

---

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. Hi everyone and welcome to the webinar on the SSR2 Review Teams Final Report. As usual, our meeting is being recorded and we will post the slides and the recording to the Wiki. I'll post a link into the chat in just a minute. And with that, that's all I have to say. So, I will hand it over to Russ, off you go. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Thank you. So, the team and I took a long time, but we're really pleased to be finished and we think that we have a quality report here to share with the whole community. So, this is the end of the SSR2, the Second Security Stability and Resiliency Review. Next slide, please.

So, the SSR is one of the bylaws mandated reviews and we wanted to just quickly go over what is required by the bylaws, that's section 4.6 if anyone wants to look it up. The SSR's assessment shall include whether ICANN has successfully implemented the efforts from the previous review team, in our case that would be SSR1. And then we'd need to say the extent to which those implementations have had their desired affect and so there's a section in our report addressing that; It's all laid out in the appendix as a matter of fact.

And we also are supposed to look at the security and operational stability and resilience about matters related to both the physical and network related to the Internet's unique identifiers performance with appropriate security contingency planning and maintaining clear and globally interoperable security processes related to the Internet's

---

*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.*

---

unique identifier system. And those are basically the things that ICANN coordinates. Next slide.

Thank you. Okay. So, the team was pretty diverse and that was a good thing. It gave us a lot of talent to look at SSR from several perspectives. And so, this is the team, you can see they come from different parts of the ICANN organization and they come from different parts of the world. So, it was a really good team, and I want to extend my thanks to all of these team members for their efforts, some over five years, some only over three years. It was quite a group, and thank you for your efforts. Next slide.

So, the review process is shown in this diagram and we're at the point now where the team has done its work. We've planned the review; we've conducted the review and we performed a public comment. Updated the report based on the things we heard from the public comment and then delivered the final report to the Board. The Board now has doing their own public comment which will then lead to them deciding which of our recommendations they will implement and which they will not. That will in turn lead to an implementation plan. So, then that implementation will then be evaluated by the next SSR team. Next slide.

One of the decisions we made as a review team several years ago was that we wanted all of our recommendations to be aligned tightly with a strategic plan. We felt that it was important to make sure that we were making recommendations that were furthering the implementation of the strategic plan, not in conflict with it. So, that is one of the things that we as a team decided. Next slide.

---

In doing our work, we divided into four work streams. The first was to look at the implementation of the SSR1 recommendations and whether they had the intended impact. The second was to look at the SSR issues within ICANN. And the third was the SSR issues related to the DNS. And the fourth was what challenges are over the horizon or coming up that we thought we could make a recommendation about to put ICANN in a better position regarding those future challenges. Next slide, please.

So, the public comment on our draft report took place at the beginning of 2020 and our original plan was that we would have a meeting in Cancun, and we would go over those public comments and produce a final report in March or April last year. That didn't happen. COVID intervened and as a result we ended up taking phone calls spread out over the year in order to deal with that, all of those public comments. But the result of those public comments is a significant restructuring of the document. We added a lot of clarification and we consolidated many of the recommendations. If they were close together, we merged them, those kinds of things. Every single comment we received got a response. Some of them are simply "thank you" because some of the comments were support for something we had said. And others offered constructive criticism which led to the rewrites, the merges, and so on. But all of those are available in the final report in appendix H so you can see that the public comment really did have a big impact on the final report. Next slide, please. And again.

So, the recommendations, as I said, have been significantly revised and consolidated. We did our best to write the recommendations according to what we call the "SMART" criteria: specific, measurable, assignable, relevant, and trackable. Making recommendations fully SMART will

---

require some thought and some action during implementation. By that, what I'm saying is some of them, you just need to put together a time frame that you think something will take to implement. And so, we hope the implementation plan will take it the rest of the way to being SMART, in terms of the ones where we weren't able to or felt that the implementor needed some flexibility. So, we think we've laid a SMART framework down and the implementation plan is to take it the rest of the way. So, in terms of recommendations, we have 24 groups of recommendations. Some of them have parts and those parts, if you count all those parts, it's 63 of them. So, one of the important things is that the whole team had full consensus on all of the recommendations. Next slide.

So, to give you a little road map, the revised structure is, we talk a little bit about the SSR1 implementation leading to one specific recommendation which is to carry on the implementation where we thought it was not finished. And then we talked about the key stability issues within ICANN, that leads to 21 of those 63 recommendations. We talk a bit about contracts, compliance, transparency, around DNS abuse and that leads to 25 recommendations in that area. And then, SSR related concerns regarding the global DNS, and that's 16 of the recommendations. So, we tried to make the document adjustable and readable and we did that by moving lots of the details, such as like evaluations of each of the SSR1 recommendations and the public comments and so on, into the appendices. So, we hope that that made the report easier to digest. And I'd like to dig down a little bit into each of those areas going forward. Next slide.

---

So, the SSR1 implementation. The bylaws mandated this review. And we have to say that the SSR1 recommendations were not written in a SMART manner. By that I mean they weren't meeting those five letters of the acronym SMART. We found that they were very difficult to measure in some cases. And so, we felt that they hadn't achieved the desired effect in any case, they all fell somewhat short in some way or another. And so, that is what we were trying to address in that one recommendation and the appendix I think provides the information about what was missing from our perspective. Next slide.

So, the key stability issues within ICANN was the next section. Here we are looking at the security, operational, stability resilience regarding both physical and network relating to unique identifiers, the security contingency planning regarding those identifiers, and the completeness and effectiveness of the ICANN Org's internal security processes. So, this led to recommendations regarding ICANN's organizational structure and in terms of the way that the chief information security officer is handled and disaster recovery and business continuity, those kinds of things, clarity and transparency within budgets and reporting, and handling of the risk managements so that it provides information that flows into business continuity and disaster recovery decisions and structures. Next slide, please.

So, the next section has to do with contracts, compliance, and transparency, around DNS abuse. Here, we have recommendations that are around what safeguards need to be in place for new gTLD program, challenges regarding definitions and data access. We talk about PDP alternatives and privacy and data stewardship. Next slide.

---

Regarding the SSR concerns on the global DNS, the recommendations come around topics about names collisions, research, DNS testbed, root zone and registry concerns, and the EBERO, or the Emergency Back-End Registry Operator. So, those are places where we dug in and made recommendations. Next slide.

I think I basically already mentioned the extensive appendices, and so I think that I'll just let that one stand. Next slide, please.

So, one of the challenges we had was setting a prioritization for each of our recommendations. We did this by using a poll; all of the review team members, once we had settled on the language for the final recommendations, we sent a poll out, "Is this one very low through very high?" And each of the team members rated the groups and then we looked at those and we ended up with the numbers at the bottom of the chart based on that methodology of assigning the priority. Next slide.

So, with the report delivered to the Board, we made a call for who would like to help as implementation shepherds. Four members of the team are going to do that. And basically, we're available to answer any questions that the Board or the implementation might need, and while the implementation's underway, we'll the people who are available to get clarification if it's needed. Next slide.

My understanding is that the public comment for the Board is open for almost another month, until the 9<sup>th</sup> of March. Then those public comments will be considered by the Board in their determination of which recommendations will be implemented. And the Board needs to

---

share with the community what that will be in terms of what actions they're going to take by the 25<sup>th</sup> of July. Next slide, please. Next.

So—a TBD didn't get filled in, sorry. I'll ask Jennifer to fill that in to the— oh, it did get filled in, somehow on my slide it didn't. Thank you. So, these are the links for you to find the—the first one tells what the SSR and other specific review teams are required to do and then there's a link to the final report and then there's a link to the public comment that is ongoing.

So, that's the material I had prepared. If there are questions, I would be glad to take any.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Thanks, Russ. I'll help you manage the queue. So, if you have questions, do raise your hand, or you can type them in the chat. And I think you can unmute yourself, but I'll keep any eye—I don't see any hands at the moment—but let's give it some time. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Well, I hope this overview at least has helped you know the parts you want to look at of the report in order to provide comments to the Board.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Russ, I see Donna Austin has her hand raised.

---

RUSS HOUSLEY:                   Okay.

DONNA AUSTIN:                   Hi Russ, Donna Austin from GoDaddy registry. I must admit I thought I was expecting a little bit more from this presentation. Is it possible for you to provide an assessment of some of the recommendations and perhaps how you've prioritized them and the expectations of the review team when they're considered by the Board?

RUSS HOUSLEY:                   So, some of the information that you're talking about is related to the specific review guidelines that came out well after we were underway. And we made the decision as a team not to adopt those. What we did instead—in fact, we provided comments as part of an open session as to why we thought those guidelines were putting the burden on the review team that was not placed properly. And so, bottom line is, we felt that that was not the way the team wanted to spend its time. And so, no, I don't think we have the material you're talking about.

So, got a question in chat that, "Do the shepherds have responsibility for specific recommendations?" And the answer is no. We might divvy it up if we find that the amount of work that's being asked of the implementation shepherds warrants, but right now we're a pool of resources regarding the whole report.

JENNIFER BRYCE:                   Russ, there's a hand from Jeff Neuman.



RUSS HOUSLEY:                   Okay.

JEFF NEUMAN:                   Hey Russ, thanks for this. So, a question I have maybe was, so there was an initial—I think it was called initial report, I always forget the terminology, or preliminary report. But can you just briefly maybe go over some of the things that were changed as a result of the public comments that you got and which things you didn't change and why? And also, I guess the second question is, because this took a number of years, as you were talking about, and there have already been a number of intervening events that have happened since. For example, there's the NCAP on the name collisions, right? So, there's that project going on. There was a SubPro report, there was a bunch of DNS abuse activities that are going on in the community. I was wondering if you had any thoughts or if the SSR2 discussed whether any of the intervening activities are actually addressing the SSR2 recommendations.

RUSS HOUSLEY:                   Yeah. We had a lot of discussion regarding that, but at the same time we kind of drew a line in the sand where we said at some point we have to stop modifying this report because new information is arriving and be done. Otherwise, we're at a place where we're just infinitely doing more investigation, refinement, and that was leading to new topics surfacing, not topics going away. And so, basically when that became apparent, I would say middle of last year is when we drew the line, it was in May if I

recall. We stopped taking on new research and so that was the point where we just said okay, we've got to finish resolving all of the information before us, format it, ship it, and stop bringing in new information. So, there could be some, but I also would observe that the amount of new things had greatly slowed down as everything became virtual and less face-to-face.

Okay, now to the earlier question. I would say that the part of the document that got the biggest rewrite was around abuse. If you look at appendix H, you'll clearly see the ones where the response is, boy, this section totally got restructured and rewritten. Second most would probably be that around risk management. I note that Laurin wants to say something, to build on this. Laurin is one of the implementation shepherds and is also one the vice chairs of the review team. Go ahead, Laurin.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

Thank you, Russ. I'm meant more like I would jump in if necessary, but I'm glad to give a bit more detail. So, if you look at the report and you compare what was there for the public comment and what is there now, It is hard for us—and that is one of the reasons why there is sometimes in our response you can see us saying, "Just look at the whole section again because there have been significant changes in a variety of places." So, in some ways I think it makes sense to read it a little bit as a new report, if that that makes sense. This impacts on the recommendations, it also impacts on the analysis, as well as the organization. So as Russ said before, a lot of work went into addressing the public comment. And what does help, I think, if you have the report

---

open, we do have the summaries of the recommendations on page six and following where also the priority is attached and for people who are interested in the strategic plan, because I think that came up. There is also an appendix, which I'm not scrolling quickly enough to find it, which one it is. But there is an appendix where we talk about how these things link to the strategic plan as well. Yes, it's appendix G.

RUSS HOUSLEY: For each recommendation, we showed where it ties in. I hope that answered your question, Jeff. But maybe not as completely as you would like, but I think that appendix will help. Any other hands, Jennifer?

JENNIFER BRYCE: No. Not that I can—no that's Jeff's hand. I can't see any new hands at the moment, unless, Jeff, that's a new hand?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, I figure if no one else is asking questions. I'd rather have others, but I think we should use the time to talk, so I'll ask another question if that's okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sure.

---

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks. So, there are a number of things in here that I would say are aimed at more of the tactics as opposed to the goal that's trying to be achieved. And so, I'm wondering, as we go through this, whether things can be implemented but in a different way or using different tactics than you have specified. For example, you're very specific on ICANN having to hire a C-Suite chief security or information security officer. It's very directed at the tactical level, but did the group discuss more of the—in some places it's hard to see what the goal is. And so, I'm just trying to figure out whether the shepherds or others are going to be in dialogues to try to draw out what the goal was and whether there are different ways to achieve that goal than the very specific tactics. I mean, in another place, you recommend a temp spec for example, and that's actually not really allowed in the contracts, the way that you're putting it, it goes against stuff. But there may be ways to achieve similar types of things without it. So, I guess maybe [just] a little bit behind it and why you were very specific as to the tactics as opposed to focusing a little bit more on the goals.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

So, okay. You've really honed in on an aspect that we really struggled with as a team. And we had a lot of discussion about whether to get very specific about implementations. And the reason where we did that was the SMARTness. It's specific, measurable, assignable, relevant, trackable. So, if your goal is to be all of those things, then you'd have to be pretty darn specific about what to do. And so, we tried in the findings to say what we were trying to achieve and then the recommendation providing all those SMART criteria for a way to get to that point—Kerry-Ann, you want to build on that?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah. And Jeff, thank you so much. And I'm happy it actually came out. One of the things that we did, when you look at the SSR1—sorry, Kerry-Ann Barrett. I'm part of the SSR2, I'm one of the shepherds. When we look at SSR1 recommendations and the implementation, one of the things that kept coming up to the team over and over was the inability to assess what they wanted to do and was it done. And you'll see that repeatedly throughout our review of the implementation of SSR1.

So, as Russ rightly said, we struggled with finding that balance, and what we were hoping in the language that we finally came up with as a team, was that the intent would be very clear. And it was something that would be able to be specifically measured. So, for example, you used example of the CISO. What we had noticed is that there was no single coordinating entity, thing, role, or function, that could tie together at the strategic level all the security concerns that we saw.

And we thought that because of CISO, the community would be understood as that individual or thing or function that could tie that together, that strategic level coordination is what we're honing in on. But if we just said that it could be something that could just be mainstreamed onto someone else's role that's not their main role, and we didn't want that either because that central coordination wouldn't have happened. So, we identified the role of a C-Suite, not saying what it should be called, but gave the example of the CISO to put context as to the type of function we thought was necessary for that one. We hope that helps, but Russ, I think you amply covered it as well.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Jeff, I hope we helped?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yes. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sure.

JENNIFER BRYCE: I see no hands at the moment. If you have a question, do please raise your hand or again, you can type in the chat.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Sounds like we're out of questions.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yep. I see no more hands.

RUSS HOUSLEY: All right. Well, thank you. And we look forward to getting together face-to-face someday.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you, everyone. Just to remind you, the public comment period is open until the 9<sup>th</sup> of March. I dropped the link into the chat earlier and

---

---

I'll post it very quickly before we wrap up just for those of you who may have missed it. Thanks a lot. Take care.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]