ICANN69 | Prep Week – Second Security Stability and Resiliency Review (SSR2) Progress Update
Wednesday, October 07, 2020 – 17:00 to 18:00 CEST

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay. Thank you. The meeting is being recorded. This is the SSR2 Update Webinar during ICANN69 Prep Week and it's Wednesday, 7th of October at 15:00 UTC.

Just very quickly, a few housekeeping things, which I'm sure are not going to be new to anybody. But just in the interest of time, there's going to be no roll call today. We'll just take attendance from the Zoom room. As usual, please keep your phones and microphones on mute when you're not speaking so we can minimize any background noise. You can raise your hand in the Zoom room if you have any questions or if you'd like to speak, and please remember to state your name before speaking. And then you can also use the chat function in the Zoom room to ask questions or type any comments that you might have as well.

Thank you. So with that, I'm going to turn it over to Russ Housley who's the Chair of the SSR2 Review Team to start the webinar presentation. Thank you. Over to you, Russ. Russ?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sorry. I started with it on mute. I apologize. Welcome. This is Russ Housley. I'm the Chair of the second Security, Stability and Resiliency Review Team. And this is a fairly short update so that

people understand where we are and where we're going. So next slide, please, Brenda.

The SSR is one of the reviews that is mandated in the ICANN Bylaws. There's four of them and they're all in Section 4.6. Basically, we are required to take a look at the implementation of the SSR1 recommendations as someday SSR3 will be required to look at the implementation of our recommendations. And we're supposed to look at the other aspects of ICANN and the DNS as well, and we may look at things that are forward looking. And we'll explain how we did each of these things in the way we did our work in a future slide. But first I'd like to introduce the review team members. Next slide, please.

This talented group of people was pulled together through the normal process in the Bylaws. I'm not going to read everyone's name but you can see that they come from all over the community and that they also come from all over the world. So next slide, please.

So the normal review team process is: assemble the review team, plan the review, conduct the review, and then once the review is conducted, the findings and recommendations get passed to the Board for the rest of the process. Where we are right now is we have a draft report that we sent out for public comment. We are in the process of resolving all of those public comments and then producing the final report. So we expect to have the final report in a few weeks. Next slide, please.

One of the things that the review team did about two years ago is we said, "Let's not make any recommendations that are not aligned with

the strategic plan." So we took a look at the strategic plan and basically if it wasn't in align with that, we stopped digging into that topic. And so given the importance of security and stability and resilience in the ICANN mission, that didn't actually limit us much but that is basically a guiding factor that we had. Next slide, please.

So I talked about how the Bylaws said what we had to do, and we basically broke this into four work streams. The first one is looking at the implementation of the SSR recommendations and whether or not they have the intended impact. Then we looked at the key security, stability and resilience issues within ICANN itself. Same for the DNS, and then we looked at future challenges. Next slide, please.

The public comment was at the beginning of this year. It was our intent that during the meeting that we were going to have in March 2020 in Cancún that we would have a nice face-to-face meeting and work on those 371 comments and produce a report fairly shortly after that. Of course, COVID intervened and that meeting never happened. We have been doing things virtually and slower. COVID has greatly impacted the speed that we were able to do that by not having face-to-face meetings.

But the result of working through those public comments has led to a significant restructuring of our final report and provided as part of that restructuring some consolidation and we are of course clarifying any places where the public comments indicated we had not been clear. So every single comment is going to receive a response. We've got a

big spreadsheet and I'll talk a little bit more about that on the next slide. Next slide, please.

Basically, what we did is we took each of the 31 recommendations that were in the draft report and we made those our 31 buckets. We assigned each of the public comments to one of those buckets, and then we formed a subteam for each bucket. They were simply self-selected. If you cared about that recommendation, you put yourself on to that subteam. And then we realized that some of the subteams were interrelated, and surprise, they had roughly the same membership, so we consolidated those subteams. It's what we call mostly the Risk subteam, which was Recommendations 2 through 9, and the Abuse subteam, which was Recommendations 10 through 19. So those extra large teams are only in the sense of the number of comments that they had to deal with worked as a group.

Within each of the subteams, we had a kind of a five phase approach. First, get the subteam organized. We picked the rapporteur for each subteam so that they could—you need somebody to do the administrative scheduling of calls and all of those kinds of things. And then their team would pick a direction in terms of how to address the comments that we got. Then they updated text. Sometimes that was a simple few edits to add some clarification. Other times, it was a complete restructuring of a section. And then when the subteam had consensus on that text, it was brought back to what we call the plenary call, which is the full review team, to understand the direction they've taken and look at the text and see if there was there was agreement. We are not yet done with this process. All of the groups

have reached at least Phase 3 but we are not to Phase 5 with all of the subteams. Next slide. Let's go to the next one. Thank you.

So the basic restructuring of the document is still to talk about the SSR1 implementation and whether it had the intended impact. We're going to talk about the key stability issues within ICANN. We're going to talk about contracts, compliance, and transparency. And then we're going to talk about concerns regarding the global DNS. So that's the basic categorization after reviewing all of those comments and trying to put things that flowed more cleanly from one thing to the next. And, of course, that means that when you see the final report, if you are interested in the draft report that went out for public comment, if you were particularly interested in Recommendation 9, it will probably have a different number in the final report. So just a heads up for when you see that. Next slide.

In addition to that, we want to make sure that all of our recommendations are smart. We are trying very hard to make sure they're specific, measurable, assignable, relevant, and trackable. We think by doing these smart criteria that the process for the SSR3, when looking back at whether these were implemented or not, will be a much easier task than we had with the SSR1 evaluation. Of course, the SSR1 team did their review before the current Bylaws even existed. So, we're not throwing stones in any way. It's just that knowing that somebody is going to have to come along behind you and assess whether the implementation was done completely and whether it had the intended impact. We're just trying to make that job easier on them than it was on us. Next slide, please. And one more.

Just to make sure that you have the links at your hand, the Bylaws that require these reviews to take place I said are in Section 4.6. And if you want to look at the draft report and the public comments that were put out on them, there's a link there for you.

So that's really all I had to share today in terms of where we are. Again, we hope to have a final report in a couple of weeks. We're shooting to get it done as quickly as we can. And as I said, we've been forced to go a little slower than we intended by not having face-to-face meetings. At this point, I'll be glad to take any questions. It is my hope that any of the review team members, who are also on the call, can help field the questions if they are detailed on any particular recommendation where I was not on that subteam. So at this point, we're open for questions. Raise your hand if you have one, please. Okay. I'm hearing silence so I'm thinking that no one has a question at this time.

JENNIFER BRYCE: There's a question in the chat that's just popped up, which I'll read for you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. I looked for the hands, not the chat screen.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay. The question is: "Successful work, but I have an important question, which is that quality standards were not related to this work and importance of measurement due to presence of some gaps in

structure?" That's the end of the question. And I will say it's difficult for me to see the name. It's Eng Moamin Hamad.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. What I think he's saying is that he felt there was some gaps in the draft report, and I think that we somewhat agree. We're hoping the final report will flow better and that the public comments pointed out a few of those. But I'm not sure what he means by "standards" in that question.

Okay. If there are no other questions and we're not getting clarification on that one, then I appreciate your interest in SSR2 and look forward to delivering a report in a couple of weeks. My understanding is that what will happen is the report will go to the Board and to ICANN Communications at roughly the same time. ICANN Communications will translate it, and then it will be posted. So the Board gets a preview before the rest of the community just because of the translate time.

Any questions at this point? No. Okay. Then have a great day, wherever you are. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]