

---

JOHANNESBURG – Security, Stability and Resiliency 2 RT Meeting - Day 1

Sunday, June 25, 2017 - 00:00 to 00:00 JNB

ICANN59 | Johannesburg, South Africa

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Do we have you back?

GEOFF HUSTON: Hi. Yes, you've got me back.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Perfect. We have Geoff. Go ahead, Geoff, the floor is yours.

GEOFF HUSTON: Okay, thanks. We're going to –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The call dropped again. We had him on for an hour without a glitch. We get in front of all of you and now this is happening. This is like taking a car to the mechanic.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I have him on my iPhone.

---

*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.*

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Geoff, do we have you back?

GEOFF HUSTON: Hi. Yes, you've got me back. How's that?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes, perfect.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: If you said anything, we missed it.

GEOFF HUSTON: Okay. So, the topic is not just security of the DNS, but it's security and stability. Now, the issue is that the broader consideration of this topic, the architecture of the DNS ecosystem is far, far larger than ICANN's remit. And while there is an intersection, we're going to concentrate on the areas of that intersection rather than the generic topic of the security and the stability of the entire DNS ecosystem.

So, we're going to look at those activities that are directed by or coordinated by ICANN or the PTI, or where ICANN has a substantive presence by virtue of hosting a community-driven process or other forms of community engagement. So, looking at it practically from the ICANN perspective.

---

Now, the ideas that were thrown up on the board, there are around 11 of them, and we have tried to put them into some kind of structure, because those 11 sort of broad ideas really were a grab bag of ideas, and it makes some sense to try and categorize them, put them into a taxonomy that gives it structure.

So, looking at this, we can see four major areas of structure. The first of this is the root zone management practice, because ICANN coordinates the contents of the root zone of the public DNS. That's one of its jobs. So, in that root zone practice, we can think about TLD label management. What labels go in the root zone? Are there constraints on those labels? Where do those labels come from? Things like the two-letter country code rules and so on, the issue that no single characters go into the root zone and so on.

Secondly, nameserver and DS-record management. Because what's in the root zone is actually a set of delegation records and DNS key records. How do those records get changed? How are they managed? What's the security behind those changes? Are those measures appropriate is a reasonable thing to review.

I'm pretty sure they are, but we should look at it, we should gather those inputs and make some judgments. What are the respective roles of RSSAC and ICANN? Because in the root zone,

---

RSSAC has a fair deal of say, and it's almost autonomous and independent of ICANN. What are the issues that that's bringing up, and how are they being managed? And does this have some implications for the security and stability of the DNS? Probably worth looking at and making some comment.

And lastly, when you actually look at the mechanics of root zone construction, ICANN, the PTI and VeriSign all have roles in this process. It's worthwhile reviewing that to understand if that is an appropriate process or not. I suspect it might be, but it's worth looking at. So, that's the first topic, root zone management.

The second one is change management, because stability doesn't mean no change. Stability means managed change. So, in looking at change management, looking at the process of introduction of new TLDs in the root zone, looking at the ways in which ICANN coordinates with ISO 3166 in both the introduction and retirement of country code TLDs, I think it's useful and timely to look at the coordination with the IETF, particularly over the RFC 6761 special use names registry, where the IETF is claiming a role that appears to in some ways directly clash with ICANN's role and has some implications for stability. Coordination within the IETF and UNICODE, particularly over IDNA standards and practice.

---

We also should look at the evolution of the root service and the stability of the identifiers so defined, because certainly, changes are happening in that space, largely driven by the standards bodies, which is the third point: how do you balance community policies, applicable standards, and security and stability concerns when you talk about evolving the DNS?

We heard this morning someone saying in response to a question, “Well, it’s a community-driven process and we’re just doing the job.” What if the stability folk coming out of standards bodies or some other voice is saying no? How do you balance all of those inputs? Where are the checks and balances in this system to ensure the result is a result that works for everybody and not just listening to one view to the detriment of all others?

So, this has a number of implications, all the way through to the contracts and contractual compliance that ICANN has with its registrars. How do you balance, if you will, what folk wanted, community policies, versus what the standards bodies say is appropriate, is a reasonable question.

And last and not least, looking at abuse and threats, which is this whole issue of, what are ICANN’s responsibilities? We know the DNS is used as an attack vector. It’s used as a command and control network. It’s abused in all kinds of ways. That’s fine. But what are ICANN’s responsibilities, and to what extent are they

---

fulfilling the today? Could that be improved? Is that fine? Are they doing even too much? Which I doubt, but you know, is it doing as much as it should and could do in that area is the question to be asked.

So, those are the four major areas. I'm going to write that up, send it to the subtopic three mailing list. We'll see if we can't get this fleshed out as a reasonable work plan by the 7<sup>th</sup> of July is our objective, which at this point seems achievable.

Questions?

DENISE MICHEL: Hi, this is Denise. James also has a question.

GEOFF HUSTON: Now I can't hear a thing.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: You can't hear anything at all, Geoff? Can you hear me?

GEOFF HUSTON: Now... Okay, so now if I mute this... Now I can hear.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Geoff, can you hear me?

---

GEOFF HUSTON: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay, let's try that again.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. This is Denise. Can you hear me, Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: Yes.

DENISE MICHEL: Great. So, on the roles of RSSAC, I think an issue that might be raised there is to make sure that we aren't duplicating the RSSAC review that occurs every three years or something. That's just kind of an FYI there. And then separately, I wanted to note that we've got some sort of duplication between ICANN security and DNS security to work out in the abuse and threats areas. So, just to flag that in when we get to the ICANN security areas.

GEOFF HUSTON: We're certainly aware of that, and it's certainly our view that matters around for example the L-root management are actually ICANN issues rather than generic DNS.

---

DENISE MICHEL: Right. Yes. I think the ICANN Security Group would agree with that. We also have things like the ICANN’s contractual obligations, the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, the registry contracts. Those things we viewed as ICANN responsibilities and put them and how that relates to abuse and threats in the ICANN Security Group topic.

GEOFF HUSTON: That might be a little bit more of a sort of negotiation. And the reason why I say that is that there is no doubt the DNS is changing, and there is no doubt that the standards bodies – particularly the IETF – are actually evolving in what’s allowed and what’s not allowed in the DNS.

The timeliness and the way in which that gets translated into ICANN’s actions, contractual compliance, etc., is I think a reasonable consideration. And whether we put it in the DNS bucket or the ICANN bucket, I don’t know, but it’s certainly a timely topic.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, no. I would agree, and I think there’s a sensible way of delineating what parts the two groups are addressing. For example, the ICANN Security Group was not proposing to



---

address getting into at all IETF, the evolving role of ICANN, but rather, focusing more on ICANN's responsibilities today and its contractual obligations and the compliance department and how it works, more of the practical operational current ICANN activities. So, yes, further discussion there though. James.

JAMES GANNON:

Thanks, Denise. So, I feel like I'm going to try to channel Eric here, given that he's not here yet. But in a similar vein, for the item on what goes into the root with regards to the labels and also on the special use names with IETF, I'm going to channel Eric and say, yes, we probably need to have a discussion around it. But I will put a marker in that we need to be very careful on how we frame our recommendations, because at the end of the day, speaking about gTLDs, that is most likely the subject of GNSO policy development.

So, we can certainly as a recommendation say that the GNSO should look at something. But if we're looking at stripping down to why can't we do one-character releases in the g-space, that's a policy development rather than something for us to make specific recommendations on.

DENISE MICHEL:

Other questions or issues?

---

GEOFF HUSTON: You know, James, certainly, there are times where I think the review can say you're doing the right thing. It doesn't always need to point at failings. And I think there are certainly areas where the right thing is happening, and that's great.

The special use names registry and the IETF is not one of those cases, and I think it would be helpful if we at least even highlighted it. Even if we couldn't come up with specific recommendations, it's a thorny problem.

JAMES GANNON: Yes. We agree on that, Geoff.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay, great. Any other comments or issues on the DNS security topic? Okay, thank you so much, Geoff, and thank you for bearing with us through the audio challenges and for staying up so late to be with us. This has been extremely helpful. Alain has a  
-

GEOFF HUSTON: No, thank you.

---

DENISE MICHEL: I think Alain has as parting comment. Go ahead.

ALAIN AINA: Yes. So, I was not in a room, but – okay, in case Geoff mention or any of my colleagues mention, we agree on the way forward, we say that we are going to take this and as team members work on it, maybe add more stuff and have a final document which we'll share with the group. Okay.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you very much. Alright. And then if you would, either as you evolve the draft or as you complete your work, if you could drop it into the Google Doc that everyone has access to, and so strike and replace what's there now for subtopic three DNS security, that'll I think be really useful in helping the rest of the team understand how you're evolving this space. That's great. Steve. I'm sorry, I missed Steve [inaudible]. Go ahead.

STEVE CONTE: No, that's okay. Just in light of Alain's comment about possibly adding more stuff and in view of the amount of items that were already there – and I know we just went through the wrongfully named deduplication effort, so there are probably less items, is it worth looking for the subteams looking at a prioritization of these items to make sure that the right [fruit] get hit and that if

---

there are more items added, then some conscious choices are made on which items to look at? Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you. That's a good observation, and we have a substantial part of our day tomorrow set aside for continuing work on this, and prioritization and adding details are going to be a big part of that, absolutely. Okay. Are we ready to move on to the ICANN security topic? Yes? Okay.

I'm not sure how I got roped into being the one who's talking about this. I guess something I'm going to have to work on. But let me see. Okay. But this is a onetime thing, and I invite my other team members to please jump in and help explain some of these things or add additional color, or remind me if I'm missing something as I try and transcribe my scribbles.

So, we're – at the useful suggestion of Steve – changing the name of this to ICANN Security and Stability. Or we could do ICANN SSR as a subtopic. Some of these work items also apply to and support security, stability and I think resiliency as well. So, that'll be useful.

And again, we focused on items for which ICANN has a leading – either a sole role or a leading role in effecting a key activity for ICANN, as well as internal ICANN operations. So, those were the

---

guiding principles for our edit of this work item. And so if you're going to pull up the work items in subtopic whatever number this is, two? Subtopic two.

So, if you have it on your screens, the first one's Scope of ICANN's SSR Responsibility. We're moving that to subtopic one as that falls into the SSR recommendations. I'll move through these very quickly, so please shout out if I'm missing a question or an additional comment.

So, number two, Effectiveness of ICANN SSR Framework Plans and Implementation. We're going to flesh this out with some more detail and it will include things like do we need to clarify the definition of security? More to come on that.

Number three, Physical Security Requirements. They talk about DNSSEC key storage facility. We're going to seek some staff help to flush out some more details there. But we're proposing – and this is something I wanted to discuss with the DNS Security Group of keeping the physical security requirements and the ICANN operational aspects of key storage, KSK, and separate that from DNSSEC, put DNSSEC over into DNS Security. What do you think about that?

And our rationale here is keep the kind of ICANN lead responsibility and ICANN infrastructure in the ICANN Security

---

Group. DNSSEC is a more collaborative, broader reaching item, and move that over to you guys. Don and then James.

DON BLUMENTHAL: I think the distinction makes sense. To be honest, one of the things I was going to question within group three is whether the extent to which DNSSEC is an issue for us to discuss, because at this point, ICANN can promote it, but it really doesn't have any mandate or control over whether – so, I'm saying yes it does, but it may be premature to say that in terms of what we do.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you.

JAMES GANNON: Thanks. So, there are two aspects here. So, I agree with both sides, but – so, there is DNSSEC as a global DNS concept, and then there is DNSSEC of the root zone as performed and operated by ICANN. The former would fit into DNS Security, but the latter, the actual operation of the root zone KSK and everything else, that is 80% operated by ICANN with VeriSign doing some stuff. That's an ICANN infrastructure issue and I would think that stays in ICANN Security.

---

DENISE MICHEL: Steve?

STEVE CONTE: I think there are more sides to it than that too, because as Geoff mentioned in his briefing of the DNS Security things, there's also the management of the DS-records in the root, which is not ICANN Security, but DNS identifier management aspects. So, I think there is a splitting, and I think trying to find the nuances of the splitting is important between what subgroups look at what items.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you. I'll flag that for something we could continue to discuss tomorrow. And then in the interest of moving through this list, we added sort of a restated category that captures a number of items so we crossed out as duplicative with the intention of adding a section on reducing the probability of DNS-related incidences, and that would encapsulate activities that ICANN undertakes that help reduce the probability of not only DDoS, but other DNS-related risks.

And that also would allow us to look at the various components within ICANN and their roles in helping to reduce the probability of attacks and other threat vectors. So, that would include

---

things like L-root, domain name contractual obligation, compliance, security training, those types of things.

So, we're separating so the proactive – what we're doing to reduce the probability – and separating that from the reactive incident response. And then there, in that category, we're proposing a gap analysis and sort of lessons learned that focuses on being reactive to incident response. When there was an incident, what was ICANN's role? How well did it fulfill its role? So, do a gap analysis in that area.

Okay. So, those are two kind of general concepts that we wanted to cover in here, and might make more sense after we write this up.

Don, you're looking at me like you have an interjection. Okay.

Alright, and then we had – there's a section on measurements and metrics, and that encapsulates things like DART, the DNS Abuse Report, the health index, and I think the action or work item there is more along the lines of gap analysis there, undertaking things like the index and the DNS abuse reporting, so we want to look at what the evidence tells us looking at the sort of gap analysis can – you know, what's happening in that area, what ICANN's role is, that type of thing.



---

Moving on then to ICANN internal security, stability, resiliency of its operations. So, that's a category that includes IT operations and risk management as it directly relates to ICANN's own IT systems. There's the GDD operations separate from IT security, so there you've got the breach of public-facing databases relating to new gTLD services and those types of things.

Separate from that is the CZD, the central zone file system, data system, and then there may be a few other elements in there. We're going to have to check with staff to get a more complete list. And then another element of that is the outreach, public information role, which includes training, outreach, some of those.

Then our colleagues Noorul and Boban are going to rewrite both the risk management framework related items to make it more clear and more detailed as to what it includes. And then we have a whole section on best practices relating to certification. We'll be combining and restating 11 through 16, kind of combining that into one element with several subtopics. So, we've eliminated 9 and 10 as duplicative.

So, we're eliminating 9 and 10, and we'll be combining 11 through 16 under a more consistent item dealing with best practices and certification. We eliminated 17, 18, 19 and 20 as

---

too broad. We'll flesh out a category related to non-DNS specific incident response plans.

Noorul, can you remind me, is that tied to the risk management framework, or is that separate? That's not planning, that's, "How did ICANN respond to incidences that are non-DNS?"

NOORUL AMEEN: Yes, what are their management policies and global coordination with the corresponding [inaudible] and those kind of policy issues. Those kind of issues will come [as] standard incident response.

DENISE MICHEL: Right. Okay. Got that? Number 22, we're proposing the move. It's the coordinated vulnerability disclosure process. James.

JAMES GANNON: Sorry. Two comments. There are two types of incidence responses and there are two types of coordinated vulnerability disclosure policies.

DENISE MICHEL: Do you want to address incident responses first and Noorul can handle that?

---

JAMES GANNON: Yes. So, there is coordinated incident response for things that are happening on the DNS that ICANN plays a part in. That's one. There is also – or there should also be – a separate one for breaches of ICANN's internal systems. So, these are two different things. One would fit under ICANN Security and one would fit under DNS Security.

NOORUL AMEEN: The first part is – just carry on, Steve.

STEVE CONTE: I'm sorry. Just to clarify that, because the 22 I think directly discusses the process that ICANN calls the coordinated vulnerability disclosure process. So, if there isn't a separate one, we should flag that and call it. the reason why it's all capitalized is because there's a process that's been developed and exercised called that.

DENISE MICHEL: What is it?

STEVE CONTE: John Crain could probably speak to this in more clarity, or David Piscitello, but if there's a vulnerability discovered that could

---

affect the domain name system, such as large operating system platform developer found a vulnerability in their version of DNS, the process was so that we as an organization can work with them and maintain the sensitivity of it without disclosing it until after the vulnerability was patched up and fixed, and then put out there.

So, it was just putting us in a trustful position that we as an organization could participate in the mitigation of vulnerabilities that affect the DNS. But if there are other aspects to it, then we should flag that and treat that as a separate item than this specific process.

NOORUL AMEEN:

Answering to James’s question, there are two aspects. One is a global incident response aspect. That is covered under this point, incident response. The second point, ICANN’s incidence response, that comes under the gap analysis of ICANN’s internal security operations. That is already covered in the point six or seven, no? Gap analysis and Internet security.

DENISE MICHEL:

Right, yes. DNS related, we have separate categories for that. Hopefully, it’ll make more sense when it’s written up. We’re ready to move – okay. We weren’t quite sure what “Assess

---

ICANN’s ability to respond to strategic threats to the unique identifiers it coordinates” means, but it’s likely combined with 22 and the way we’re proposing to deal with incident response and risk management.

24, instead of vetting process for EBERO operators, there needs to be a category EBERO, and it has a number of subtopics under it. So, we’re going to take a first cut at that, and I think other team members will have some additional items to add.

25, ICANN process around vetting registry operators. Again, we’re proposing a registry category. Vetting operators is one. I think we have other registry-related issues that have been raised that we’re proposing to put under that category.

We deleted 26 as duplicative then.

27, what is the scope of ICANN’s threat modeling? I think that we’re going to combine with the previous categories that we articulated around reducing probabilities of risk and risk management framework activities.

We’re proposing to delete 28 through 34 as being covered elsewhere.

35 we’re deleting from this as it’s covered in risk management, as is 36. 35 and 36 are covered under the risk management item.

---

So, we're going to flesh that out but remove it as a separate item.

And then we don't know what 37 means, "What is ICANN doing in the area of interoperability, security, STDs to monitor (ITHI)." We deleted it, but if someone has an explanation and argument as to why it should be put back in, please let us know.

I mentioned that we have an item on registry issues, we have an item on registrar issues, we have an item on compliance, ICANN compliance and issues under that. We have an item under L-root, and so we want to flag that for the DNS team. So, under our framework of ICANN's primary role, we thought it appropriate to include L-root, the operations and best practices that they engage in as an item to flag under ICANN SSR.

And then I think the other one we added was IDNs as a separate category. We have a number of issues that have come up under that, so we'd have IDNs and then specific issues under that.

Noorul, Boban, Ram, have I missed anything? Do you want to elaborate on anything? DNS Security team, do you hear any other duplications or issues to discuss here?

[ŽARKO KECIĆ]:

Yes, I just want to mention that there are a couple of things which are mixing actually duplicated with SSR1 review. Actually,

---

when we do work on this, we should collaborate with SSR1 team on those issues.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. Thank you, [Zarko.] That’s an excellent point. So, this evening I’ll flesh out the list of work items for SSR1 and include all the recommendations, and then I’ll flag the ones where I’m aware of the connections to other subgroup topics, and we can discuss this further tomorrow. Noorul?

NOORUL AMEEN: For our internal security operation, ICANN’s internal security operation, we need to coordinate with the [CTO] also.

DENISE MICHEL: Right, the CIO. Right, yes. So, we have a number of issues and questions for the CIO, and he’s on our list of people to talk to. Yes, thank you. Any other issues? [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes. When we mention CIO, we should think about making that list of questions.

---

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. I think there are so many issues that have already been raised, it would be a great idea – thank you – to develop a list of questions in advance before he talks to us. Yes, thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Excuse me. We agree on that, but we should start working tomorrow on that.

DENISE MICHEL: Like actually start listing? And so if staff could take as an action item, “List of questions for CIO,” and we’ll want to put that on our action item list for tomorrow.

JENNIFER BRYCE: James actually got started on this this morning. He sent me a list over, so I’ll put it in the Google Doc and share it this afternoon.

DENISE MICHEL: Wonderful. Thank you. Thanks, James. Any other items on this?  
  
So, I’ll flesh out the work item list for SSR1, flag items that are connected to other subtopics. The four of us in ICANN SSR Subteam will clean up the work item list for this topic, and we’ll be ready for further discussions tomorrow.



---

It is 4:00. We have an hour remaining. Are there any other issues? I think we've done a good job of teeing up a lot of work for tomorrow, and most of tomorrow will be focused on subtopic work. But before we close out the discussion this afternoon, is there anything else you'd like to raise relating to subtopics?

Pardon? Would you like to do IANA? That would be great. And then just FYI, we've got a discussion on outreach and then a review of our action items before we're done. Go ahead, James and Cathy.

JAMES GANNON: Thanks.

CATHY HANDLEY: He's going to channel me.

JAMES GANNON: I'm going to channel Cathy [inaudible]. So yes, we had a really good meeting. We fleshed out most of the breakdown of the high-level topics into what areas we want to look at. They're primarily concerned with the resiliency piece of [PTLE] post-transition. So, it's business continuity planning, it's impact on processes, impacting on training, documented evidence of business continuity plan testing, this type of thing.

---

We've identified that we would like to meet with Kim and with Elise both from PTI. Jennifer is taking an action item to reach out to both of them with a hope that we might be able to grab them here in Johannesburg, because they're both here. So, it would be useful if we could do that face to face. If not, we're going to schedule a call for some time in the coming weeks.

We've identified what we think is a list of documentation that we want from ICANN and PTI on these topics, so again, Jennifer is going to reach out to staff to try and coordinate what we think exists documentation-wise and turn that into what is actually there, and then hopefully look at what that can be released publicly versus under NDA, etc., because some of it would be sensitive documentation.

So, we can look at that, and the hope is that we can conclude the interviews and the documentation gathering by the end of July is the plan. We're both pretty busy for August, so the plan is we'll start writing up the outcomes of that over August and it happens that myself and Cathy are going to be in Geneva at the same time, so we'll try and get together and finish that out then at the start of September with the hope to deliver that mid-September.

---

DENISE MICHEL:

Great. So, again, we'll update the Google Doc for the subtopics that we've worked through today so we'll be ready to address those items in tomorrow's agenda.

Thank you. Anything else on subtopics before we move on?

Outreach. Could staff pull up the basic text that had been previously agreed to by the team relating to outreach?

There had been a request to address outreach at this meeting, determining what guidelines are needed, addressing ICANN's internal outreach to SOs, Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, as well as external outreach and outreach by the team broadly and team members specifically. So I'll wait until the staff has a chance to pull that up.

So we have a general commitment to outreach as we noted in our terms of reference. And then, of course, going beyond the basic tools that we already use, of having a wiki, providing regular updates on our progress, and having recordings and notes and agenda items, and all the other information, being transparent on the wiki and encouraging e-mail input as well as noting observer contributions in our calls and meetings.

The issue that some members asked that we address, I think under the broad rubric of outreach, is do we need more specific guidelines on how we're going to conduct outreach, both within

---

the ICANN community, and more broadly? And if team members find themselves at conferences of organizations and entities that are relevant to the SSR arena, should they talk about the SSR team's work? Should they do that in their personal capacity as a team member and distinguish that from speaking for the team as a whole? I think these are the types of issues that, questions that have arisen over the last couple of months, I think, by some team members. So this is an opportunity to discuss this further.

Way back in March, I think I was asked for kind of an initial list of some of the types of entities that we would want to consider if it's relevant to do some outreach to. That could take the form of simply an e-mail saying, "Here's our terms of reference and work plan. We invite any input you may have to sending a specific set of questions to an entity or having a conference call with them." So outreach can take a lot of different forms.

But this simply lists the various bodies within ICANN and if you scroll down, includes, and then of course, the SSR1 Review Team that we've contacted and requested for any input they have on implementation of SSR1. And these are just an assorted list of other sort of Internet ecosystem players. This, again, is simply a kind of draft list of entities out there. It's not a "here's everyone we're going to talk to" list.

---

So that's what I have on outreach. I'm putting it here on the agenda to give people a forum to discuss it. Who would like to start? Or are there people who care not here today? We can hold this over until tomorrow.

James. Alain, and then James.

ALAIN AINA:

Yes. I think I am one of the people who always raise these issues, so thank you for giving me the opportunity.

One of the things I think I always saw we should clarify is what do we mean here by outreach. Because I see, if you look at the things, for example, where if you look at ICANN community and then the community At-Large, a consistency there, which are customers or directly elected to what we are doing here in terms of security and stability.

For example, IETF, the RIR, for example. So for me, I think – SSAC, RSSAC – so these people, I think we need them for this review, to engage them and discuss with them, etc. So for me, I don't see them, I don't see talking to these people as outreach. For me, it's part of collecting data, reaching out to people who are affected by this security and stability, resiliency, who are the primary customers or community member involved.

---

Then maybe when we have some product or we have something, then we go for the global, what we call the outreach where we meet people, we present a primary report, we get feedback, etc. So this is how I see things. I don't know if everybody shares my view on this.

JAMES GANNON:

Thanks. Yeah, broadly in alignment. I think there's two types of outreach and there's one time point that changes our outreach. There is publicizing our work, and there is asking for specific input. And publicizing our work is basically, to me, saying, "Hey look, we're doing this thing. Do you have any general comments on what we are doing?"

There is specific input which is approaching SSAC on this specific topic because we want feedback on that, or approaching the TLG, the Technical Liaison Group, to the Board. These specific, "We are approaching you for a specific reason."

The former – the "Here's what we're doing. Aren't we great? Can you give us some general feedback?" – I think we can approach pretty much everybody with that. I think that's something that we can do, shout for out loud and send things to our wiki and to our observer list.

---

The specific question approach, I think needs to be a little bit more considerate and I think if we are looking at asking specific group specific questions, that's something that we should discuss as a Review Team and how we frame those questions and what those questions are at a basic level.

And then there is also a time point which changes things, which is when we have our draft report. So everything up to our draft report is input and then once we've put out our draft report there as a work product, we need to change our tack a little bit because anything that we get back at that point is potentially commentary that we might need to assess and incorporate which changes the dynamic a little bit, which is where I think we need to be more. It would be somebody from the Review Team is presenting our report at a conference with the specific goal of getting input from that group of people or we are approaching and presenting to this group as, "We want your specific input on what we have written." So there is kind of the time point and then the two different types that I think we need to be careful on.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you, James. Cathy?

---

CATHY HANDLEY:

Thank you. I'll take what James said a little bit farther, and what Alain said, I think it's fine to ask questions of other groups regarding what's in a document, but I think we have to be very careful how we do that because there are some, I'm sure, groups that will want to respond and rewrite things. Their job is not to write the report. That is our job and we just need to make sure that we have a real clear understanding if we get ready to go out and do some outreach, and to go to IETF and say, "What do you think?"

IETF is 800 people and you're not going to ask 800 people, so we need to really keep that in a little box. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you, Cathy. Those are all very useful comments. I would also add – well, it's actually a question – should we ask the subtopic groups in their work items when they're flagging, sort of tasks, next steps, to also flag those issues for which specific input is needed or information gathering involves another entity within ICANN? Cathy?

CATHY HANDLEY:

I think that's an excellent idea. I think the subgroups are going to know what's going on and are going to know where they are in



---

questions, and the reasoning that the question is being asked, which is half the issue.

So the first place I would look would be to the subgroups. If someone thinks they have an opportunity to go speak to someone, I would say they should go back and talk to that subgroup or reach out to that subgroup and make sure that the subgroup agrees there's questions, not just the individual that's doing the outreach that may have a question. Does that make sense? Okay.

DENISE MICHEL:

Yeah, that makes sense. Other comments?

So do people feel comfortable with this conversation and kind of the direction that we've outlined? Is there a feeling that we need more official documented guidelines? How are people feeling about outreach at this point? James.

JAMES GANNON:

So one concern that I've had, and this may be just me, I don't want any group to feel special. So particularly if we're potentially doing a V2 of our terms of reference, I would almost like to swap our list with some guidelines instead and then that gives us the flexibility to, within the subgroup, say, "Okay, well, here's how we are going to approach outreach" rather than say,

---

“Well, here’s who our people are,” and then if we go outside of that, then it’s like we’re outside of our terms of reference and it gets a bit more messy because we’ve identified internal and external groups here that we’ve kind of went, “These are out outreach people,” you know?

DENISE MICHEL:

Yeah. Thank you, James. And if I may just respond before Don raises his point, that we don’t have a list. This list was kind of just an initial brainstorming list for particularly people who are newer to the ICANN arena and wanted to know who were some of the players or groups that touched SSR. We chose not to put a specific list of entities for outreach in our terms of reference, just noted as appropriate and necessary for the conduct of the SSR we would conduct outreach with, you know, relevant groups.

But your point is well taken that we should be specific and targeted with our information requests and contacts with other groups, coordinated well with the subtopics and be mindful of treating all of the external groups equally in a neutral fashion and making sure we keep things in the context of input, but the Review Team ultimately has to make their own decisions about the recommendations. Don?

---

DON BLUMENTHAL: Normally, I wouldn't put a stress on announcing exactly who we want to talk to. I think, I don't agree with all of the Board's comments, but if in the interest of politics, if we question whether we should or should not disclose information, I would do it. Just [said] politically.

DENISE MICHEL: In terms of who we're asking questions of, who we've sent e-mails to encouraging comments, or sort of documenting all the different ways we've shared information and encouraged input – is that what you're saying?

DON BLUMENTHAL: At the very least, I would suggest that we announce the types of groups we're talking about and while I'm not necessarily comfortable about being specific if only because if somebody said something about hurt feelings or something like that.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you. Other comments or contributions on this point?

Okay. Great. Thank you for that.

This takes us to reviewing our action items. Staff, could you please pull up the staff and team action items that we need to review? And while they're doing that, if there's anything that...

---

We noted that we're going to add the Board letter to our agenda for tomorrow. If there's any other issues people have about tomorrow's agenda, please take a look at it and we'll address that right after we talk about action items. If we wanted to look on our own screens, where is this located? Can you use your microphone?

JENNIFER BRYCE: So this is on the wiki, the SSR2 wiki. There's a tab, "Plenary Action Items".

DENISE MICHEL: I'm sorry. What's the tab called?

JENNIFER BRYCE: It's called "Plenary Action Items".

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. I'll just start down this list, and as they noted, it's under the wiki Plenary Action Items tab. So we still need rapporteurs for the rest of the groups, so that's something we're going to get done by tomorrow, close of business.

We'll, we need to address updating our call schedule, so that's an item that's still outstanding.

---

In our last conference call, we reviewed the list of participants in the three call times that we have scheduled and there's a proposal on the table to drop one of the rotations and just have two separate time schedules for calls, so we want to see if we can get closure on that, if not tomorrow, then in the next week, we can follow that up on the list.

We have the January Doodle poll. As a reminder, that closes tomorrow at the end of the meeting, so if you have not gone on Doodle and added your availability for the various options for a January face-to-face meeting, you'll need to make sure you do that by the time our meeting's done tomorrow so everyone can plan well ahead on their schedules.

We posted the latest progress update, right? It's on our wiki or it will be.

Microphone.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Sorry. On the action items list, it's actually embedded there where it says "June Progress Update".

DENISE MICHEL: So staff has sent it out to the various ICANN groups as an informational item and it'll be posted on our wiki. So we have

---

staff. Staff has captured discussion around outreach and we've just had that discussion. Okay.

ICANN DNS Engineering Team to reframe the following question. So that's an open action item. Emily has contacted staff. I think staff is working on a response, right? Steve.

STEVE CONTE:

So yeah, my understanding from DNS Engineering is they are working on a response and Emily had flagged discussion for the larger topic of the clarity or reframing of questions, how the Review team and how staff should interact with that. So as two separate items, I'm awaiting an answer from DNS Engineering and I think, I got the impression that Emily wanted to have a discussion about the process itself.

DENISE MICHEL:

Yes. There's two issues here. One is the response and information gathering on that server-related question that Geoff asked, and then aside from the substance relating to the root servers, there's more of a process question of staff seeming to unilaterally decide that something is out of scope that's requested by the Review team.

So after we get a response to Emily's e-mail inquiry from staff, then we can put that on our team list to discuss. James.

---

JAMES GANNON: Thanks. Just it might be an idea that, not necessarily just for you, Steve, but for other members of staff when they're reaching out, if there are, for example, concerns about confidentiality or whether information should be public or not, that is an ongoing process at the moment about what processes should exist to release documentation to the review teams. That's something that, for example, ICANN Legal are working on at the moment, so I have to say I do agree with Emily on this, that there really shouldn't be any cases that we receive a "no".

I do agree that there will be cases where it'll be, it needs to be in this form or it needs to be under this NDA or it needs to be after this conversation, [inaudible] at the end of the day, there should be very few situations, maybe one or two where there is an absolute no.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks, James. So we'll pick that item up again after we get a response from staff.

Requests for follow-up questions to the Global Stakeholder Engagement staff that were on our call. They did provide their follow-up reply. I believe they responded to all of the questions. Is that correct? Okay.

---

Okay, share thoughts and continue discussion on list regarding presentation of ICANN Security and SSR1 subtopic work plans. We're doing that. Share thoughts on the list on how to be more important to observer inputs. Is there any additional input on observers or the way we're processing observer inputs? That's always an open, ongoing invitation.

Next one is Review Team members continue to volunteer for subtopics. More volunteers, particularly, are needed for group one. So again, really by tomorrow, we want to have solidified the membership of the subtopic groups and get the rapporteurs identified.

Draft work plan proposal for the SSR1 Review and ICANN Security topics. That's building on the work, initial work, of Boban and Žarko. Go ahead, Jennifer.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Hi, so some of these are actually marked as complete and I don't know if you can see, if you can scroll over to the side, and that way, yeah. So can you make it –

DENISE MICHEL:

If you do full screen, you can see that, which I hadn't done initially but now I can see the status. I can see the ones that are done. Okay.



---

Consolidating duplicative items, working on the subtopics which we're doing now and finishing tomorrow, drafting our work plan which is our key deliverable for our meetings here in Johannesburg.

Share thoughts regarding outreach engagement. We've just done that and we'll reflect those on the Google Doc and continue our conversation there.

The next few items are shown as completed. Then we have draft note and summary of SSR1 implementation for ICANN to send to the SSR team members. Invite them to share their assessment. Okay.

So as part of the SSR1 subtopic team, we'll be starting our work on assessing the implementation and its effectiveness, and as part of that, we'll be following up as needed with staff. We've already covered SSR1 outstanding briefings very thoroughly, I think, and that need to wrap those up. The rest are completed.

We've got reviewing the nondisclosure form with ICANN Legal and reporting back to the Review Team on any updates or edits to the circulated form. James.

JAMES GANNON:

Thanks. So just for an update for everybody, so myself and Kerry-Ann met with a number of members of the ICANN Legal

---

team, Sam Eisner, Dan Halloran, [Lena] I think as well was there. We had a very, very good conversation over, well, my concerns over the NDA and Confidential Disclosure Framework and we came to a pretty good medium ground on how we can approach this.

Sam has gone back, obviously, with her supporting CCWG this week. It's going to take her a day or two after Johannesburg to flesh it out, but there's going to be some changes to the Confidential Disclosure Framework and there is also going to be a process and kind of a review piece for us as we start putting requests in if we encounter issues for, and it will be in the formal approved Confidential Disclosure Framework that we can ask for it to be reviewed and updated based on our experiences as we go through the Review Team so that it becomes not quite a living document, but if we encounter issues, it can be updated to meet our needs.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thanks, and so it's going to take Sam this week. So should we put this as an item on our next conference call after Johannesburg to close it out? Okay. So if you could put the, instead of a TBD, put the deliverable for whatever the next conference call date is for that one.

---

Collaborative tools is next and you're going to be talking about that tomorrow. Great. So we'll have, I think, perhaps some more specific deliverable on the staff side after that presentation tomorrow.

The next open item is Statement of Work for a Technical Writer. Louisa has a delivery date for providing us some draft text, correct? If you could get that delivery date from her and put that in there instead of TBD. Wherever we have "to be determined", we'd like to have specific dates.

So for everyone's edification, there's been quite a delay but staff is finally committed to getting us some draft language to review for the Technical Writer Statement of Work. James and Cathy and I had volunteered to work together to provide a draft Statement of Work to the full team for their review and then getting it out, we had hoped to have it done quite before now, but I think that is finally on track and hoping that we can wrap that up soon.

Provide the SSR2 a timeline for the ITHI. That's the Technology Health Index project. Steve.

STEVE CONTE:

Thank you. I think I brought this up on the last call when we were reviewing action items, and if I did, I apologize. I received

---

some input from Alain Duran from the OCTO team, and a couple of e-mails responding to this, so it's my action item to consolidate those e-mails and prepare a response for the Review Team. So I can have that by the end of this week, so by the next call we do, it will be already submitted to the Review Team.

DENISE MICHEL: So this is the specific timeline and schedule for ITI?

STEVE CONTE: This is a response to the timeline. I have to look at the e-mails again. I don't think they have a specific timeline yet, but it's responding to the formation of it. Let me get that together before I give you any kind of better response.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, and so we can put the next conference call as the date instead of TBD on that.

The rest of the items on the list are marked as complete. Is there any additional items people would like to put on the action items list? We've got follow-up questions for staff relating to the SSR1 presentations we have today, so that's on the list specifically. Anything else from today's meeting? Nope. Alain?

---

ALAIN AINA: I think we still have open, if I'm not mistaken, we [have] discussion on the nondisclosure [agreement].

DENISE MICHEL: Right. The NDA or the Nondisclosure Agreement, James and Karen, Emily, someone else has been working with ICANN staff to get clarity on that, and so it will be on Kerry-Ann was helping with that. So it'll be on the next conference, the first conference call we have after Johannesburg, that will be on the schedule. So we'll have the updated NDA, we'll have guidance around whether and when it needs to be signed, what the implications are, and in general, how the Review Team is going to handle nonpublic or sensitive information. Yeah. Any other questions or issues? Action items, that is. Don?

DON BLUMENTHAL: Just jumping back to the Doodle poll, the e-mail said it's due the 26<sup>th</sup> and to be honest, I'm not going to know if I can go out and play that weekend until I talk to my wife.

DENISE MICHEL: Well, that's an important exception. So we'll leave it open a little while longer and wait to hear from you, Don. Anything else? Okay.

---

Then the remaining item we have on our agenda – it would be so awesome if we could end a little bit early – is just to review our agenda for tomorrow. Again, we’ve got continuing our subtopic work groups, adding specific tasks, more information, developing work plans and timelines in much more specific detail, flagging any information gathering, community discussions, research that needs to be done, any information we need from staff to move that forward, so all of that will be done tomorrow and then we’re going to pull that into the sort of scope of work, and work plan, and a more robust timeline for the team as a whole.

And so, it’s basically one big work session tomorrow with the exception of, and I’ll note this in the agenda that we update and send around, we’ll be discussing the Board’s letter tomorrow as well. That’s the only addition to tomorrow’s agenda. Any other suggestions or things they want added to tomorrow’s agenda? Nope. Okay.

That brings us to the end of our agenda for today. Are there any other items people would like to raise? Don?

DON BLUMENTHAL: Pure logistics. Wondering if anybody else is staying at the Garden Court so we can coordinate getting over to the dinner

---

tonight? Or maybe I should ask how are we supposed to get to the dinner tonight?

DENISE MICHEL: Great. I was just about to turn it over to staff to remind everyone when and where dinner is and other logistics. Yvette?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Hi, everyone. Okay, for tonight, dinner is at 7:30 P.M. It's at the Michelangelo Towers, which is directly across the street here. I will go ahead and butcher the name of that restaurant. I think it's Paviglione. This is where Pamela is much better at this than I am.

Basically, it's on the, you can get to it from here. You don't even have to go outside. I know Garden Court, you may end up having to go outside, but if you're still in the building at that point, if you go to the third floor on the same end of the building that we are here, there's a sky bridge that goes directly across the street. You go across the street on that sky bridge. The restaurant's right there on your left-hand side, first thing when you walk in the door on the towers. You can't miss it.

So that should be about it. That's the easiest way to get there. I know some of you may not be staying here, but the easiest way

---

to get there is to take that third floor sky bridge across the street, which is Mod Street right out here.

DENISE MICHEL: Steve.

STEVE CONTE: And we are meeting over there, not at the restaurant, but at the Michelangelo Towers, tomorrow. Is that, so the directions are the same – you go across the sky bridge – because I’m going to get lost. I’m good at that.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, and thank you so much for raising that. Yes, can you give us explicit instructions on how to get, and remind us where the meeting is tomorrow? Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The meeting tomorrow is just past the restaurant, so if you make it to the restaurant, you’re almost to the meeting room. And they will have signs in the hotel directing you to the meeting room. So it’s down the hall from the restaurant.



---

DENISE MICHEL: Could you specifically tell us, in case someone misses the dinner, how to get to the meeting tomorrow? And it starts at 9, by the way.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It starts at 9. Same instructions.

DENISE MICHEL: Where is it located first?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: In the Michelangelo Hotel. If you're connected to the walkways to the convention center, on the third floor, there is a sky bridge that goes directly to the Michelangelo Hotel. You'll end up in the lobby and there will be signs there that will, in essence, you walk past the restaurant, down the hallway, and that's where the meeting room is.

Now we have checked and there are spaces, public spaces, to break out into, little sofa areas that if you wanted to break out in working sessions, groups could meet that way.

DENISE MICHEL: Room number or name?

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I don't have that.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Let me spell it for you because if I try to pronounce it, that will just be comical. So let me go ahead and try to spell it for you. The room is spelled IL PAVIGLIONE. My guess would be IL [Pagnoli].

The idea, the way we found it is we went across the same sky bridge and you're going to see the restaurant on your left. You keep going. So in other words, you make your first right and then you make two lefts after that, and keep going straight and you'll eventually run right into the reception area and then you'll see the room.

I will be out there tomorrow. Pamela will be out there tomorrow. There will be people out there to get you where you're going, so you won't be walking in the lobby going, "What in the blue blazes is going on?" We will be there to get you to the room.

But in case you're one who wants to GPS it yourself, you can go across the sky bridge and it's one right and two lefts. This is, honest to God, how the reception area told us to find the room. Swear to God. True story. And we actually did. We did. It looks like a mall area. You swear you're walking into the mall.

---

So you go down there, you walk, and to the right, and I'm like, "Two lefts?" They weren't kidding. There it was. So you can go ahead and do that, but we will also be out there to get you where you're going. We won't leave you lost. I promise you.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you so much. There you have it, folks. Start early to find the room. We're starting at 9 a.m. tomorrow. And if there's no other business, thank you so much for all.

There is other business. Alain.

ALAIN AINA: Just to inform the group that tomorrow, I'm going to be on the DNSSEC panel tomorrow around 9:50, so I may be late, so.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Alain. All right, we're adjourning. Thank you so much for all your hard work today. I think we made a lot of important progress and I look forward to bringing this all home tomorrow. See you all at dinner.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**