

1. ICANN should publish a single, clear and consistent statement of its SSR remit and limited technical mission. ICANN should elicit and gain public feedback in order to reach a consensus-based statement.

Staff Status:

This is done, although the public comment summary is in process of posting. See also <http://blog.icann.org/2013/07/icanns-security-terminology/>. The Security Office anticipates formal Board acknowledgement will be on the September Board agenda.

Evaluation:

Complete.

2. ICANN's definition and implementation of its SSR remit and limited technical mission should be reviewed in order to maintain consensus and elicit feedback from the Community. The process should be repeated on a regular basis, perhaps in conjunction with the cycle of future SSR reviews.

Staff Status:

Rec 2 is being addressed through the FY 14 Framework, next opportunity to review would be in publication of the FY 15 Framework in 2014, and as part of the SSR RT2 kicking off in 2015.

Evaluation:

Complete. FY14 framework has been published and public comment period has been completed. Frequency of definition/implementation reviews tied to SSR seems appropriate albeit this is a matter of opinion. Note that the review **should** be done prior to the SSR-RT2 review in order to provide the SSR-RT2 team with the most up to date information prior to their undertaking their review.

3. Once ICANN issues a consensus-based statement of its SSR remit and limited technical mission, ICANN should utilize consistent terminology and descriptions of this statement in all materials.

Staff Status:

This will be addressed after completion of the comment period on the FY 14 SSR Framework.

Evaluation:

[Waiting]

4. ICANN should document and clearly define the nature of the SSR relationships it has within the ICANN Community in order to provide a single focal point for understanding the interdependencies between organizations.

Staff Status:

Staff has made a determination of the different types of relationships, that they fall into categories of collaboration on threat awareness, coordination, technical engagement, organizational risk management. From this categorization (this includes relationships either through partnerships, MOUs, contracts) we're documenting the relationships that fit into these sections.

Evaluation:

Incomplete

5. ICANN should use the definition of its SSR relationships to maintain effective working arrangements and to demonstrate how these relationships are utilized to achieve each SSR goal.

Staff Status:

Although the definition is not yet complete, there has been progress in documenting relationships with the establishment of the Global Stakeholder Engagement team and support of regional strategies. We are probably at 40% now.

Evaluation:

Incomplete. Depends on completion of Recommendation 4.

6. ICANN should publish a document clearly outlining the roles and responsibilities for both the SSAC and RSSAC in order to clearly delineate the activities of the two groups. ICANN should seek consensus for this across both groups, recognizing the history and circumstances of the formation of each. ICANN should consider appropriate resourcing for both groups, consistent with the demands placed upon them.

Staff Status:

This recommendation is approximately 50% complete (6A is largely done, except for the publication of the roles and responsibilities for SSAC and confirmation from SSAC that the text is appropriate). 6B will involve staff and RSSAC collaboration to ensure the text has its endorsement.

Evaluation

6a. (Publish a document clearly outlining the roles and responsibilities of SSAC):

Incomplete. Depends on input from SSAC.

6b. (Publish a document clearly outlining the roles and responsibilities of RSSAC):

Incomplete. Depends on input from RSSAC.

6c. (ICANN should consider appropriate resourcing for both groups, consistent with the demands placed upon them.)

Complete. Both SSAC and RSSAC have budgetary and staff support allocations. Whether those allocations are sufficient is, of course, a subject of opinion.

Proposed Recommendations for SSR-RT2:

a. Seek {SS,RSS}AC and community input on whether resource allocations are sufficient to meet {SS,RSS}AC goals/requirements and adjust those allocations accordingly.

7. ICANN should build on its current SSR Framework by establishing a clear set of objectives and prioritizing its initiatives and activities in accordance with these objectives. This process should be informed by a pragmatic cost-benefit and risk analysis.

Staff Status:

Some of this recommendation is pending completion of the FY 14 operating plan and budget process.

Evaluation:

7a. (ICANN should establish a clear set of objectives):

Incomplete

7b. (ICANN should prioritize its initiatives and activities in accordance with these objectives):

Incomplete – depends on 7a

8. ICANN should continue to refine its Strategic Plan objectives, particularly the goal of maintaining and driving DNS availability. The Strategic Plan and SSR Framework should reflect consistent priorities and objectives to ensure clear alignment.

Staff Status:

Completion of this recommendation is dependent on development of the next Strategic Plan.

Evaluation

Incomplete – depends on Strategic Plan development

9. ICANN should assess certification options with commonly accepted international standards (e.g. ITIL, ISO and SAS-70) for its operational responsibilities. ICANN should publish a clear roadmap towards certification.

Staff Status:

Assessment is currently underway within IANA, IT. Security is providing a supporting role in this process. ICANN is working with an outside consultant to assist with completion of this assessment.

Evaluation

9a (ICANN should assess certification options):

[Waiting]

9b (ICANN should publish a clear roadmap towards certification):

Incomplete

10. ICANN should continue its efforts to step up contract compliance enforcement and provide adequate resources for this function. ICANN also should develop and implement a more structured process for monitoring compliance issues and investigations.

Staff Status:

We think this recommendation is largely complete through the work of the Compliance team in FY 13.

Evaluation

10a (ICANN should continue its efforts to step up contract compliance enforcement):

Complete.

10b (ICANN should provide adequate resources for this function):

Complete. Whether the resources provided are adequate is, of course, a matter of opinion.

10c (ICANN also should develop and implement a more structured process for monitoring compliance issues and investigations)

[Waiting]

11. ICANN should finalize and implement measures of success for new gTLDs and IDN fast track that expressly relate to its SSR-related program objectives, including measurements for the effectiveness of mechanisms to mitigate domain name abuse.

Staff Status:

This recommendation is not yet implemented.

Evaluation

Incomplete

12. ICANN should work with the Community to identify SSR-related best practices and support the implementation of such practices through contracts, agreements and MOUs and other mechanisms.

Staff Status:

This is partially complete with the incorporation of SSR language into the new gTLD registry agreement and 2013 RAA out for public comment now. We will need to produce a list of SSR-related best practices and where incorporated in contracts, agreements, MOUs and other for tracking purposes.

Evaluation

12a. (ICANN should work with the Community to identify SSR-related best practices):

Incomplete

12b. (ICANN support the implementation of such practices through contracts, agreements and MOUs and other mechanisms):

Complete. 2013 RAA (at least) incorporates support for best practices.

Proposed Recommendations for SSR-RT2:

- b. ICANN should identify all contract, agreements, MOUs, and other mechanisms in which application of SSR best practices can be incorporated and for each of those mechanisms, work with opposite parties to establish metrics to measure compliance with those best practices.

13. ICANN should encourage all Supporting Organizations to develop and publish SSR-related best practices for their members.

Staff Status:

We are in the early stages of this recommendation and implementation is still underway.

Evaluation

Incomplete

14. ICANN should ensure that its SSR-related outreach activities continuously evolve to remain relevant, timely and appropriate. Feedback from the Community should provide a mechanism to review and increase this relevance.

Staff Status:

We think this recommendation has been met with the annual SSR Frameworks and approach to engaging with TLD operators, law enforcement and community groups, however, the ATRT2 should keep in mind that this recommendation is very open ended. We do not think this is one that is ever "done". For our tracking purposes, this has been addressed for Fy 14 budgeting, and now we need to deliver on requested trainings and engagement.

Evaluation

Complete. The Security Team has been active in outreach, particularly in the context of DNS-related technologies.

Proposed Recommendations for SSR-RT2:

- c. ICANN should ensure the Security Team undertakes SSR-related outreach activities that address other aspects related to ICANN's limited SSR remit, e.g., IP address-related SSR concerns.

15. ICANN should act as facilitator in the responsible disclosure and dissemination of DNS security threats and mitigation techniques.

Staff Status:

We think this recommendation is complete. There will be an on-going activity for acting as a facilitator, but the tools to enable facilitation are in place.

Evaluation

Complete. Publication of ICANN's "Coordinated Disclosure Guidelines" (<http://blog.icann.org/2013/03/icann-coordinated-disclosure-guidelines/>) documented the implementation of this recommendation.

16. ICANN should continue its outreach efforts to expand Community participation and input into the SSR Framework development process. ICANN also should establish a process for obtaining more systematic input from other ecosystem participants.

Staff Status:

We think this is being implemented with the FY 14 SSR Framework, however, as with our comments on Rec 14, this is an on-going responsibility for the Security team, not work that can ever be completely checked off as "done".

Evaluation

16a. (ICANN should continue its outreach efforts):

Complete. The Security Team has reached out to communities and individuals for input on the SSR Framework development process.

16b. (ICANN also should establish a process for obtaining more systematic input from other ecosystem participants.):

[Waiting]

17. ICANN should establish a more structured internal process for showing how activities and initiatives relate to specific strategic goals, objectives and priorities in the SSR Framework. It also should establish metrics and milestones for implementation.

Staff Status:

This is being addressed with the development of the next Strategic Plan, and the implementation of At Task with FY 14.

Evaluation

Incomplete

18. ICANN should conduct an annual operational review of its progress in implementing the SSR Framework and include this assessment as a component of the following year's SSR Framework.

Staff Status:

This recommendation is 100% complete.

Evaluation

Complete

19. ICANN should establish a process that allows the Community to track the implementation of the SSR Framework. Information should be provided with enough clarity that the Community can track ICANN's execution of its SSR responsibilities, while not harming ICANN's ability to operate effectively. The dashboard process being used to track implementation of the ATRT recommendations serves as a good model.

Staff Status:

70%, but needs to be updated to current with the FY 14 activities.

Evaluation

Incomplete

20. ICANN should increase the transparency of information about organization and budget related to implementing the SSR Framework and performing SSR-related functions. Information should be provided with enough clarity that the Community can track ICANN's execution of its SSR responsibilities, while not impeding ICANN's ability to operate effectively.

Staff Status:

This is well underway with the development of the FY 14 budget, pending the adoption of the budget and operating plan and updating of related projects and initiatives in At Task.

Evaluation

Incomplete

21. ICANN should establish a more structured internal process for showing how organization and budget decisions relate to the SSR Framework, including the underlying cost-benefit analysis.

Staff Status:

This is well underway with the development of the FY 14 budget, pending the adoption of the budget and operating plan and updating of related projects and initiatives in At Task.

Evaluation

Incomplete

22. ICANN should publish, monitor and update documentation on the organization and budget resources needed to manage SSR issues in conjunction with introduction of new gTLDs.

Staff Status:

This is well underway with the development of the FY 14 budget, pending the adoption of the budget and operating plan and updating of related projects and initiatives in At Task.

Evaluation

Incomplete

23. ICANN must provide appropriate resources for SSR-related Working Groups and Advisory Committees, consistent with the demands placed upon them. ICANN also must ensure decisions reached by Working Groups and Advisory Committees are reached in an objective manner that is free from external or internal pressure.

Staff Status:

Implementation of this recommendation is still in progress.

Evaluation

23a. (ICANN must provide appropriate resources):

Complete. Whether the resources provided are “appropriate” is, of course, a matter of opinion.

23b. (ICANN also must ensure decisions reached by Working Groups and Advisory Committees are reached in an objective manner that is free from external or internal pressure.):

Incomplete – unclear this is possible.

Proposed Recommendations for SSR-RT2:

- d. Seek Working Group, AC, and community input on whether resource allocations are sufficient to meet demands and adjust those allocations accordingly.

24. ICANN must clearly define the charter, roles and responsibilities of the Chief Security Office[r] Team.

Staff Status:

We think this recommendation is complete. The charter, roles, and responsibilities of the Chief Security Officer Team have been addressed through the publication of the annual framework (see page 17 of the FY14 SSR Framework).

Evaluation

24a. (ICANN must clearly define the charter):

Incomplete

The charter of the Security Office does not appear to be clearly defined or documented. On page 16 and 17 of the FY14 SSR Framework talks informally of how SSR fits into ICANN's functional areas however it may be argued this does not "clearly define" the Security Office's principles, functions, and organization.

24b. (ICANN must clearly define the roles):

Complete. See page 17 of the FY14 SSR Framework.

24c. (ICANN must clearly define the responsibilities):

Complete. See page 17 of the FY14 SSR Framework.

Proposed Recommendations for SSR-RT2:

- e. While providing the roles and responsibilities of the Security Office Team in the yearly SSR Framework addresses this recommendation, these descriptions would likely be more easily found and understood if that information (as well as the Security Office charter) was made available on the Security Office Team website.

25. ICANN should put in place mechanisms for identifying both near and longer-term risks and strategic factors in its Risk Management Framework. This process should be informed by insights from research, business partnerships, ICANN Supporting Organizations and other sources. ICANN should publish

information about risks, recognizing the sensitive nature of some of these factors.

Staff Status:

A draft framework was presented in Beijing, will be published for comment for Durban.

Evaluation

25a. (ICANN should put in place mechanisms for identifying both near and longer-term risks and strategic factors in its Risk Management Framework.):

Incomplete. While efforts are underway to create a Risk-Management framework, those efforts are not yet complete.

23b. (ICANN should publish information about risks):

Incomplete – depends on 25a.

26. ICANN should prioritize the timely completion of a Risk-Management Framework. This work should follow high standards of participation and transparency.

Staff Status:

This is being prioritized, by the Board-level DNS Risk Management Framework Working Group, participation has been open in public sessions at ICANN Costa Rica, Prague, Toronto, Beijing. A public comment opportunity will be available after the draft is completed.

Evaluation

Complete.

Completion of the Risk-Management Framework has been prioritized and provides for participation and transparency, albeit whether the standards of participation is high or not is a matter of opinion.

27. ICANN's Risk-Management Framework should be comprehensive within the scope of its SSR remit and limited missions.

Staff Status:

This is well underway, a draft Framework was published for community to see for the ICANN Beijing meeting. A draft will be presented for Community comment for the ICANN Durban meeting.

Evaluation

Complete. Whether or not the Risk-Management Framework is comprehensive is, of course, a matter of opinion.

28. ICANN should continue to actively engage in threat detection and mitigation, and participate in efforts to distribute threat and incident information.

Staff Status:

We think this recommendation is essentially complete.

Evaluation

Complete.