
BRENDA BREWER: Good day, everyone. Welcome to the SSR2 plenary call number 118 on the 22nd of July, 2020, at 14:00 UTC. Review team members attending the call today include Danko, Kaveh, Russ, Ram Krishna, Laurin, and Scott.

Apologies from KC, Boban, and Steve, and attending from ICANN Org is Jennifer, 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 meeting over to you. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thanks. So, in your mail you should have a bunch of information that we're going to go over today. Hopefully, you had a chance to look at it ahead. We're going to swap items two and three on the agenda, just because, the risk team stuff, you've seen several times. It has text in terms of changes to the report and it has responses to the public comments.

This is a bunch of recommendations related to the risks stuff, and then Kerry-Ann, who had additional somewhat-related items, put her changes in the same Google Doc. And then, from the abuse team, we have a PDF document that has their public comment responses, and then we expect to have their text next week. So, let's start with the risk team, plus Kerry-Ann, and I'll turn it over to Laurin to do that.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah. Hi, everyone. Essentially, I will say the same that I've said before, which is that, essentially, very little has changed since I last presented.

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.

So, Russ already said we have a full table with our responses. Surely, they will need some editing for the final report in terms of making the text understandable, and flow nice, etc., etc., but it kind of contains where we went with things.

You also have the text where I can see KC actually added some comments, but I think most of them were about writing rather than the context or the recommendations.

So, essentially, what we have done, again, for those who have not heard this before, is we have kind of moved recommendations from all over the report we put out for public comment into one section that, essentially, deals with ICANN internal security, looking at things like security management, risk management, business continuity, disaster recovery. So, essentially, this whole topic area that has to do with how the organization manages security.

So, as a quick overview, we're starting out with the C-suite security position recommendation that I'm sure you all remember. This was Recommendation 6. I'm not sure what number it will have going forward, so I'll refer to them by the old number.

So, essentially, establish that this office give this person a budget and move activities under this position. There, following, is the recommendation on budget, which is the only one where there have been recent changes.

This was because we took this one in, but there was a version that Naveed had kindly already dealt with. So, essentially, I took it, put both into one, Naveed had a look and gave me a thumbs up. So, he is happy that the

things he worked on in regards of this recommendation, which was Recommendation 4, is now included everything.

We're then kind of going down right to the [inaudible] person. We now have money. Now, we're going with what was Recommendation 7 into risk management where, essentially, not much has changed. We then go into information security management systems and security certifications. This was security recommendation two with, again, I think, only minor adjustments from what we had.

We then go into Recommendation 3, or what is still called Recommendation 3. This is about using best practices. And the last two are the business continuity management disaster recovery planning.

As before, we're essentially focusing on the use of accepted internationally-developed standards, trying to have the organization work toward and according to what is widely recognized as appropriate/best practices.

We're calling for actual audits as checks as just a norm all over the industry. And that, essentially, concludes the risk section. To kind of summarize again, it is have leadership, have budget, go through what is known as best practice risk management, information security management system, and then have business continuity and disaster recovery done like that, as well.

Our reasoning is there throughout, which mainly has to do with, essentially, how important the operations are. And I think we did address all the comments that we had clarified where necessary, etc.

But obviously, happy to answer any questions. If everyone is happy, I think the sub-team that worked on this would like to, essentially, finally get this one stamped for the next stage, meaning that changes will still be possible but that we know, okay, everyone is roughly happy with what is here in terms of content, and that we can start integrating it into the new structure and, obviously, come back to it with the whole report for everyone to check out. But for now, we can kind of move forward with getting this one ready. I think that's it. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Okay. I'm not seeing any hands, so I'm going to ask. We've heard about this, I think, three times, now. Are there any concerns with the directions that have been laid out, here? Obviously, we're going to need it passed by Heather to make it all read like one person wrote it, after all this rearranging.

But other than that, does anyone have concerns with what the team has done here? Seeing no hands, hearing no objections, I'm taking that as consensus of the people who are on the call.

So, I will send a note with a pointer to this document that the people on the call are satisfied with this. If you're not, please respond to that e-mail so that we can address whatever concern you have. Did anything change in the public comment responses since we went through them last time, especially on the point that Naveed had raised?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Russ, essentially, apart from that one, obviously, no changes. I have not anything available, I think, on what Naveed's responses were to his edits, but my assumption is that they do exist, so I will follow up with him and make sure that this is [him], but if I remember correctly, there were very few, if I'm not mistaken.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I don't see him on the list of participants to say one way or the other, and I don't see Kerry-Ann, either. I was hoping she could take us through her edits. Do you feel comfortable doing that, Laurin?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Not really. So, this was discussed on our calls, but it was an item that, essentially, was kind of a follow-up. So, I don't have any up-to-date discussion. The last time I was involved was when we were chatting about what she was planning to do and how. So, I think we need to move that to next week when she's here herself.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. That brings us to the abuse team. Can we put up the PDF and, Denise, turn that over to you? Denise, you're muted.

DENISE MICHEL: How's that?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Much better.

DENISE MICHEL: The abuse subgroup worked its way through all of the public comments on the recommendations, and [sub] recommendations, ten through 19. The spreadsheet reflects the proposed comments, and actions, and proposed responses for each and every comment that was filed.

Additionally, the group agreed broadly to synthesizing and updating the recommendations. So, there will be fewer recommendations. A few will be combined and clarified per the note in the spreadsheet. I think we hope to have that next week, but keep you posted. Hello?

JENNIFER BRYCE: I see Laurin has his hand raised.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah. Just to, maybe, add quickly to what Denise has said. If you go through the admittedly long table where, I think, again, as with risk, obviously, this needs some rewriting before going into a final report, I think what is important to mention is that, even though we said this before with abuse, we often have a split.

Some parties are generally happy with the direction, maybe are proposing smaller changes while others are clearly unhappy with the direction we're going in. So, I think one of the key things is that, having been on both of these teams, with risk it was really more about, "Okay, let's see what we have. Let's see what we kind of forgot to do," and kind of working things, restructure, so that it makes more sense.

With abuse, it's much more ... We as the team have to, essentially, take a side, as ridiculous as it sounds. What we have written is supported by some but not all, and it will not be possible to, essentially, do what we did with risk. It was, "Okay, let's listen to everyone."

The very few that we couldn't address somehow with abuse, I think, it will essentially be we have to say to some people, "We disagree with you," and you can also see this in the table very well.

Then for some it's just, "Okay. You don't think what we're saying is a good idea or whatever, but we still think it's a good idea." That's that. So, I think that's an important comment to make, because I feel it's quite a bit different to some of the other recommendations.

DENISE MICHEL:

Yes. Thanks, Laurin. I would agree with that. Additionally, there are many opportunities throughout for clarification and some additional explanation of the recommendation. So, that work is proceeding, as well.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Do you think, the ones where there is a split, we need to make sure we have the team agreement, or what are you ...? I'm not sure what you meant to propose as a next step, Laurin.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

So, Denise can add or disagree with me, obviously. I would say the following. We have had a certain direction with abuse as a team when we

put this report out for public comment, and we also knew that some would be less happy with this than others.

So, I think what the team so far has done—and Denise, please correct me if I’m wrong—is to kind of go in the direction of looking at what we have done, obviously trying to clarify/incorporate, etc., etc., where possible, but to, essentially, stick to our guns unless the comments really show, “Okay. Oh, you made a mistake, here,” or where we recognize, “Okay, we have to do this slightly differently.”

We’re trying to incorporate but some, essentially, are opposed. They’re saying, “Okay, you just cannot do this, full stop,” while others say, “Yes, this is a good idea.” So, in those cases, we’re essentially going the same direction we had before, and I feel the team, then, has to look at what the sub-team produces and decide if this direction was appropriate.

But essentially, what we’re trying to do—at least, this is my feel—is to take our position, obviously go through everything, trying to make sure we incorporate what is possible, but to, essentially, defend our opinion, defend our approach, based on what we have done before.

And obviously, the team at some point has to look at these comments, look what we have done with it, but I think it makes more sense as a whole than trying to do this now. But at least, that’s my kind of interpretation of it right now.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Okay. So, what I hear you saying is the position in the report hasn’t changed but the defense ... Or, now that we’re clear that some people

disagree with it, we need to be more prepared to defend it. And of course, once we have the final language, confirm that we still have consensus.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

I think that's a good summary. And in addition, obviously, we're looking at everything. Just because it disagrees with what we have said doesn't mean we will just throw it out and get defensive but it means we look at it and we kind of check what we're doing with it.

But if it's completely against then we just have to think about, how can we kind of defend the position we have taken as a team if we have the feeling what we're saying is still the right thing?

If a comment—and I can't think of any right now where this is the case—identifies something that is kind of [tough] and we really didn't see it, then, obviously, we would have to concede that point, but I cannot think of an example for that action. Maybe Denise can. I'm not sure.

DENISE MICHEL:

An example of what?

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

Like an example where a public comment really points us toward something where we made a mistake or where we actually have to concede, "Yes, what we wrote really has to be pulled," or something like that. I cannot think of one that did that.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. I would agree with that. However, the public comments did surface many misunderstandings/misinterpretations. And so, they provided an opportunity for us to clarify in many areas. In other words, opposition was based on either a misunderstanding or a misinterpretation of the proposed recommendations, and there were certainly comments that provided additional information and suggestions that led to some additional suggestions and explanations.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Thank you for that. Anybody from the team have questions, concerns, comments about any of the parts of this table that were reviewed? This is such a long table, I'm quite surprised to hear that there's no one who wants to talk about any rows.

But if we have consensus, I will take it, and I will, again, then send a note for the people on the team who did not make the call. I'm quite shocked that we only used half the time to go through these two big pieces of work, but if there is no other business, we'll end a half-hour early. Well, I'm not seeing any hands, so I'll give you a half-hour back. Thank you.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Thank you, all.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks, everyone. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]