| BRENDA BREWER: | Good day, everyone. Welcome to the SSR2 Plenary #108 on the 15th of April 2020 at 14:00 UTC. |
|---|---|

Attending the call today are Russ, Ram Krishna, Danko, Laurin, and Alain. Apologies from Eric, Denise, and Kaveh. Observer Dennis Tan is on the call. And from ICANN org is Jennifer, Steve, and Brenda. Technical writer, Heather.

Today's meeting is being recorded. Please state your name before speaking for the record. I will also add that Kerry is joining in as we speak. I'll turn the call over to you, Russ. Thank you.

| HEATHER FLANAGAN: | Looks like Russ dropped off. |
|---|---|

| BRENDA BREWER: | Hold tight for a moment. Russ is back. |
|---|---|

| RUSS HOUSLEY: | Zoom dropped me and I'm just getting back. Did others get dropped too or was it just me? |
|---|---|

| BRENDA BREWER: | Just you, Russ. |
|---|---|

| RUSS HOUSLEY: | Okay. |
|---|---|

| BRENDA BREWER: | Norm Ritchie is joining us right now too. |
|---|---|

| KERRY-ANN BARRETT: | Hi, good morning. Can I just do a quick disclaimer? I'm on [duty with] the kids this morning, so I'll be listening. I'll try to follow as best as I can. |
|---|---|

| RUSS HOUSLEY: | Thanks, Kerry. Okay, the first thing is to make sure that everybody is aware of how the subteams all shook out. We have 31 subteams to deal with the topics associated with the public comments 1 through 31. We have tagged a subteam member to be the rapporteur for each of those groups. I know I've been doing some reading for my subgroups. I hope others have been doing the same and that the subteam members are getting together their subteams. I suspect the vast bulk of the work can be done by e-mail, but if a call is needed then the subteam rapporteur will be responsible for finding the time and making that happen. There's only one subteam that has only one person and that's #29 on privacy. Kerry-Ann is taking care of that one all by herself. If somebody wants to lend a hand, you can join that subteam. |
|---|---|
| | With that reminder of where we are, are there any rapporteurs that have already made a dent in their work and need to report anything to the whole team? |

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:     Russ, this is Kerry.

RUSS HOUSLEY:     Go ahead, Kerry.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:     No, don't get excited. There's no dent in anything. I just wanted to ask a question. I haven't seen any e-mail from anyone. I haven't seen any e-mail yet from any of the subteams I'm on, so just to confirm, is it that the rapporteurs would be the one to start the e-mail chain to begin the subteam review process?

RUSS HOUSLEY:     Yes, that's correct.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:     Okay. So I'll try sending my e-mails today. I guess I wasn't clear on so I didn't do anything. As I opened the documents, I looked at them but I hadn't started to do anything yet. I just wanted to confirm. Okay. The only person I saw under second question was Denise that had test e-mail last week was that to begin a subteam because I wasn't clear what the test was.

RUSS HOUSLEY:     No, I think she was having e-mail trouble when we're sorting that out.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:     Okay. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY:     Okay. So hearing that none of the subteams need to bring anything to the whole group, we have some comments that were for the whole group. We started going through those last week. We'll continue on those this week. If I remember properly, we are on row 352 of the spreadsheet.

BRENDA BREWER:     In the "Organized by section" tab, just to make sure folks on the right – there's two tabs in the spreadsheet.

RUSS HOUSLEY:     Yes, that would be important. Is someone trying to say something? If you're not trying to speak, please mute.

Okay. On this one, SSAC asks us to be more clear about how we calculated the priorities associated with our recommendations. This is row 352. So we said when we dealt with 349 that we were going to come back to the priorities after the comments were resolved. So I think that we should do the same here. Does anyone think otherwise?

HEATHER FLANAGAN:     I think you're going to see this as a recurring theme. There are a lot of the comments that came in, wanted more clarity on how the priorities

were calculated or commented in some way, shape, or form on the priorities.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:    We can easily [inaudible] even if we [inaudible]. So I don't think that's a problem. That's like a two-sentence explanation. This is what we did before the comments and we ran the exercise following changes after. I think that would be okay. I think that's probably what we'll end up doing, but let's see. We know, for example, that KC wants to remove some of the recommendations and if that happens … if she's able to convince her subteam to go along and that she'd bring it back to the whole group and is able to convince the whole team to go along then that will have an impact on the priorities.

RUSS HOUSLEY:    Okay. Let's move to row 353. They're asking us to rearrange our final report into a structured matrix following the NIST cybersecurity framework or ISO 27001. I think we have rearranged – I have no idea if our rearrangement aligns with the structured matrix that they are suggesting, but I think we can say that the review team has rearranged the report trying to offer to remove the repetition that was caused by the previous structure. Does anyone know the structure that they're talking about regarding the structure?

HEATHER FLANAGAN:    The comment came about in response to – we made the recommendation that ICANN consider following one of those

frameworks, the ISO framework or the Compliance framework, and their point was, "Well, if you're recommending that ICANN do that, why don't you do that yourselves in this report?"

SCOTT MCCORMICK:     Yes. Basically, they're asking us to map these recommendations to either ISO or NCSF which is 153.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:     Sorry, Scott. Can I ask a question?

SCOTT MCCORMICK:     Yup.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:     With your knowledge of ISO standard that they're referencing, is it something that's practical to do? Because ISO usually walk you through a series of systems and checks that you have to do, so should it be going to specifics steps through ISO or just refer that to the ISO standard still?

SCOTT MCCORMICK:     Yeah. No, we could totally map this to either NIST ISO – when I say NIST, I mean CSF 800-53, ISO or even SOC 2 controls.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:     But is it that the [inaudible] is asking us to go more grounded like specific sections and the process that the ISO standards want them through?

SCOTT MCCORMICK:     Yes. ISO has obviously its technical controls. ISO and CSF, SOC 2 have technical side of it. But then there's also the overarching right. So we could say, hey, this is an access control on EC, instant response or just IR which comes out both – I should say [inaudible] 353 more than ISO. I think ISO is probably a better one to go to, or we can map both. Realistically, there's cross-functionality mapping between all the standards.

RUSS HOUSLEY:     Scott, do you think that any of our recommendations don't map?

SCOTT MCCORMICK:     No. Thinking about it off the cuff, probably 90-95% do. My thought is if we do that mapping, it will justify our findings even further. This is how I do this for companies across various industries. The company I work for does this for a living.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:     Scott, I was just thinking, we already have something – I mean, the whole responsibility, accountability, consulting, and informing stuff that ISO wants to do, I see this as pretty close to what we're trying to do with the SMART criteria. Would you say that we could do this by just

adding to that table? So we're essentially just adding this in and say, "This is how this maps," and then we're good? Or do you think –

SCOTT MCCORMICK:    Yes. We could add two columns or even three columns. I mean, whichever standard … I will say SOC 2 is a standard third party audit that obviously they're not doing. ISO is an internationally accepted version of that that's a little bit more expanded. Then obviously NISTCSF give us government framework. So we could add a column and to say this is the standard in which it maps to.

BOBAN KRSIC:    Just posted the overview in chat as well.

RUSS HOUSLEY:    I'm hearing people think this might be a good use of our time. I have a comment in there that we'll come back to looking at that adding those columns at the time we look at the prioritization. Okay. Let's move to 354.

I'm not sure I understand this comment because things that we think overlap we called out as separate recommendations. For example, Recommendation 2 builds on some SSR1 recommendations.

HEATHER FLANAGAN:    In the full context of that feedback, because remember you're getting the –

RUSS HOUSLEY:              Yes. The synopsis. I get that.

HEATHER FLANAGAN:         They were responding to recommendation to the SSR1 Recommendation 9 expansion. The start of that was given Recommendation 1 of the SSR2 report recommends the completion of the SSR1 recommendations, and Appendix D of the SSR2 report contains further details related to findings inclusions including SSR1 Recommendation 9. The SSR2 Recommendation 2 seems duplicative. The SSAC believes it was so many recommendations from both reports. Do you see where this is going?

RUSS HOUSLEY:              Yeah. Now I get it. Thank you. So I think we should come back to this one. What we should do is assign this to subteam 1 because subteam 1 is the one that deals with all that table, not the ones that build. So at the end of the call, you're going to sort this and that will pop up?

HEATHER FLANAGAN:         Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY:              Okay, fine. Please don't read [now] while we're talking.

| | |
|---|---|
| HEATHER FLANAGAN: | No. |
| RUSS HOUSLEY: | Okay. Does anyone disagree with that decision? |
| BOBAN KRSIC: | Sounds good. |

RUSS HOUSLEY:      Okay, 355. There's more prioritization. They want to understand timeline. When does it start, when does it need to be reviewed and so on? That's actually in conflict … this we got when we talked to the ICANN SMEs where they said give us flexibility to actually implement what you mean. So we'll have to figure that one out but it clearly has to do with priorities and being more explicit about what high means.

Okay. Let's go to 356. That's the same. Explain either prioritization scheme in a way that helps [inaudible] not deferred is the way I read their comment. Does anyone read that differently? No?

BOBAN KRSIC:      Having been on some of the later calls for this, this is mainly about the thrust of the argument. ALAC is happy with – they are just essentially saying, "Give us more on what are the key things why are they important, etc." It's again mainly about detailing and strengthening essentially our own priorities. Again, probably ask if we're done with all the other edits.

RUSS HOUSLEY:              I think that if we address [SSAC] that basically says tell us what … They basically said, "If you implement the recommendation, tell us what benefit we're going to see. If we don't implement the recommendations, tell us what harm we're going to see," leads to the data that I think they're actually looking for. So as each subteam works and adds that material to their recommendation, it probably will not only provide the argument they're looking for but it will also serve as good information for the next prioritization discussion. Anything else on 356?

Okay, turning to 357. They're looking for a bunch of things – dependencies and linkages to other things that are going on. We're just high, medium, low. I think the dependencies need to be addressed by each of the subgroups because that's what we're asking them to do. Heather, do we have a way to say every group needs to look at this one?

HEATHER FLANAGAN:         I could basically copy the comment and then just tag it to every section.

RUSS HOUSLEY:             Or we could tag it all and put it at the front.

HEATHER FLANAGAN:         I wonder how it would prioritize if I made it zero?

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's one down.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yeah. I'll play with that and see what I can do.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. What we can say – all subteams are here. Okay. Is there anything else besides the dependencies and coming back for the prioritization?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: What are you trying to do?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm trying to put some white space. Then it pushes it to the next cell. I'll let you play with it.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I think you want to do that?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I wanted some white space between the "All teams" and the "Come back."

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay. Hang on just a moment.

RUSS HOUSLEY:              Yeah, that.


HEATHER FLANAGAN:         Double-click on the cell and hit "Command" and then hit "Enter" or "Return."


RUSS HOUSLEY:              I did that. The second time I tried it but then I was up in the Edit bar thing.


HEATHER FLANAGAN:         That will work.


RUSS HOUSLEY:              So, on to 358. We were going to do that at the end and make sure that people have an opportunity to see the absolute final text before they choose the [sent] if that's what they're going to do. So that takes us to 359.

                          This is about some of our recommendations require PDP. We know that and I think we said that where there is a linkage.


HEATHER FLANAGAN:         For those, do we need to say something like we recommend that the ICANN Board work with GNSO Council or something?

RUSS HOUSLEY:      I think what we need to do is have all subteams highlight any actions that lead to PDP process. I think that part of zero. Okay. Do you want to see anything else to be in there?

Okay, 360. This sounds like a restatement of the SSAC [inaudible] state the benefit or harm.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:    I think yes. I just want to make a comment on this. I think sometimes we might be able to do this as well on a per section basis. It's like, okay, this is all about anti-abuse so do all of these things, same direction, same problem. So we might not have to restate.

RUSS HOUSLEY:      So I guess we make this a zero as well?

HEATHER FLANAGAN:    Actually, this was –

RUSS HOUSLEY:      Sorry. Wrong row.

HEATHER FLANAGAN:    Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY:          Thank you.

HEATHER FLANAGAN:      So many pretty colors.

RUSS HOUSLEY:          So this is the prioritization and dependencies again. Okay, 362. I don't know what to do with this one other than to say thank you.

BOBAN KRSIC:           Yes. This seems to be more like a comment to other parties rather than us.

RUSS HOUSLEY:          That's what I think. Like a note to the Board that says, "Three review teams get on with it."

BOBAN KRSIC:           Yeah. I think the only thing we can do is to make these links kind of think about it in final review to make sure that these links are explicit and explained. But that's really like a writing thing more than content I guess.

RUSS HOUSLEY:          Okay. Would there be any other thing to do there? Okay, 363.

BOBAN KRSIC:                    Again, the same thing.

HEATHER FLANAGAN:              I did warn you. All these came up a lot.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:            Question to the people on the call. We discuss this stuff a lot and we know there are a lot of dependencies in this, which I think complicate the – "Okay, this is high priority, this is medium, this is low." I'm wondering, do we want to maybe at some point discuss if we should have a whole – I don't want to say "out of section" but essentially this is what I'm saying. One thing that just talks about implementation and dependencies of these recommendations. It doesn't have to be super long but just to say, "Look, these are the five key issues we want to solve, whatever, blah, blah, blah." And just give a bit of a narrative in –

RUSS HOUSLEY:                Laurin, if we could get to the five key issues, we'd have five recommendations.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:            Russ, I think we do have these issues. If you look at the thing Heather and I wrote, it actually breaks down very easily to a small number of concerns.

RUSS HOUSLEY:                No. You have categories I think.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:              Yes.


RUSS HOUSLEY:                  I don't think you could turn it into a recommendation per category.


BOBAN KRSIC:                   You probably could –


RUSS HOUSLEY:                  Solve [abuse] would be a recommendation.


LAURIN WEISSINGER:             Essentially, what I'm trying to say is if we added like a half page on essentially these are the things we identified … break it down and these are the dependencies for each of them and so on, so that people understand our process and how we felt this can be addressed.


KERRY-ANN BARRETT:            Russ, this Kerry. If I could just respond to something that Laurin said.


RUSS HOUSLEY:                  Sure, go ahead.

# EN

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Laurin, I was with you for a second in terms of the logic to just have a paragraph. We spoke about this on the last call and that's when Eric had given a very good suggestion as to what we could state in terms of the methodology for actually looking at the recommendations and either prioritizing or not prioritizing because of how challenging it is. I think there is merit in doing our paragraph. I still wouldn't attempt as I think all of us, Naveed has spoken about it. We've spoken about it several times in terms of how challenging it is to do it. As you said, it is because of how many dependencies there are, especially at the time of publication. Things could be dramatically different. There is value to a paragraph but I would still not try to do it as these are our top picks still. I think the team has more like – the level of competence that's on this team as ridiculous, and if the team can't agree on the priorities at a whim, it means that because there's so many different interest groups and priority space on what each team members see from their constituency groups. So I think there's value in a paragraph but I still wouldn't try to do what you're suggesting in terms of saying, "Hey, our top five, these are cherry picked." But I just wanted just react to that.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah. I think first we have to come back to this at the end. That's one, for sure. The other one is I wasn't talking about specifically the recommendations when I said it's actually not that many, but really more the issue spaces that we're considering. Then below it gets complicated. I just wanted to say let's think about if we can do something about this somehow. That's all.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I agree that we need to come back at a high-level discussion of dependencies. I'm not sure what we should do regarding about SMART KPIs. Because I think we've already said we have to look at the smartness of each and every one of the recommendations. So in that sense, it's an "All" but not every recommendation is going to have a performance indicator, I don't think. It needs to be measurable but if that's what they mean by key performance indicator, it's achieving the M in SMART, but I agree.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: It's terrible as it sounds. I think we're just asked to do something that is really beyond the capability of a volunteer group that can put some hours in every week. That's why I was going into this. Let's explain our process here because actually doing this is a huge exercise that … big teams of professionals are paid a good at of money for them to do. So I think we have to find a middle way. That's why I came up with this. Think about it if you can describe this and maybe resolve some of this.

RUSS HOUSLEY: But actually, the thing we need to do in terms of mapping to either ISO or this [inaudible] what the big thing they're really asking for.

Okay. Anything else to capture there? Okay, 365.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: At this point, we're now in two things that were about … they weren't about the whole document but they're about the specific work streams

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, I think we either need to assign them to a subteam or talk about them. I actually don't agree with this comment. They're asking us to give a report card on the community, the Board, and org.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Isn't that essentially inherent in the report?

RUSS HOUSLEY: No. There's nothing in the report about giving the community a report card.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: No, not the community but we're definitely talking about –

RUSS HOUSLEY: [It's what it] says.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I know but the thing is we raise a lot of issues so it's pretty clear that our conclusion is that there's a lot of work to do. But I don't understand this comment.

RUSS HOUSLEY:     It's our job. They expect … They didn't come to consensus either because it says, "Some reviewers believe." I suspect his name was Jeff.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:     From my perspective, I just don't know what to do with this one. I feel it's pretty clear. You also think it's not that clear. I'm pretty clear in what we think.

RUSS HOUSLEY:     I've written as our response that we have suggested actions that we believe will improve SSR but we do not intend to produce a report card for the community, Board, or org. Does anyone disagree with that response? I'm hearing nothing. Let's move on to 366.

I [inaudible] this one, Heather. There had to be more.

HEATHER FLANAGAN:     Oops. Hang on. Let me attempt to fix this. Cutting and pasting from PDF documents is in fact [inaudible]. Okay. There.

RUSS HOUSLEY:     Well, we found one.

HEATHER FLANAGAN:     There, how about that?

RUSS HOUSLEY:          A job description. Okay. Now we know what to do with this.

HEATHER FLANAGAN:      Details, details.

RUSS HOUSLEY:          That goes to Recommendation 6.

NORM RITCHIE:          Yes. I think it's already been captured on the list of recommendations, six items.

RUSS HOUSLEY:          But to write the response … I think we actually give a high-level job description already there, not a job boosting that …

                       Does anyone disagree that subteam 6 should tackle that one?

NORM RITCHIE:          What I'm saying is it's a duplicate. It's already there.

HEATHER FLANAGAN:      No. The missing text that I just put in here, I put in another box and assigned it to 6.

RUSS HOUSLEY:          Oh okay.

NORM RITCHIE:              It's not unique.

RUSS HOUSLEY:             Sorry. I wasn't understanding, Norm.

HEATHER FLANAGAN:         I'm just removing this line later.

RUSS HOUSLEY:             Are we ready for 367?

LAURIN WEISSINGER:        I can't say I disagree with any of this. I feel this is best for the abuse part to handle, right? Okay. I would say let's give it to them, [SME] as well.

SCOTT MCCORMICK:          I would agree with Laurin but at the same time, some of these are more than just abuse like instant response behavior, the registrars. While it does fall into abuse, it also covers this basic security and stability issues.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:        Scott, I agree. The recommendation we have that goes in this direction is I think in that part of the document. I didn't want to say this is just abuse. I might be mistaken but I think the rec on that is in there.

RUSS HOUSLEY:               I think 11 and 14 cover this.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:          Let me just jump back to –

RUSS HOUSLEY:               Oh, 11, 14, and 17.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:          Yes.

SCOTT MCCORMICK:            I would agree to that.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:          Yeah, that should be good.

HEATHER FLANAGAN:           It's a date field. What?

RUSS HOUSLEY:               How is that possible?

HEATHER FLANAGAN:           What the heck?

LAURIN WEISSINGER:      11/14.


LAURIN WEISSINGER:      No. Would you –


RUSS HOUSLEY:      This is Google being helpful. Separated by [deliverers], it must be a date.


SCOTT MCCORMICK:      I would add that that also falls under 7 as well.


LAURIN WEISSINGER:      Yes. Obviously, that should be there. I agree.


SCOTT MCCORMICK:      It's this part of BCDR stuff as well.


LAURIN WEISSINGER:      Yeah, I agree. Let's put into both.


RUSS HOUSLEY:      If you go with four numbers, Heather [is obsessed] at two.


LAURIN WEISSINGER:      These things, it's a date plus the hour.

# EN

HEATHER FLANAGAN: The call is being recorded. So I just don't have anything to say about that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I want us to be more SMART, especially on the M part, right? Okay. So we already said all subteams are going to make sure they're SMART. They also caution … make sure we don't recommend anything that's outside ICANN's remit, but the only thing what they think we did. I'm not sure what to do with that. Any thoughts of the [copy]?

BOBAN KRSIC: No. I don't see much we can do with this. I mean, we can definitely check again before we submit but that's about it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: What we do is assert we didn't do that I think.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Russ, are we able to do that? I mean, it's changing so rapidly sometimes under so many different sources. Is there a single source that we could … It depends on the dates of the reports and all of that, so I wouldn't want us to site anything so specific since it's common knowledge in the community.

RUSS HOUSLEY:                    I don't understand – what's common knowledge?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:              The nature of the abuse and the different types of abuse that's happening. So it will be a help for the report to note the larger picture of abuse and not necessarily scoped range, actions, and consequences that lies within the responsibility. It's an evolving thing right now. It's something that we want to cite specifically, like to give specific examples or to give any stats. That's what I thought that section was asking for, like specific detail, unless I misunderstood.

RUSS HOUSLEY:                    Well, maybe you did. But I thought they were saying, "But be careful with doing that doesn't expand the remit." So I kind of thought they were talking about DAAR. I mean, it mixed so many things here – the SSR1 partial implementation.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:              I think I was just tuned in to the part of this that spoke about the –

RUSS HOUSLEY:                    Got a TBD in there I think. One of the footnotes – they're asking for that to be filled in, which we did already. I don't know what else to respond to here.

Okay. We've reached the end of our time. I don't want to belabor this any more than we need to. When we come back next week, we could

pick up here. Let's see if anyone who's on the call next week wants to say something other than those two things. I guess I don't want to move this one yet. So when we return, it's still in this spot.

HEATHER FLANAGAN:          Okay. I won't resort.

RUSS HOUSLEY:          Don't resort. I changed the backdoor [extreme] 3 so that when you resort it'll stay there.

HEATHER FLANAGAN:          Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY:          Then hopefully next week we could finish this [inaudible] part of it. Please, rapporteurs, get your subteams going. And everyone on the team, please stay safe.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:          Bye, guys.

BOBAN KRSIC:          Stay safe, everyone. Bye-bye.

HEATHER FLANAGAN:          Thanks. Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**