
BRENDA BREWER:

Good day, everyone. I'd like to welcome you to the SSR2 plenary #116 on the 1st of July 2020 at 14:00 UTC. Review team members attending the call are Ramkrishna, Danko, Russ, Laurin, Zarko, Denise, Kerry Ann, and Naveed. Apologies from Norm. Observer Dennis Tan is on the call, and attending from ICANN Org is Jennifer, Steve, Brenda, and technical writer Heather. Today's meeting is being recorded. Please state your name before speaking for the record. Russ, I'll turn the call over to you. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Thank you. If you could bring up the subteam status chart, please. Okay, so we set today as the deadline for ourselves to have each of the subteams report out, and we've got some that haven't even gotten started, so I want to do those first to see where we are, and then we'll loop back to the ones that are not finished. So we'll start with subteam four which was the SSR1 budget. I can't see Noorul on the call. Did he join? No. Ram, can you tell us whether the team has done anything? Ram, if you're speaking, we can't hear you.

So this is the recommendation that says we need SSR-related budget items to be clearly identified as SSR-related. That was something that SSR1 asked for. We have another item elsewhere that does some discussion of budget, but it's not exactly on that point. So I guess we're in a place where this subteam isn't getting the job done. We either need to drop this recommendation or assign it to a different team. What would the team prefer to do?

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.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Hi everyone. Recommendation 4 actually, there was some stuff that the risk cluster team had to deal with, but I think we have not in the end included it in the text that was there and instead put it somewhere else. But we had a look at it, I remember adding some items to this because of the [inaudible] [CISO, whatever you want to call the role,] because then the budget's relevant points, etc., we have to move [into the function.]

So that part exists and I believe we took recommendation 4, that was the budget one, and incorporated these aspects into that recommendation.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Is that number six?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: No, that is number four, I believe.

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, four is the one you merged. Where did you merge it to?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I think we took this in. I'm sorry, I don't have my laptop out yet, that's why I cannot check. I literally arrived home a few minutes ago. So I can confirm this by tomorrow or even tonight, but right now it's really

difficult because I don't have it on screen. But I do believe we did something with this.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, what that means is that there are public comment responses that still need to be done though. Is that correct?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: [Yes.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Could you add that to the risk team? And then Kerry Ann, I see your hand.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah, I was going to suggest a similar thing to Laurin. I don't think it should be dropped, because all the things that we're asking for for SSR to be more prominent, [I think] the budget comment makes sense, it's just to—as you said, a team—which if it's going to be our team, we could do it, just needs to go through the public comments and make sure that we address it. But I don't think it's something that [inaudible]. That's my view.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Naveed?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Hi. So, actually, I think that I was the last person who worked on this recommendation 4 because I remember that I brought some text that was missing and not making sense with the draft that we prepared when it was getting ready. So I worked on that. So I'll have to look at what I did with that and then also will have to look at the public comments, but if somebody else can also join me in working on that, I would be willing to do that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Thank you. It sounds like the risk subteam that Laurin is heading up is also working in that. But if you could take the first pass at the public comment response, that would be great. And then if you would look at the budget text that Laurin added regarding six to make sure that your additions were carried forward, that would be good. Denise, I see your hand.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Okay, so I'll sync up with Laurin and by tomorrow we'll see what is the action forward to it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Great. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: Hi Russ. I'm just adding my agreement I think to the others who spoke. I think this is an important recommendation to carry through from SSR1 and underpin a number of things that the review team is

recommending. There should, I think unquestionably, be more transparency and accountability in budget relating to SSR. So I'm happy to help if help is needed on this, but I too do not want to drop it. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Yeah, I didn't hear anyone speak to dropping this one, so I think you're in good company. All right, I think we have a way forward with number four. I'd like to skip down to 25. KC send a note about this yesterday to the whole team, and essentially, she says that before any progress can be made on this one, we need an update from ICANN Org on where they are in implementing the recommendations in SAC097.

So, have we asked this question before, or did this just come up again?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

I can [inaudible] that. The question was asked before, so it's one of the outstanding answers that the review team is waiting on. So we're working to get those answers, and hopefully we can get the update on this particular one ahead of next week's call.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Okay, so this team is stalled waiting on that.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

Excuse me, everyone, can we quickly go back to number four? Because now I have the text in front of me.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sure.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: So I'll just let you know the risk subteam indeed took this recommendation—and I believe it was myself who did it, that is why I remembered it is part of the revised risk subteam text, and it still contains the transparency aspect and it has a new point added which says after this executive C-suite [security] position has been created, ICANN should move all security relevant budget items, as far as possible, under the purview of this new position. And then [4.2,] this is essentially old recommendation, is where this is possible and reasonable in terms of effort, [we're making some description of that,] it should be more transparent with the budget, [inaudible] implementing [inaudible] security, stability and resiliency framework [inaudible] performing SSR-related functions including [inaudible] of the introduction of new gTLDs.

So this is what's currently in there, so I can confirm this has been incorporated. What would be good, obviously, is—and Naveed as the last person who looked at this before I took what was there and incorporated it because we needed this budget thing for the CISO, to make sure that this is fine. It is just below in the new structure of the risk section. It is under recommendation 6 which is the executive C-suite security position. They're still numbered [as per the old scheme] so we can find things. So everyone please have a look, but I remember I did

not make a lot of changes apart from putting in that budgets should be moved into the executive C-suite.

So I think we can put this by the way also at level—it's essentially complete unless I deleted something by mistake. [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So just to make it easy since we have so many Google docs lying around, could you send that link to Naveed to make sure he looks at the right document?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Absolutely. I will do that right away.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. All right, the other one that has had no action is 28. Naveed, Ram and Noorul are working this one. Naveed, can you tell us—oh, I'm sorry, you also have a hand up.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah, so I just wanted to follow up on that because I think this recommendation 4 was actually a follow-up recommendation of SSR1 20, 21 and 22. So while the budget issues can be related to some new aspects just like CISO and other things, but this recommendation specifically looks into what was being recommended and what is staying relevant with respect to the budget, especially the budgeting of the SSR

with the gTLDs and having more transparency. So these were the two fundamental things.

So it would be nice to maybe we can share some text and then we'll decide if we can merge these two into one or it still needs a separate recommendation. But separate recommendation makes more impact and we discussed that a lot of times before as well, that these 20, 21, 22 of SSR1, so we did not make it [with] other SSR1 follow-up recommendations. So that's why it was there in the initial place.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Yes, but we at some point along the way decided that overlapping recommendations was confusing, and so where possible, we were going to merge them. And yes, it does mean that the appendix that talks about SSR1 will need to be changed to point to the new place where the follow-up recommendation is, but I think Heather can handle that.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

Yeah. Just a quick note because I have realized the way I expressed this wasn't potentially clear, that budget is still its own recommendation. When I said it is under the CISO, it was literally meant as the recommendation is below that recommendation is below that recommendation in the document. It is not incorporated in that recommendation. I'll send you the e-mail right now, Naveed, have a look if you think this is fine or if I omitted something.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Okay, Naveed, can you talk to recommendation 28?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah, actually, we have not started anything on that. I got some material from KC about [NCAP] and it's some recommendation that would make on its draft recommendations. So I'll have to scan through it because I wasn't available before yesterday. So I think I would need one more week to look into it and then can tell how we can move forward on that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Does anybody have a problem with that approach? Okay, so let's then turn to the other recommendations that are not flush against or have not been reviewed by the review team already. So number one is done. Number two, the team says they're ready. The subteam has consensus and they're ready to present to the team. I didn't see Boban on the call today. Has he joined since? No, I don't see—is one of the other team members here? That whole team is absent, so we'll put that on the agenda next week to go over. Kerry Ann, can you talk to us about recommendation 3? Laurin, is that a new hand?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes. Sorry, Russ. I'm not a member of the SSR1 [ISMS team which is two,] but it is in the new risk section and it has been edited. And I emailed everyone on that one and asked already for a consensus call and no one on the subteam complained, so I assume this one's also ready to be looked at by the team and [inaudible] consensus on. Sorry, Kerry Ann.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: No, that's what I wanted to explain to Russ, that all the ones that kind of have Laurin and I consistent throughout, that has been kind of merged. I don't know if you recall that the risk subteam, what we did, everywhere we had interrelation, all of us just met together, so Norm, myself, Laurin, Boban and Scott. We looked at all of them that were intersected and kind of ensured that there was consistency so they're all now in that risk document that was circulated.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So just to make sure I understand, this is 2 through 9 except for 4. Well, you took in 4 as well so it's 2 through 9.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: [inaudible] four was just, I think, referenced, but just consistency in terms of thought process. But it would still Naveed's specific look at regarding the public comments and the other items he raised. But I think Laurin, [I'm current,] right?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes. This is what I said. So essentially, everything from 2 to 9 in the risk section has been looked at and described on the call, multiple times. So as I mentioned in my e-mail to the leadership team on Monday because I couldn't join, I think this one is ready to go. With number four, I would say if Naveed is able to confirm that from his point of view this is looking fine, we can also incorporate that one, and then this one should be complete.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, Laurin, I got confused about one thing on that. We haven't seen the exact text on the full plenary call yet. So that's what you mean completed, ready for the plenary call? Because we went through the approach you were taking but not the response to the public comments. Is that correct?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: On the call, I didn't walk through every word. That is correct. But the two versions, our markup plus the kind of cleanup for the team to have an easier read have been shared, at least twice, I think three times now.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. It's the response to the public comments part I don't remember being shared.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: It was put in the spreadsheet, Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh, thank you. All right. I lost track.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah, just remember that what we had explained is that we didn't—just to keep the process clean in the spreadsheet, and I think my comments that I had sent via e-mail where we had done stuff, I think they're in the

spreadsheet as far as I know, unless, Laurin, there's one that's specific to us. I don't think so.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: So we did copy [about,] yes. And I believe—

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: [inaudible]. Yeah.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: But I have moved this to the [definitely the] team Drive, so this should also be available. But again, I can pull it out and send you another e-mail with everything, even though I'm pretty sure it went out. I'll take an action to send it all to the team.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so let's give ourselves the deadline next week to have team members review the risk grouping of subteams' output, and we'll go over it on the call next week to make sure that we still have consensus. Okay, I think the next block—

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Russ, just before we move on, I personally have a challenge. I'm lost with all the links and e-mails. So I just need a single reference to understand where things were. For example, I called Laurin yesterday because I had wanted to add the CIO thing and just got so confused with the different documents that were floating. So I just wondered if when

Jennifer sends links, if we would just use that as a baseline that these are the most current versions of the documents.

RUSS HOUSLEY: The problem is that each subteam—

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Has a different version.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Has a different version so that they weren't working on top of each other. That was what Heather recommended as a way forward, so that's what we did.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Okay, so for example, the chief information or data officer, which version should I put that in? Should I put that in the risk—

RUSS HOUSLEY: That goes into the risk subteam's version.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Under the C-suite. Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Correct.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Okay. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, the next grouping is the abuse team, and I'm going to ask Denise for a status which is a bunch of these teams. I believe they're the ones that all have arrows ending at phase two. This group of teams got over 100 public comments, so I'm not surprised that you're not done yet. But please tell us where you are.

DENISE MICHEL: Sure. So I plan to do sort of a final check-in—because we had I think 165 individual comments within submissions, we decided to divide them up, go through them all, document our recommended approach to the specific comment, and then also note a suggested brief response. Our intention is to actually respond to every individual specific comment that we've received. So we're working on that and it's 165, so working on that spreadsheet. I anticipate that I'll be able to do sort of a final call with the spreadsheet where we can see all the comments and all the suggested responses to the comments and move that so the full team consideration at the end of this week, and then we're also working on redline edits to the report text involved to make updates based on some of the comments and the discussion of the team, and also to streamline the recommendations, we're also intending to merge some of them to make fewer recommendations. So I think end of this week, we should get a spreadsheet to the full review team on processing all the

comments, and I hope the following week, draft updated text for the review team's consideration.

RUSS HOUSLEY: All right. That's encouraging given how many of the public comments that represents. Okay, the next one is—Laurin, the ones that are 15 through 18, are they part of risk, or something else? Or are they part of abuse?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah, this is all part of abuse, and it's all connected so we're hoping to make big strides towards completion as Denise just described.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. You'll have something great for us next week. All right, Eric, could you tell us about DNS test suite?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. DNS test suite, 20, I talked with KC and I told her that I would have things done by today. And without much surprise on my side, I didn't quite make it there. But she and I have consensus on the text, it's a small dealt and we have, like you mentioned before for another group, we have a document from Heather that allows us a workspace to make these changes. So it's on me to incorporate, but sort of the high order bit on that is that the substantive comment that made the most change to us was from ICANN Org and it was a relatively small one, and we saw no reason not to attenuate the text to meet their request. So it

should go in there pretty straight forward. So I was hoping to have all that by the call today. I didn't make it. I certainly will have it by the call next week. Deadline coming up tomorrow, so it'll be like some small number of days before I can be sure that I have it out. But we've reached consensus, we've talked it through, and if you want, I can sort of blast through the next set since they're mine.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sure.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Same thing with the key rollover. With the key rollover, I have a bit of a heavier lift to document the comments that came back from the key rollover. The most substantive were from SSAC, and the long and short of it is there needs to be some clarifying text written in the findings to illustrate what the recommendation is talking about, so the findings need [defined more,] but that's fine because I don't think there's any discovery needed. I've walked it through with KC. So again, it's on me to just put that into the text, but it'll be to explain the process models already being applied to medical safety, like doctors in the ER and OR, and to election security. So the DNS is really not beyond the pale for this sort of model. That just needs to be written, so that's on me.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. We just got a note yesterday from KC basically that observed that 19 was being folded into the abuse section. So I think that just means that 19 is part of that block and that there is text for 22, but that

she had sent it to Ram and was waiting for his review before sharing it with the whole list, and that brings us to 23. Zarko, can you tell us where we are on that one?

ZARKO KECIC:

Okay. Hi everyone. Regarding 23, I am [reading the call] with Alain to respond to public comments and to a little bit change wording in our recommendation. The public comments are about security issues and as far as I understand and I remember, when we wrote this recommendation, we were thinking about making secure access and secure communication between TLD operators and root zone management system. So it gets more secure. And recently, during meetings in CENTR, a lot of CENTR members replied to that and saying that PTI should do something in regards to security. And even on voluntary basis. So, who wants to implement, let's say, two-factor authentication or secure signed and encrypted e-mail exchange with PTI, that's fine. Who cannot do that, they can continue the way it is.

So I'll talk to Alain and I will change the wording on that.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Okay, so do you think we're a week, two weeks?

ZARKO KECIC:

I believe we will have something until next call.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Great. Okay. You're also the lead for 26, EBERO.

ZARKO KECIC:

Yes, I had a talk to Boban this morning and he's away from home, business trip, and he said he will be back tonight and we'll talk tonight about that. We just have to clear up a few things and request from public comment is to clarify what words we are using there and what they're recommending, and as I saw in public comments, they're pretty much supportive on the EBERO testing. So we'll have also something until next call.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Okay. And since you're talking, why don't you do 31 as well?

ZARKO KECIC:

31, I exchange mails with Eric and with Alain, and we'll try to organize some call this week. My standpoint, even—I'm pretty much concerned about how DOH is implemented and deployed. [In a sense,] meeting in DC in January, we couldn't find what and how ICANN can help with that. So my personal proposal is to draft this recommendation and to put our concern in recommendation 29 while talking about privacy and DNS encryption stuff that there is concern and that ICANN should monitor this. But I really cannot put this recommendation into ICANN's remit.

I don't know, we'll have a call and we'll find out what is standpoint of Eric and Alain, and we'll soon come with some proposal for this.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I will remind the team that in April, OCTO also published a report about DOH and DOT, what they're seeing, which I think met some of what we had in mind in this recommendation. We have more of a continuous look thing. And of course, that's a snapshot.

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah, and there is also SSAC report on DOH and DOT.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so we look forward to hearing next week how that—what you're recommending. If there's an impact on 29, we definitely need to loop Kerry Ann into that. Okay, jumping back to 29, Kerry Ann, you had this one by yourself. And based on the arrows, you're ready to brief the team. Is that right?

BRENDA BREWER: Russ, Kerry Ann had to disconnect. She left a note in the chat. She had to leave.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh. Sorry, I'm watching too many other places. She had to leave. I wouldn't have jumped ahead to 31 if I had known she had to leave. Okay, Eric, let's talk about 31. I think based on the arrows, this means you're ready to share text with the review team. Is that right?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. I didn't incorporate it yet into the document that Heather sent me. I'd spoken to Mr. Matogoro over e-mail and we reached consensus there. Imagine that. What would be your preference for us to brief the team? Should I wait until it's incorporated into the bigger doc with all the recommendations, or would you like me to send a note to the team with the text in it? Basically, it's not a huge amount of change, but it proposes a way to accomplish the recommendation. I think we talked about this a number of times, both in person and on plenary calls about whether it would be too directive to suggest an implementation. And based on the comments we got back, people have clearly taken an assumption that there's too much work to do. So the text basically proposes a pretty light lift to accomplish the recommendation, as an example, and I'm happy to brief the team however you think it makes sense.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, so let's get it into the doc and maybe you can even put 20, 21 and 30 into one doc, because I don't think there's any overlapping text, right?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. So Heather gave me a doc that included one of KC's, but KC and I were speaking about it and I think that's fine with her. So I've got a doc with 20, 21, 24 and 30, and my expectation is I should be able to update those before the call next week, hopefully in the next short number of days but certainly, I can say by the call next week if that's acceptable.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Perfect. All right, so it looks like we're going to have a whole bunch of text to go over. The sooner it can be sent out, the better so that we can be effective next week and not be reading it for the first time during the call but actually just be raising issues. Because it looks like we're going to have pretty close to several hundred of these public comments reported out in the text next week.

Yeah. Okay. Laurin, we have about 15 minutes left on the call. That seems like too little to make a real dent in the risk document you already sent out. Do you agree?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Russ, I completely agree. In addition, I'm also kind of not prepped for this and my brain is slightly mush after [a transcontinental flight,] so I would prefer to do this next week.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Fair enough. Okay, then I think with that, I will ask if there's Any Other Business. Okay, I'm not hearing any, so next week, it looks like we're going to have a big readout. So please do the reading in prep so that we can do it expeditiously, and we'll talk next week. Thank you. For those in the United States, happy 4th of July.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Russ. Bye.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]