know we're going to need the Montreal face-to-face and that's already scheduled but we also said that what we thought we would need is to take the feedback from Montreal and the Community engagement and put it into the final report so the coming out of a face-to-face in January we could release a report for public comment.

Laurin Weissinger:

This is Laurin again. I thought that L.A. worked well last year. We might not want to go the same week where everyone else somehow is in L.A., so we have room. But I felt it worked well. It was good to reach so I would say that would be an option again considering other ICANN offices, yeah, Brussels probably won't be that nice that time of year.

Russ Housley: So, Negar do we know... Last year we collided with the Board and you couldn't spend much time with us. Do we know if the Board is doing anything in January?

Negar Farzinnia: Hi, Russ. This is Negar. I believe the Board has a Workshop in January. I'm not quite sure what the dates are. But I believe they do have a Workshop sometime in that month.

Russ Housley: If you could find out the dates so we can put together a Doodle, that would be helpful.

Negar Farzinnia: Yeah, I can do that.

Laurin Weissinger: I have something here. I confirmed the dates, they are 24th until 26th of January in L.A. for the Workshop.

Russ Housley: Thank you. Okay, so we want to avoid those dates. Are there any other dates we need to avoid in January? Obviously the 1st.

Laurin Weissinger: This is Laurin.

Russ Housley: Go ahead Laurin.

Laurin Weissinger: Okay, whoever spoke stopped. I would also say probably the first week after New Year is likely not going to work because too many people will still be on holiday and so I'm not sure about school holidays, but I don't have kids, but I believe it's about two weeks after New Year when school starts again, so probably shouldn't before that because we have multiple people that would struggle with doing that.

Boban Krusic: Hi Laurin, this is Boban. I second this because we have holidays the first two weeks in January and I also recommend the start the third week in January with the Doodle until the 24th of January and then we can decide which two or three days to choose.

Russ Housley: Okay, that makes sense to me. Can we put together that Doodle poll please so we can pick the dates? Does anyone have concerns with L.A.? That way the people who overlap can go to L.A. once and maybe stay?

Kerry-Ann Barrett: What were the possible dates? Sorry I missed that. I have to interject. What were the possible dates we were looking at?

Russ Housley: We're looking at starting the third week and then the Board is meeting the 24th through 26th, so basically...

Kerry-Ann Barrett: Of October or November?

Russ Housley: January.

Kerry-Ann Barrett: January, okay. I had to take my earphones in to someone I look like a Secret Service person in a meeting. Sorry.

Russ Housley: Right. So, we're looking at somewhere in the last three weeks of January, but not the dates the Board is there.

Laurin Weissinger: This is Laurin. Maybe... I'm bad with the clashes today. Early February should also be a possible date. That's all I wanted to say. I'm sorry Kerry-Ann.

Kerry-Ann Barrett: Oh, no that's fine. That's okay. The last week of January would be out for me because I may or may not be [inaudible] but the two weeks in the middle is perfect because we have a slow time here at the office.

Russ Housley: Can Staff put together that Doodle poll? I'm not hearing any objections to L.A..

Kerry-Ann Barrett: Russ, sorry that I missed this if we discussed. Are we still doing Montreal or not?

Russ Housley: Yes. We still are. This is to deal with what we learned from our engagement to produce the final work for public comment.

Kerry-Ann Barrett: Alright, perfect. Thank you.

Russ Housley: Okay. Is there any other business today? Okay, hearing none I think we're done. Thank you all.

Kerry-Ann Barrett: Bye guys.

Russ Housley: Bye-bye.

Brenda Brewer: Thanks everyone. Bye-bye.

Laurin Weissinger: Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]