BRENDA BREWER:

Good day, everyone. This is Brenda speaking, and I'd like to welcome you to the SSR2 Plenary Call #80 on the 14th of August, 2019 at 14:00 UTC. Members attending the call today are Russ, Danko, Ram, Norm, and KC. Apologies from Eric, Boban, Laurin, and Kaveh. Attending from ICANN Organization is Jennifer, Negar – oh, I apologize. Negar's not on yet. So, it's Jennifer, Steve, and Brenda, technical writer Heather Flanagan, and observer Kristina Hakobyan. Today's meeting is being recorded. Please state your name before speaking for the record. And I'll turn the call over to Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Welcome. Sounds like we have a light turnout today. I hope that's just because of the time of year and that people are enjoying holidays. The plan today was to – all the penholders were supposed to have updated the document. I went through it earlier today, and I see that there are still several holes, but I'd like to go through what we can and see if there's any concerns with what's there, and we can get the penholder to update anything that is in concerns. Jennifer sent out the link to the Google Doc that contains all the recommendations. Recommendation one was turned to a suggestion, so it's at the end of the document, so we'll skip that one. Recommendation two, Scott is the penholder, and it is about getting a certification in the security management system defined by ISO 27001. It looks like several people have put some edits in there. Does anyone have any concerns with what's here?

Okay. Hearing nothing, recommendation three is still missing, and the penholder is not on the call. Recommendation four is about finishing

one of the SSR1 recommendations. It says that lay out the budget so we can tell which parts of the budget are related to SSR and which ones are related to other things. Any concerns there? Okay. Five is related to finishing SSR1 recommendation six, which says, please explain in a public document responsibilities assigning to SSAC and to RSSAC. There's a draft document, but it has never been finalized. Just says, finish the job. Any concerns? I heard some noise, so I don't know if that was someone trying to speak.

Okay. Recommendation six has to do with the SSR strategy and framework, has to do with two of the SSR1 recommendations. And it says to capture SSR-related best practices in a consensus document. Establish clear, measurable and trackable objectives related to them. Okay. Recommendation seven – somehow, we thought we were done with this. We assigned it to Angie, and, of course, Angie is gone. I would like a team member to take penholdership for this one. Can someone on the call do that?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Hi, Russ. This is Kerry. I can.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. I suspect it won't take much to finish that. Okay. And recommendation eight, Boban's the penholder, and it has to do with SSR recommendation 27. And basically, other than a typo that I see – basically, says risk management is not centralized and strategically coordinated and asks them to do that. Okay. Nine is deleted. My

EN

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: This one was to address the fact that we wanted to have a confirmed position for chief security officer. Like, over the years, they had, like, different persons holding a similar position, but we wanted this to be established. So, I think we – the aim for this was just to specifically state that we want this person hired. Like, not a role that we want to see just floating, but we want to see specifics. So, we also suggested some of the areas that we think should happen in terms of reporting because it was the need to establish clear guidelines for ICANN's procurement process to ensure that the supply chain on a whole will be secure, which would then eventually lead to their management [contracts, etc.] for their hardware and software to be secure. So, I don't know if anyone has any comments.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. Okay, recommendation 11 is –

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: And Russ, just one addition. The sentence is that the CSO, I think we could probably write the CSO/CISO since we had it as 'or above,' just to make [for consistency. I'd just seen that] a while ago. The CSO should oversee because –

RUSS HOUSLEY: I see. Yeah.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That makes sense. Okay. 11 is also about security risk management. It has a bunch of bullets. Some of them tie back to recommendation two. Some of them tie back to the previous recommendation. And some of them tie back to the recommendation eight. So, I'm wondering whether, given all that tying back, whether this is – whether the pieces that do have overlap should remain or we should make this a more simple, straightforward thing on the pieces that don't overlap. Do – I wish Boban were here to say why. It's either that, or we should delete the other ones and have them all point here is the way I'm thinking.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Hi, this is Kerry. I know Boban isn't here, but I know when he came up with this, it was that the security risk management framework stands alone. I think the idea was to make sure that it stands alone from the other recommendations because it has much more wider steps and implication that needs to happen outside out of the other specific recommendations. So, I think probably we could make it more concise rather than to remove it or merge it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I see.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: But, I think the idea was that we needed it to stand alone so they know that they need to implement a security risk management framework 'cause what we saw, I remember some of the data that he found, it was bits and pieces and records dating back like five, six, eight years. It was [inaudible] that they have a management framework going forward. I don't think the idea was to delete, but we could probably try and make it more concise working with Heather or someone. I don't know.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I understand what you're saying. So, we'll just leave this for now, unless anyone has any other points to raise. Okay. Recommendation 12 was – is part of the – was deleted in – and merged with nine, and now it's part of the compliance cluster that we have yet to receive. 13, we lost the penholder here as well. Can I get someone on the team, maybe someone other than Kerry-Ann, since she just took one, to take the penholder on this one?

BRENDA BREWER: Russ, I'm not sure – you're probably not in the Zoom Room – but Žarko has his hand raised.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh. No, I can't see that. Go ahead, Žarko.

EN

ŽARKO KECIĆ:	Yeah. Hi, everybody. Do you hear me?
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Yes.
ŽARKO KECIĆ:	Okay, great. I'll take this one.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Thank you. Okay. The recommendation 14 – Laurin. He's not here. This is the IANA portal, and there – while there's a bunch of little points to it, I think it is – it all does kind of hang together. Alright. Not hearing anyone speak, so 15 is root server operations. This one, we had a pretty vigorous debate about this one last time we talked about it, and I think this is the result of the debate. Basically, it says that L-Root should develop a best practices, and they should be the example to the rest of the root servers. There was a whole bunch of stuff that was in here that got removed.

So, the last time that – the only piece I see of the discussion last time that was not resolved is – should also include hardening strategies for L-Root. There was a question of how that was measurable. I don't – doesn't look like that one piece got sorted out, but maybe it was sorted by adding the next sentence, which was to develop performance measures. So, basically, we're asking them to tell us how to measure that. Okay. The next three are part of the compliance cluster that we haven't seen yet. And 19 – this is KC regarding the research briefings. KC, is there – I think this has been stable a long time. Is that right?

KC CLAFFY:	Yes, as far as I'm concerned.

RUSS HOUSLEY:	Okay. Alright. Twenty. So, this is about abusive naming and guidelines for IDNs. And basically – we're – the last comments regarding visually indistinguishable, somebody wanted to come up with a document that explains what that means. My hope is that the findings text will include that as opposed to the recommendations text. There was also a question whether this can be measured. Naveed's not on the call, so he – I can't – I don't know whether he did anything to address that. I'm pretty happy with what's here. Do others have concerns still?
	Okay. The next three were merged, and so into 20. Then, the next three, Eric has not gotten put in here yet, which leaves us to the data recovery plan, which is recommendation 27, which basically says create a third site and have an external auditor verify that it all works. Okay. 28 we do not have a penholder for. Can I ask someone other than Danko or Kerry-Ann to pick this one up? This is a pretty important one regarding name collisions.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:	Russ, this is Kerry. I think we need somebody technical for this one just to make sure. There's a note below about the working party, Name Collision Analysis Project. So, I don't know if the intent was to have it tied in or referenced only.

DENISE MICHEL: This is Denise. I thought Scott McCormick was going to work on this one. I'm happy to reach out and to clarify, but –

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'll put Scott's name here and see if this is –

DENISE MICHEL: Maybe put a question mark after it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Alright. Alright, and then we have the ones from Eric that haven't been filled in yet. And then, 35 has to do with looking forward to the next generation cryptographic algorithms for DNSSEC.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Russ?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, okay. So, if you can – if we could scroll down – if you scroll down a little bit. So, this – I started editing this, but we said that we can do the rationale later. So, the main thing to look at here is we scroll down, scroll down to the resolution itself. Okay. The resolution has been – so I've edited the resolution like this, so I don't know if [other] has any concern if you compare it to what it was previously. So, I edited the

recommendation, and basically saying that we should follow lesson learned from the recent root KSK rollover and also develop a plan for algorithm rollover to plan for migration to ECSDA and post [quantum]. So, I will be happy to see if there are any comment or things about – so it may change over time, but this is what I have so far.

RUSS HOUSLEY: This looks fine to me. Others? Okay. So, I think we have – so you've incorporated the findings text here, which ultimately will go elsewhere, right?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes, yes. But, this is not yet final. I think I have to – yeah, if you want to delay it, we can delay it because I just started – I started working on it, but you told me that we'd do that later. So, but what's there is not – it's just some data I took from the document you and I did. So, but it's not yet final, yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Alright. 36, Kerry-Ann. This is about privacy.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah, Russ. It's been drafted for a while. I haven't gotten any feedback or comment much from anyone, so I think just you guys have asked which document to point to and stuff like that, but I don't know if everyone is okay with how it's structured or if there's any recommended changes. But, this kind of summarizes all the different

data that were floating around on privacy, and the steps on the inside are just clearer actions that we – I wanted to recommend that they do. So, I don't know if anyone have any specific questions or if they want it restructured in any way, but this was the best way I could've figured out how to summarize everything. And it's still green. I wasn't sure why it was green, so I don't know if that meant anything that I missed.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I have no idea why the ones that I edited are green either, so I can't help you there.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I mean, it's a good color. It's good to go, but I don't know.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I guess I'm a Google Doc neophyte. It looks fine to me.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: And I didn't put any bullets in the front because I don't know if we're going with [A] bullets, dash bullets, symbols, so –

RUSS HOUSLEY: We'll –

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I mean, that's fine.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Let Heather figure that out.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah, you figure that [out at the end.]

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Y'all have to leave me something to do. This is Heather.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. 27 was merged. 28, or 37, 38 were merged with other ones. And I believe all the rest of them are in the compliance group. Okay, so my understanding – Denise, you can please confirm this – that we'll have another readout next week from the compliance group and hopefully have some text from them to review, the Sub Team work and the compliance issue. Is that right?

DENISE MICHEL: That's my hope. I'll need to connect with the group to confirm that, so I'll do that via e-mail.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, great. And I'll reach out to –

KC CLAFFY: Russ, this –

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go ahead.

KC CLAFFY: Russ, this is KC. Laurin and I did work on the – some of the text and added some notes. And, yeah, what Denise said is right. I think we'll need at least one more call we could try to do this week, and then we should have something next week to talk about, at least the next phase.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Alright. Thank you. And I will reach out to Eric and find out why the ones he was assigned are blank. I suspected that he got confused and worked in another document, but I don't know that for sure. Okay. Is there any other business to raise? Okay. Hearing none, I'm sorry that we didn't have more people so that we could for sure know we have consensus on the approach we're taking, but I think that we're getting close to a set here. And once we have the whole – the inputs from the compliance Sub Team, we'll be close to have – being able to see what our total recommendation looks like. Alright. Thank you, and have a good week. We'll talk next week.

DENISE MICHEL: Bye, everyone.

KC CLAFFY: Thanks. Thanks, bye.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Buh-bye.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Buh-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]