SSR2 Community Input | ICANN60

Saturday 28 October

15:15 - 15:45 | At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) | Hall A, Sec B. | http://sched.co/CbJ0 | Multimedia Session Recording

- Interest in hearing from ALAC members on SSR2
- Is this what you think this would be when you applied?
- Are you trying to look to what extent the system that support the DNS structure have been penetrated? Are we in good shape or is there evidence that work is needed?
- Is testing the RDS in your scope? Could it have consequences on users? Can the information provided through RDS entail security related issues?
- With respect to the Impact of IANA stewardship transition on SSR - what is the goal of this topic
- How the KSK rollover impacting the review and what SSAC or RSSAC is doing about it?
- Why issue a request for proposals to conduct gap analysis?
- Is this setting a precedent?

17:30 - 18:00 | Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) | Capital Suite 05 | http://sched.co/CbF | Multimedia Session Recording

- What is the scope of this review?
- What is the timeline of this review?
- How independent are you from the influence of the ICANN Board
- Given what has happened recently - do you have the resources, the skillsets, what you need?
- Do you look at whether recommendations are obsolete? Is it just a checkbox?

Sunday 29 October

10:30 - 11:15 ALAC and Regional Leaders Working Session Part 7: ALAC Discussion with SSAC Representative | http://sched.co/CbJ3 | Multimedia Session Recording

11:30 - 12:00 | Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) | Hall B, Sec. B/C | http://sched.co/CbId Multimedia Session Recording

- What's your take on what's going on? What are the next steps?
- Concerned by the Board action. Could be a similar issue with RDS: Suggestion of limited scope. Perception by some that our scope has broadened so I'm worried this is an independent RT being instructed by the Board. I don't think the GNSO should tolerate this.
- Nobody knows what's going on and why. Seems 'behind the curtain'.
- SSR of DNS is ICANN's primary job. Re board letter and potential interference with RDS and GNSO working groups. It's not clear if it's an order or strong request.
- Both letters are vague. Concerned this creates paranoia. No constructive feedback. Details would make conversations more fruitful.

13:30 – 15:00 | SSR2 Review Team Community Engagement Session| Capital Suite 14 | http://sched.co/CbGX | Multimedia Session Recording

- What is purpose of gap analysis?
- Is the contractor going to interview SSAC?
- ICANN is going to finalize the operating/strategic plans and process will start shortly. How will you ensure alignment?

- Look at KSK rollover - it is important
- What are your thoughts on the review's timeline
- Who was/does exist in a region - you can get that data but consistency is a real issue. Standardized formatting is a real issue.
- Two relationships with ICANN - 1) IANA function - 2) Role as ASO. The SSR should focus on IANA functions as other bits don't seem to have interesting security issues. For IANA functions, everything is already published. We could do a better job of helping people following the trail IANA allocated to, transferred to etc.
- Contract with RIRs needs to be reavaluated every 5 years - we get monthly reports from PTI. IF you want to look at that efficiency or accuracy it would make sense.

Tuesday 31 October
- What is the background to the Board letter and next steps?
- It's something that should go to the community. There seems to be alot of emphasis on inaccurate WHOIS information/registrar compliance...things I'd expect to be part of the WHOIS review team. I have some concerns of going into those areas because I don't know why we'd look at that from an SSR standpoint. I think more of infrastructure within ICANN/IANA. DNS Abuse I can make a case for being under SSR. I don't believe that WHOIS abuse is equivalent for DNS abuse. There was a data request that focused on WHOIS inaccuracies and all the data behind that. Maybe because that letter focused alot on it I thought it was a big emphasis.
- Board letter notes in correspondence that it has scope concerns. I want to note that the scope is outlined in the Bylaws. I don't think the team is colouring outside the lines. I'd like more context around the suggestion that SSR2 is outside its scope.
- We as the community have new responsibilities after IANA transition. SO/ACs are responsible for appointing nominees to the RT.
- Why did you ask for information on all information security of ICANN org. that was not related to iana functions.

-
- Bylaws requires you to look at implementation of WHOIS recs. Bylaws also identify items you may look at. Thanks for volunteering. Up to the community to press play button
- You are not sharing the timeframe. We need to understand how you are planning to do the work. How long are you giving yourselves? When in 2018 would you issue your report?
- Did Board react to ToR? How can we help solve the problem?
- What are the steps that we might do to show that we support the work of the SSR2
- There is history to this problem. Should we try having a discussion with those who have interfered?
- Communication is an important issue. Up to the Chairs to give direction on what SO/AC groups should say. Difficult for the community to get time to discuss.
- Why did you decide to put out an RFP for gap analysis? Was it a consensus decision? Was there pushback from staff/Board?

- What of the SSAC letter? What outreach and comms did you receive from SSAC? What concerns did they raise prior to letter?
- CCT anxious about its work/recs. Board attitude is a concern. Concern about lack of transparency with Board.

11:30 - 12:00 | Security & Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | Capital Suite 19 | http://sched.co/CbGx | Private meeting: No recording available

16:25 - 16:55 | Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG) | Capital Suite 07 | http://sched.co/CbG4 | Multimedia Session Recording
- Please tell us what you know about the suspension.
- How fast was the 'unilateral' move?
- Heard complaints from within the team that things weren't moving forward. Can you give us concrete concerns of the SSAC?
- I heard from team members that remit was inactively debated and sometimes suppressed by external parties.
- Email from Kaveh points out the issues from the Board's perspective.
- Do we have procedures when things appear to be going off the rails or there is a lack of conceptual clarity on what we're about. I can see having the same problems with RDS down the road. We had similar problems a couple of years ago on the issue of whether something is a PDP or and IRT.
- What are some of the weaknesses that your team had...and what are you willing to work on if you were to resume? What would be the ideal process for the Board to deal with this issue? What did you provide in your response to the October Board letter?
- We would be concerned about a not-functioning RT and also an arbitrary action from the Board to pull the rug out from under the RT.

Wednesday, 1 November
12:00 - 12:30 | ccNSO Council | Hall A, Sec. A | http://sched.co/CbJy | Multimedia Session Recording
- You submitted ToR to the Board - scope is part of the ToR. Is there a common position on the team with respect to the scope?
- If the Board has overstepped its remit, what do we do?
- Can community unpause or do they need to go back to the Board to request unpause?
- We need Operating Standards in place to make it easier for the RT. I believe that the scope must be set before a specific review team being formed. Would it help you if we had scope set before you come together?
- If SO/ACs agreed to set the scope, would that be helpful for the team? I'm hearing that you probably need more people.

13:30 - 13:45 | GNSO Council Discussion – SSR2 Review Team and RDS Review Team | Hall B Section B/C | http://sched.co/CbIm | Multimedia Session Recording
- SO/AC statement will be posted hopefully at the end of the week.
- Will there be a review of what's been done to date? Who will do the review?
- It's very important that we understand where the Board has got the information from so that it's clear there was no request from the GNSO to take this action.

Thursday 2 November

13:00 – 13:50 | SSR2 Review Team Meeting with Board Caucus Group| Hall A, Sec. B/C |
http://sched.co/CbKJ

- The resolution requests the team do deliver an approved ToR and work plan. Has the work plan been delivered?
- Is it the SSR2 Review Team's position that there is a completed work plan? All I have seen is an email on 14 August to team saying it was a draft. Feels to me this is not a complete work plan. The subgroup that put forward the ICANN SSR work - that would have formed a part of a completed work plan. The fact that this was still being proposed in October, that indicates that the work plan was still in progress.
- It would have been nice to receive a notice to let us know that the workplan was coming. In both of the letters the Board sent we raised the flag that the work plan was not submitted to the board.
- On the staff support, we are always happy to see what the issue is and what you would like to see in a way that is understandable.
- It's not clear to me what the overarching goal of this review is meant to be.

SSR2 Discussion with ICANN Board - 2 November - 14:00 GST / 10:00 UTC

- What will happen at Friday's meeting?
- Board is handing the matter to SO/ACs now.. If you accept that questions raised are real, whilst solving those is probably sensible. Eg. one of the issues is that there are not enough people on the team. It might be sensible to fix that issue for one thing before kicking off again.
- SDB: We increased capacity of RT to 21 people in the Bylaws. But this team didn't begin with 21 and now it's well under that contingent. Perhaps we consider that we get ICANN's assistance to ask for reinforcements. Then it's up to SO/AC chairs to round out the team. That will process will inject some additional help.
- We have provided SSR2 with a list of skills we think will be appropriate. We look forward to a matrix of members assessed against the skills and seperate matrix of outstanding tasks to assess whether there is a skills gap. It's an evidence-based step to start this process.
- A ready reserve of GNSO people. I heard that we may need to increase resources by about 40%. I welcome Jay's request also.
- Can we take it that there is agreement that you all need to get together to figure out next steps on this. So, what can we do to help?
- What input does the Board anticipate giving - what are your next steps after your next steps?
- We need to avoid start/stop.
- Staff support. We understand that they have been unable to get staff to take notes of telephone calls and record decisions. Should we be asking the Board to address the matter urgently.
- ICANN org has been asking for information - if there are things we can do better we will be happy to help. We will make sure we assign the resources needed. We are where we are. Often we do these things with an open spirit.
- Suggest tackle scope, then workplan, then resources.
- Resources are vital to the workplan and resources.
- We understand that the process by which progress is reported isn't reflected the way they wish it would be reflected.
- Are SO/AC leaders planning on collective monitoring or individual? How will you sync reporting.
- We end this meeting with the understanding that SO/AC leaders are going to go away and get together.