
BRENDA BREWER:

Good day, everyone. Happy New Year. Welcome to SSR2 Plenary Number 96, on the 8th January, 2020 at 15:00 UTC. Members attending the call today include Danko, Norm, Kaveh, Laurin, Russ, Denise, Boban, Eric and Jabhera. Attending from ICANN Org is Jennifer, Negar, Steve, Larisa Gurnick, Brian Aitchison, Michael Karakash, David Conrad, Suzanna Bennett, and Brenda. Technical writer Heather is on the call. Today's meeting is being recorded. Please state your name before speaking for the record, and I will turn the meeting over to Russ. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Hi. Happy New Year, and welcome to all of the folks from ICANN Org that are not normally on the call. Thank you. A couple announcements before we get into that. First is you should be receiving an email shortly—all the team members—regarding a survey. It will come from Laurin. The idea is that we're using this survey to try and get an understanding of the prioritization of the—could you mute, please—and so that we have the data in front of us when we get together next week to look at that.

Second is you should all have hotel reservations now for next week and everything travel set up. If that is not the case, please speak up now so that staff can help you sort it out.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I'm still trying to get the travel people to go forward with me, so I'm not sure [of its status]. We don't have to do it during the plenary, but if someone could reach out to me offline, that would be really helpful.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Jennifer or Negar?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks. I've taken a note, Eric. I'm not sure what the issue is, but we'll follow up with them. Sorry about that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thank you very much.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Quick note from Laurin. The survey won't come from me, but from the [two] email server. It's a Qualtrics survey. So, it will not come from my email address, just in case it ends up in spam.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Ah. Thank you. Okay. Just to remind everyone, please do all your pre-reading before the face-to-face meeting so that we can have a productive time. And the bulk of this call, we're going to spend hearing from subject matter experts within ICANN Org who have reviewed our recommendations.

We're hoping to get some constructive input. The idea is to improve the recommendations where there's a misunderstanding or correct it where we have had bad data. I'm hoping we can do this in a constructive, non-confrontational way on both sides. I don't know how the subject matter experts want to handle it—in what order. But I will turn it over to you. David, are you going to lead that or is someone else?

STEVE CONTE: Russ, I'm going to lead that if it's okay with you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. That's totally fine.

STEVE CONTE: All right. First, Happy New Year to everybody. I hope you all had a wonderful holiday, and had some good time with your family, and are back and refreshed like we are. Couple of notes ... As Russ said, rightfully, this is not meant to be a defensive position and also not meant to be an offensive position. So, in the comments that are going to be made, if you ... And most of them are going to be made by me.

We had a prep call yesterday from the SME as we collected notes. I want to thank Jennifer for a lot of the heavy lifting on collecting those notes and getting them together so I could prep it for the discussion today. So, thank you, Jennifer.

Any perception that you might get of ICANN Org being defensive or, conversely, offensive is in my pure lack of command of the English language, which is unfortunately my first language. So, it's all in me.

With that said, we're also going to be jumping around a lot because the way ... I want to thank you all for letting us have the opportunity to have an informal read of the recommendations. I think it's a positive thing. We had a lot of eyes on that document. We captured the document as of December 9th, so some of also what we'll be talking about may or may not have changed since then because I know there's been some revisions to the document. So, please take that into consideration.

So, some general comments and then we'll get into some of the topics that we felt were worth highlighting on this call. I am going to be working off of a notes document that I've prepared. So, please feel free ... If you have a comment, interrupt me. Speak up. I'm not going to take offense to that. I'm not looking at the Zoom Room. So, if you need to jump in ...

We have a good opportunity. We have one week between right now and our face-to-face in DC. So, if there's a specific ask or item that needs to go back to the SME, please be explicit in that. We'll capture that. We'll chase that before we all meet in DC, to try to get more clarity or

more alignment around any specific item. It's a good opportunity to do that.

So, on to the document. A couple of general items is during the reading, many people in the Org who looked at it felt that there could be some value—and this is editorial, so Heather—some value to numbering the sub-recommendations. There are a number of recommendations that have bullets underneath them. Some of those, as we looked at them, the implementation could be spread out across functional teams, and we thought it would be valuable to number any kind of sub-items within a recommendation so we could have a better reference to it when we're working on the implementation plan.

A general feeling by the Org members who looked at it—by the SMEs—feels that many of the recommendations go right to an engineered solution, rather than clearly stating what the preferred outcome would be. The Org feels that there are some multiple paths to achieving implementation of some recommendations, and a specific implementation path may be too narrow. So, Org asks the Review Team to take that into consideration as we go into the editing phase next week on that. I'm going to pause really quick.

KC CLAFFY:

Yeah. Sorry I joined late, but I just heard that thing you said. It would be very helpful to me at least if the SMEs could be specific about which recommendations and give some examples of alternative paths to implementation, just so that we have an idea of the granularity that you're talking about.

STEVE CONTE: Okay. I'll ask Jennifer to note that as an item. We'll work internally to try to identify some examples.

JABHERA MATOGORO: Yeah. I was also having the same [idea]—[inaudible]—that it's better Steve be specific on which recommendations, and then it can also help us as the Review Team to better phrase, or if you have an alternative way to improve it so that we are guided based on what you have recommended, so that we have a smart recommendation. Thank you.

STEVE CONTE: Thank you. I appreciate that. We'll not that, and we'll try to capture some examples to highlight next week. The purpose is not to change the recommendation. The thought behind that was there are resources in place within the organization that the Review Team might not have full visibility to. So, we felt that there were paths that we could take to achieve implementation and achieve the desired outcome that may not be specifically laid out within the engineered solution within that recommendation. So, I will take that as a note. We'll see if we can highlight some examples of that to talk about next week.

DENISE MICHEL: Hey, Steve.

STEVE CONTE: Hi.

DENISE MICHEL: Hi. Sorry. I'm not online yet. If you could also, as you go through this, address in the context ... Part of the context and part of what the team has struggled with is ultimately, there was a very low rate of implementation from the SSR1 recommendations, although staff indicated it was fully implemented. One way of getting at that big disconnect is to be more specific, or perhaps engineered as you may be phrasing it.

So, it would be helpful to get staff's thoughts about that disconnect and about how the team can build in specificity and accountability where it may be needed, while providing flexibility for implementation. I think that's part of what the team is struggling with.

STEVE CONTE: Okay. Thank you. I'll take that to note, too, and we'll see if we can get some information back for you.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Steve, Naveed has his hand raised.

STEVE CONTE: Yes, Naveed. Thank you. Hi.

NAVEED RAIS: Yeah. I was just wondering if it would be possible for the ICANN Org at this stage to provide a tentative implementation complexity of some of the recommendations that we have in our draft so that we can try to prioritize things and see if we can dilute them or work on them a little more. If we find later that something is not implementable, or takes a very long time, or something like that, we would like to have an expert opinion on that. I'm just wondering if that was part of the discussion [inaudible].

STEVE CONTE: Thank you. That's actually an interesting question. We did not talk about prioritization, per se, specifically, for one, because the Review Team hasn't really discussed prioritization yet. In one of the items I'll discuss, there was some mention of prioritization, but it was in regards to the functional team and their priorities versus the recommendations. So, I'm not entirely sure that we're at the right moment yet to have that discussion about prioritization, because I feel that ... This is just me speaking. I feel that the Review Team needs to come up with some at least strawman draft of the priorities so we can plug that in. We're happy to discuss ...

NAVEED RAIS: Sorry to cut you. I actually meant ... Prioritization comes at later stage, I can understand, but like an implementation complexity kind of

analysis—an expert opinion on that. I was wondering if that would be helpful.

STEVE CONTE:

I think it would be, and I want to remind that we considered this reading of the draft as an informal reading, and we consider this as an informal dialog. I think some of that work also might go into the more formal analysis and the formal comments, going back from [inaudible].

JABHERA MATOGORO:

I was also having an idea that ... This kind of informal discussion is good, but the Review Team, as we are [aware] is kind of an independent kind of ... We appreciate the input from ICANN Org, but we should also take into consideration that there are some of the issues that ICANN Org might not be of their favor, but the community—something that it's looking for.

So, it's also very important for us to know that this flexibility should not be something that is that much [inaudible], but we make sure that we stick on what we have worked on. We know that we have gone through up and down, and we have gone through a difficult way of getting some of the data, which has helped us to give—to [reach up] to these recommendations.

So, we should not give that much room for flexibility, other than improving what we have so that we make sure that we have something that is implementable. So, I'm not of the idea that this flexibility ...

Changing these, rephrasing these should not take us away from the original meaning of our recommendation [after giving out]. Thank you.

STEVE CONTE:

Thank you, Mr. Matogoro. Yes. Actually, I completely agree with that. I think that goes back to the statement of having a better understanding of the proposed outcome of the recommendations versus the engineered solution to it. So, I think that feeds into that as well.

I do recognize and support that the Review Team is comprised of non-staff members and community, and should be ... This dialog is meant to help inform and align, but not at all meant to try to change the way and the methods that your team has used, nor the findings that you have made at all. So, this is just meant for us to help try to align and make recommendations that are good and implementable, and we know that make sense.

JABHERA MATOGORO:

Thank you. Well noted.

STEVE CONTE:

I also note that at the time of the reading of December 9th, there were many portions where the rationale was not in place yet, so that could have impacted the perception of the reading of the recommendation based on whoever was reading it at the time. So, please take that into account.

I'm going to ask ... And we're going to jump all over the pages, because the SMEs viewed it at different times and noted different items. So, I apologize for moving all around the document. I'm going to ask Jennifer to pull the document up on the screen, and we're going to start on page 69. Thank you, Jennifer.

Throughout the SSR1 findings, there's been comments about the SSR framework. I've spoken to staff, and at this time, there is no further plans to do any future SSR framework documents. We feel that the right place for SSR-related items will go into the strategic plan—the five-year strategic plan and the operating plan.

So, it's due to the changing landscape and not set in stone, so future landscapes could call for a separate SSR framework document, but at this time we feel that the items that used to be in the SSR framework are being rolled into the strategic and operating plan. So, we just wanted to make note of that, so for reference or for recommendations, anything that refers to the SSR framework should be folded into and be part of the strategic and operating plan for ICANN. I'm going to pause [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: Steve, can I ask a quick question?

STEVE CONTE: Absolutely.

DENISE MICHEL: Could you just share a little bit more background on the rationale for that—the thinking behind that?

STEVE CONTE: I can capture that as a request, and I will bring that back to the SME staff that's in charge and ask for a rationale around that.

DAVID CONRAD: Steve, if I might ... One of the reasons we've taken that approach is with a view that SSR is critical to essentially pretty much ICANN does. As such, it needs to be a core part of the strategic and operating plan moving forward.

So, instead of having it as a separate document, which may not be incorporated into how the organization as a whole, as driven by the board, plans the way it moves forward, the idea was to better incorporate the SSR requirements within the strategic an operating plan so it's always front and center. You can see that in the draft strategic and operating and financial plan that has specific callouts to specific SSR-related items.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks, David.

STEVE CONTE: Sorry. I'm looking for my mute. Any other comments about this item—about the SSR framework? Then I'm going to move on. Please go to

page 55 under root server operations. While that's happening, just to note that these are highlighted items. This is not a comprehensive list. This is items that we felt were the strongest, that would be the most valuable to discuss in the allotted time that we have today. Page 55 ... Thank you.

This is about root server operations. The recommendation is, "In order to minimize SSR risks, ICANN, in close cooperation with RSSAC, should develop baseline security practices for root server operators and operations." We feel this is an entirely reasonable recommendation, to create and publish a security BCP, but we want to note that we have contractual means or mechanisms to encourage other root server operators to adopt this document. So, we're fully willing and feel it's a good idea to work with RSSAC to develop a security BCP, but we just wanted to note that our outcome will be a document and not necessarily the communal acceptance and usage of that document.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Steve, David is in the queue.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think we knew that when we made the recommendation. But if you don't have the document, you can't get the adoption.

STEVE CONTE: Fair enough. David?

DAVID CONRAD:

Yeah. Just to amplify what Steve was saying, I think in general, we have no ... I think it's a good idea that we put together a best practices. In fact, Göran's goals for this fiscal year, he has something called a facilitation function related to DNS security. One of the items associated with that particular goal is to establish a way of collecting a propagating best practices.

There is quite a bit of work being done outside of the ICANN community as a whole. For example, there's a draft within the IETF—a Draft Moura DNS Op Authoritative Recommendations—that gets into best practices and collecting those into a set of best practices that is tailored for root server operations would seem to make sense. It's just, as Steve had mentioned, there's no way that we can force any of the root server operators to do anything, much less implement particular best practices that may not correspond with their business interest.

So, as long as it's made clear within the recommendation that this is essentially advisory to the root server operators, that seems like a good idea. I might offer that generalizing, because the same sort of issues that face root server operators also had an impact on operators at the higher levels of the DNS hierarchy, which is I think what the Draft Moura DNS Op was instructed during discussions within DNS Op Working Group, who may be generalizing away from specifically the root server operators to top-level domain operators in addition, may be warranted.

STEVE CONTE:

David, thank you for that. Actually, that will lead down to one of the other recommendations about security best practices for ccTLDs. So,

please note David's comment about the higher-level operators as well, because one of the recommendations ... I'll just say it now.

That was on page ... That is abuse and compliance contracts and agreements, page 49, asking, "ICANN should attract and collaborate ccTLDs and ccNSO to address DNS abuse and security threats to ccTLDs." We also feel that is a good recommendation, and are willing to do it, as David just mentioned, and don't have any contractual mechanism to encourage adoption on that. So, we're supporting both of those, as David mentioned, through the DNS security function ... I'm forgetting the name of it. It's still brand new. That would probably be the mechanism and the means of output for that.

DENISE MICHEL:

Hey, Steve. I'm sorry. The DNS security function ... What were you referring to?

STEVE CONTE:

David, do you want to explain the DNS Security?

DAVID CONRAD:

Sure. Within Göran's goals, which were publicly posted, there is—I think first item. I don't recall off the top of my head. There is a specific goal that indicates that it would be useful to create ... I believe within the goals it's a coordination center related to DNS security. The rationale behind that particular goal item, as specified by the Board, was an observation the primarily came out of OCTO when we were confronted

with the DNS espionage and Sea Turtle attacks that were occurring towards the middle of last year.

We were surprised in our inability to gain direct contact with a number of the affected parties—in particular, a number of the ccTLD administrators and security folks associated with ccTLDs that were being impacted by those attacks. That triggered discussion within the Board about, “That seems like not an ideal situation, so we should work to facilitate the integration of information and contact points and communities that may be impacted by a DNS-related SSR event.”

The goal of that is to provide a clearinghouse of information—of education and information sharing—along the lines conceptually of an ISAC, Information Sharing and Analysis Center, related to the DNS. However, as some of you might recall, some years ago there was an effort initiated by Rod called the DNS Cert that crashed spectacularly upon takeoff. We’re particularly interested in not repeating that particular incident.

So, we’re working closely right now to try to make sure that the community is kept informed, provides input on what exactly that facilitation function would do. It is not in any sense a cert. It’s more of a mechanism by which we can share information. So, things like the best practices that are mentioned for the root server operators would be something that could be collected and maintained by this facilitation function. Similarly, other recommendations I’d note that involve information sharing or analysis related to DNS-related SSR stuff could also be encompassed by this facilitation function. But whether it does or not is a community-based decision.

As we move further in—the community defines what the role is for this facilitation function, who performs it, how it’s performed—that sort of thing, it will become clearer what particular aspects of the recommendations would fall into the facilitation function, which would be done outside of that. Hope that clarifies.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thanks, David. I know we’re short on time, so perhaps we could just take a note to have you provide more written information to the team on the facilitation function of DNS security. I think this is the first time the team is hearing about this. It sounds like a great new idea that’s quite relevant to many of the things that the team is working on. So, if we could get more detail on what it is, what it will do, what your implementation plan and timing is for it, I think that would be really helpful, if we have a chance to incorporate some of that into our report. We could at consider it. Thanks.

DAVID CONRAD:

Happy to, with the caveat that it is still at the very earliest stages and there isn’t a whole lot of written documentation yet about it. But happy to provide a write-up of what we do have.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Thank you. It would be great if we could focus our recommendations—say, encourage particular activities go on there instead of something that’s conflicting or extraneous or additional.

STEVE CONTE:

Thanks, Russ. I think one of the items on that, as David mentioned, that this is really in infancy. I think there has been one call about this so far. So, as David mentioned, it's community-driven. So, the scope and breadth of the function is still very much up in the air. With that said, talking about it and understanding it is a good thing, and we'll definitely do that. But talking about it within the recommendations may not fit the alignment of where it lands once it's baked. So, just take that into consideration, please.

We're going to move back up to page 31. This is SSR recommendations 12, 15, and 16 surrounding SSR strategy framework metrics and vulnerability disclosures. This is a request from staff to the Review Team, asking for more clarity on what context the Review Team want the vulnerabilities to be disclosed so that we could provide the answer. It was unclear to the SME reading what type of metrics, what details. As we work through the open data platform, would that be the appropriate delivery platform or mechanism for those types of information? This is a ask to the Review Team to consider that as you guys work through that final editing of that recommendation.

KC CLAFFY:

On that point, one of the requests I was going to say would be for an update from ICANN on exactly what is all of the data—the SSR2-relevant data that ICANN thinks is currently being—making available through the Open Data Initiative. I'm not sure ITHI you consider under the ODI umbrella, but I'm ... As a person who's trying to do the data sections of the report, I'm still struggling to find the stuff in a central place.

The last time I asked ICANN folks, they said a lot of stuff just wasn't done yet. So, I want to make sure when we write the final report we're up to date on all of the SSR2-related data that ICANN believes it is sharing with the community.

STEVE CONTE:

Thanks, KC. I think the right answer on this is that the Open Data Platform, formerly known as the Open Data Initiative—Platform now, being operational—is launched and recently read. So, there's really not, at this moment, a lot of data in that. So, I think the question that I'm hearing from you is, "What is proposed? What's the intended data that's going to be feeding into ODP that's SSR related?" I'm not sure if you're looking for a timeline on that as well, or is that the right reframing of that question?

DAVID CONRAD:

Steve, if I could ... There's a couple of issues associated with this particular recommendation—not issues, just observations. One is in my very quick reading of it ... And I apologize. I haven't had a chance to read the entire draft report. It wasn't clear which vulnerabilities the Review Team is actually referencing.

Are you all talking about vulnerabilities that affect the internal systems—within ICANN Org, for example, the Salesforce glitch that happened back during the New gTLD program? Or are you referencing vulnerabilities that are reported to ICANN via the Expedited Security Reporting platform? Or are you talking about both or neither? Having

some clarification on exactly which vulnerabilities you're actually referencing would be quite helpful.

With regards to the Open Data Platform, about a year ago we transitioned what was then the Open Data Initiative over to operations to put it into production. The Open Data Initiative was essentially a pilot project to identify a good open data platform. We chose Opendatasoft to get a couple of datasets into that platform, to allow the community to experiment and play around with the platform and the preliminary datasets. And then, it was transitioned over to operations to be put into production.

Right now, we're in the process of ensuring that data that is brought into the Open Data Platform is done in a sustainable fashion, to ensure that the data that's put into the ODP is done in a way that we can ensure will be maintained over the long term. That means basically automating collection from whatever the various data sources are.

The Open Data Archive ... No. What's the terminology? The catalog of the datasets that we provided to the community during the initiative is what we're currently working on as the collection of all possible datasets that we will then incorporate into the Open Data Platform at some time if we're able to, because some of the datasets that were identified have sensitive data, contractual information—that sort of stuff. So, we'd have to go and cleanse them.

Our initial focus with the Open Data Platform is to try to get that data into the platform and make that available via APIs. We're planning on having the first sustained datasets imported into the platform for the

Cancun meeting. This was mentioned in the Montreal ICANN meeting. With regard to specific datasets related to SSR, the initial datasets that we're importing include the M3 metrics for the Identifier Technologies Health Indicators. If you aren't aware of what those metrics are, I'll provide a link in the chat to the existing website where those datasets are being collected and housed.

One of the reasons we are interested in the Open Data Platform is because we didn't want to proliferate these independent websites that are presenting the data in different formats. We wanted to make it consistent so that people who want to play around with the data have a consistent API to gain access to that data. So, the M3 metrics will ... If you look at them, you'll have a better understanding of why we're wanting to pull in that data into a consistent and single point of collection for researchers.

The other datasets include the marketplace indicators and the registry reports that are currently available as CSVs, but we're going to import those into the Open Data Platform. Then, finally, for the initial soft launch of the Open Data Platform, we'll be including the aggregated information that's available in PDFs from DAAR. So, that will be able to be pulled down. Instead of having to scrape or read PDFs, you'll be able to pull it in via the API.

Subsequent datasets that we'll be importing will largely depend on a combination of community interest and the complexity, feasibility of taking the data sources—making them sustainably harvestable for collection into the Open Data Platform. Hope that helps.

KC CLAFFY:

To answer both Steve and DRC, yes, it helps. But it would help a lot more if we could have an email from OCTO that summarized a list of all ... If the ones you've just said are comprehensive—that is, that captures all of the SSR-related data—I mean measurement-type data ... Even if it's not in one place on the website, if the links could be in one email so that we know that we're not missing anything that ICANN's actually providing when we write the report, that would be helpful. I don't want to overlook anything. And I know this is a moving activity.

On the threat stuff—the disclosure issues—I think, again, it would be helpful if ICANN could, in an email, list all of the disclosure activity that it currently does or that it plans to do in the next two years. That's internal things like the Salesforce thing that you mentioned, as well as other things that ICANN thinks it should be addressing with respect to the community—other DNS systems, other parts of the supply chain of domain names. That would help us with making that recommendation 12, 15, 16 more clear. I accept your point that it is not clear which kind of disclosure reporting we're talking about. Is it possible to get those two emails to us by next week?

DAVID CONRAD:

With regards to the vulnerabilities, I'm only aware of the two—the internal stuff—that we're doing via HackerOne and the ESRS stuff. We can provide those, obviously. If there are others, I'm unaware of them and I'll need to talk with folks internally, if there are other vulnerability disclosure mechanisms that exist.

With regard to a catalog of the SSR metrics, that's going to be a little more challenging because it's not clear to me what you mean. SSR can mean a whole bunch of different things. There are various datasets. They aren't tagged as SSR specifically, so we'll have to go through them and identify—go through the catalog and say, "Is this SSR or is it not?" That kind of gets into a subjective evaluation.

We can provide a pointer to the actual data catalog itself and answer questions regarding specific datasets that the Review Team might have. Maybe that would be a way that you could go through and say, "Well, this one clearly is. This one clearly isn't," as just an idea to try to address that requirement.

KC CLAFFY: That would be great. I'm happy to ... We can do the subjective assessment of what's SSR-related or what we mean by SSR. I take the point that it's a broad area. But if we could have something to know ... And a list that's too long is better than a list that's too short, because like I said before, we just don't want to overlook anything.

DAVID CONRAD: Sure.

KC CLAFFY: Thanks.

STEVE CONTE:

Thanks, KC. Thanks, David. I posted the URL in the chatroom for ITHI. For those on the phone, it's <https://ithi.research.icann.org>, is where the current data for ITHI is housed. Sensitive to time. We're not going to make it entirely through this list, so my suggestion is we get as far as we can, and if the Review Team feels that there's value to continuing, we can finish this off at the start of the face-to-face next week. So, I'll put that out for consideration. Russ, I'm going to hand it back to you. You can make that decision or the team can.

While David's still freshly-muted, we're going to move to page 34. This is about the c-suite security officer. I'm going to pass this entire one over to David, if he's willing to accept it.

DAVID CONRAD:

Yeah. Sure. I guess the executive summary of our input is that we're unclear what problem this particular recommendation is attempting to solve. We have within the organization folks who perform the security-related functions, focused on ICANN enterprise-related security stuff. That's currently performed by Terry Manderson, who reports to Ash. And then, we have someone who's focused on the identifier security stuff, who is John Crain, who reports to me. The overlap of functionality of these two folks is relatively limited, at least in experience, but we haven't been ...

KC CLAFFY:

Well, that doesn't work.

DAVID CONRAD: Sorry?

STEVE CONTE: KC, I'm sorry. You're unmuted.

DAVID CONRAD: Oh. Okay. We haven't identified what deficiencies or inefficiencies are a result of the role that's focused on things like software vulnerabilities and intrusions into ICANN's network, or hardware-related failures, or personal security—not being combined with somebody who's focused on how the DNS is secured from a global perspective.

I guess our request would be—this sort of falls into what Steve had mentioned earlier—that this appears to be recommending a particular solution instead of trying to identify a desired outcome and explain why that outcome is desired and allow the organization to implement the whatever is necessary to meet that outcome, in order to address whatever the underlying problem is. So, for what that's worth ...

STEVE CONTE: Thank you, David. I think we have time for probably one or two more, so I'm going to move on to—we already talked about the ccTLD one—to page 54, formal procedures for key rollovers. When we spoke about this yesterday, there was some discussion that there are procedures for key rollover, and they're housed within the IANA function. They're not public documents. So, IANA's looking for clarity on how comprehensive or involved these procedures should be.

They do have a suite of fairly comprehensive documents, but to go on anything beyond that could be a significant piece of work to do that. So, just some clarity ... They're asking for some clarity on what the Review Team is looking to—the outcome on this—what they're looking at implementation to achieve through that. Please take that into note when the Review Team does more editing next week on that, to see if we can get some more clarity around that.

Next is also IANA. We're going to go to page 57. This is root zone data and IANA registry measurements. There was some different interpretations of the readings of this and some confusion. So, we're asking for some clarity around that—around this item. I asked Kim yesterday. There are currently 2,960 registries managed by IANA. One reading of it was is the Review Team looking for information on service—like uptime on the availability of these registries? Or is the Review Team looking for information on diffs of that?

One note to take into consideration on this is that IANA does have more than 10 years of historical data. They keep the registries. They have those diffs. They are interested in doing something of that sort, where you could see the historical evolution of a registry. However, they have extremely limited resources and the resources that they have for this are currently working on the root zone management improvements that have been requested by their customer base. A very small portion of the customer base have actually asked for the historical data and the evolution of those registries.

So, this is where we alluded to priorities, going back to the comments that Matogoro made earlier today, talking about prioritization. From a

internal perspective, the priority to produce this is rather low because the ask by IANA's customers are higher for root zone management service improvements, rather than looking at this. So, there's two asks on this. One is a clarification on what this recommendation is asking for—if it's uptime or if it's diffs and things like that evolution. And then, also, please take into consideration the prioritization aspect of it when you're building this out.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thanks, Steve. I want to put my hand up. I'm not in the chatroom.

STEVE CONTE: Please. Go ahead.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I just have a clarifying question. I may have missed it earlier, so apologies if this redundant or wrought or something. But in the last couple ones, this occurred to me as just a clarification point. What's the best way for us as a team in the writing to convey ... Like you're saying, "There's some ambiguity. What did you guys mean by 'blah,'" or, "How would you do whatever? Give us some direction."

How can we propose text that isn't meant to be directive but it's meant to be helpful? We don't want to say, "You must do it the following way." What we mean to say is, "Here's an example of ...". Is there any sort of guidance you can give us on where we could be more specific but we don't want to be directive—how we can do that in a way that makes the most sense?

STEVE CONTE: Thanks, Eric. That's a great question, and I think that's something that we—the collective we, including you guys—struggle with all the time on how to do that. So, I'm going to keep that as an open challenge. Maybe while we're face-to-face next week, we can sit down and work through some of that, because I think finding that alignment and finding that balance is going to be important and critical to producing good recommendations, and more importantly than that, producing good implementations out of that.

So, I think that's a really important question and I wish I had an answer for you right now, and I don't. So, I think that's one that we should challenge ourselves to see if we can accomplish that.

DAVID CONRAD: Steve, if I could.

STEVE CONTE: Yeah. Please.

DAVID CONRAD: One minor point in that context would be to be clear as to what part of ICANN you're actually referring to. The term "ICANN" is obviously ambiguous, and could mean anything from ICANN Org to Board to the community, and within the community, specific portions of the community.

So, one of the inputs that I would have is try to avoid saying “ICANN—” just a naked “ICANN.” Always try to be clear as to which part of ICANN, even if you have to say “ICANN Org, ICANN Board, and ICANN ISP, CP” or whatever, to focus the recommendations in a way that allows them to be directed to the right place within the ICANN structure as a whole.

The other thought that I would have as a lead-in to earlier comments is to try to focus and be clear on the desired outcome, as opposed to the methodology by which that outcome is reached. That would probably help in a number of ways.

And if I could just comment on the specific recommendation that Steve was referencing, one of the challenges we have with this specific recommendation is that there are bit under 3,000 individual registries within the IANA system. The wording that I have of the specific recommendation is that they’d want availability and responsiveness metrics on a single page on the ICANN.org website.

Since we have a little under 3,000 registries, that’s going to be an exceedingly long page. And the information on that page will be almost entirely redundant because all of the registries—not all of them. The vast majority of those registries are static data that are held on a website that is prompted by a CDM. So, the availability and responsiveness measurements will be identical for the vast majority of those registries. What would actually be shown would be the availability of responsiveness of the CDN.

Then, you get into the questions of responsiveness to whom? Where are you in the internet to be able to get a response from those

registries? So, you would then need to figure out how to do multiple vantage points, presumably, or something along those lines. So, with regards to that specific recommendation, focusing on the outcome would—"The availability and responsiveness of the registries needs to be x or y," or something like that—might be a better approach, so just as input.

STEVE CONTE:

Thanks, David. We are out of time on this. Before I had it over to Russ, I do want to make two notes here. One is there are a couple items on DAAR specifically. I've spoken to John Crain, and he is available. I would like to ask the RT to consider having a—not necessarily a plenary, because that would take us into weeks from now, but maybe have a small team of volunteers willing to have a discussion with John, hopefully this week or next week prior to the face-to-face to gain some more alignment on the functionality of DAAR in relation to the proposed recommendations on that.

The other item is to Denise's note in chat about sending email. I think my preference is just to continue this informal dialog—would be to continue it and pick it up when we're face-to-face in DC. But I leave that to the Review Team to consider how they'd like to hear the rest of the informal input from staff to the Review Team. With that, Russ ... Go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL:

I think I really appreciate the need for this being informal. The challenge with waiting until DC is we need to essentially finish a draft. At the end

of next week was our plan. So, staff observations and information would come too late if we waited until DC to get the rest of your thoughts. If you could put in big, bold letters, “This is informal, initial observations from staff,” and then provide the rest of the information in email this week, that would actually allow us to think about it—potentially incorporate it into the work that we’re doing next week.

STEVE CONTE:

Thanks, Denise. Sure. And thank you for acknowledging the informality of it. That really was my concern for putting it into an email. So, if the Review Team is okay with those disclaimers on top of it, I think we can produce that. But I do really want to note that this is the informal process. There will be a more formal process where there will be written communications around the recommendations and staff’s view on that. This was really meant to try to drive the dialog and move it so the recommendations are in a good place.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

So, Steve, we appreciate that. We do want the input. We do want to produce something that’s useful. At the same time, we don’t want to stop.

STEVE CONTE:

Fair enough. There were actually just a few more, so it won’t be a long email, and I’m happy to produce that. Just as a note, I will run anything that I write to the SMEs that I’m representing before I hit send on that

because it's more permanent record of my misinterpretation of their comments. But I'll get that before DC.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you.

STEVE CONTE: Russ, I'm over time, and I apologize for that. We'll continue on from there. So, my ask to you is about the DAAR stuff in a call. And then, I'm just passing the call back to you and we'll see you all in DC. Thank you all for your time and putting up with me today.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. So, I think we'll have to have a discussion about your suggestion there. My concern is getting that done before the meeting, when, of course, people need to travel and so on. Anyway, I'll start an email thread with the leadership and see what we think ought to happen. So, we've run over. Thank you. I didn't hear a bunch of beeps, so people have stayed on to the end. I appreciate it. Look forward to seeing everyone next week, and safe travels.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]