

---

ABU DHABI – Joint Meeting: ASO and SSR2 Review Team  
Sunday, October 29, 2017 – 15:30 to 16:45 GST  
ICANN60 | Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is the ICANN60 Joint Meeting ASO and SSR2 Review Team meeting on 29 October 2017, from 3:30 to 4:45 in Capitol Suite 7.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hi, everyone. I don't see a Chair or Vice Chair of the Address Council or of the ASO. So I think in the absence, I'll probably turn it over to the Review Team. Who is speaking on behalf of the Review Team?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That would be me.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay, Eric, great. So, Eric, I'll hand it over to you. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, okay, thank you. My name is Eric Osterweil. I'm one of the two co-Chairs of the SSR2 Review Team. I think we have a lot of time today, and most of it will not be taken up by the

---

*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.*

---

presentation I suspect. So looking forward to any comments or questions from you all.

But if those of us on the Review Team could just raise your hand and identify yourselves. I'll spare the effort of going through and introducing. A few team people mostly sitting at the table up here. Okay, thanks. All right, so next slide, please.

I want to give just a general overview of both where are heads started at, where we've gotten to, and where we're hoping to get to from here. Our starting point for what we consider part of the SSR review stems from ICANN itself and the broad swath of things that it covers and the fact that observations that security, stability, and resiliency really underlies pretty much everything that happens within ICANN.

Our understanding of our objective is to basically assess how we are doing. To that end, there's a mandate to have SSR reviews every five years. We're the second – in other words, there has been one before us – of several mandated community-led reviews. Next slide, please. Thank you.

We're mandated by several parts of the Bylaws. What we've done here in this slide is summarized them, so this is not the exact wording, though the chapter and verse is referenced over there on the right, 4.6(c).

---

Basically, we've derived our scope from the understanding that basically we're to assess the extent to which ICANN has successfully implemented the security, stability, and resiliency efforts in regards to the unique identifier system that is under ICANN's purview, the effectiveness of these to address challenges and threats, the extent to which the remediations extend toward the future, and the extent to which as the second Review Team the first Review Team's recommendations have been effectuated. Next slide, please.

Needless to say, there's a lot in there. There's a huge amount to consider for a category as broad as security, stability, and resiliency. So we've necessarily been faced with reviewing a lot of documents, a lot of procedures, a lot of everything. It has been really good that on the Review Team we have a very diverse set of skills from a lot of people from a lot of backgrounds representing a lot of different constituencies.

In facing this rather large chunk of work we had to do, our primary objectives have been [conscientious]. We've gone very slowly and carefully through the things that face us, and our intent is to produce recommendations that are as useful and implementable as possible. So when you factor all that together, it was pretty clear immediately and it has been ever since that this is not necessarily going to be a fast process. It has taken

---

some time, but none of that has surprised us. Next slide, please.  
Thank you.

Here's a list, an I-chart, that I'm not going to read of all the members of our team, the affiliations that nominated them and the regions they represent. I'll note at the bottom, we've had two people on the team that have had to step down and that's for various reasons. But they're listed here for completeness. Next slide, please.

As we began to dissect the task before us and how we were going to structure our work, we decided to break things down into five categories that we created as sub items of our work.

The first was to assess the 28 recommendations that SSR1 gave back at the end of its review process and how they've been implemented to date.

The second one is more of an inward-facing objective of SSR to look at ICANN itself and see how its SSR posture is structured, how it is functioning. Is there anything that it needs or doesn't need, etc.?

The third one is the outward-facing component of that, more focused on the unique identifier system itself like DNS to ask what are the SSR aspects of that outward-facing component

---

underneath ICANN's purview? How can we analyze that and determine SSR gaps that need to be filled?

The fourth one reads a little bit prosaic, but in regards to future concerns, our objective with that was not to be pie-in-the-sky about things. It was more to say these reviews are mandated to happen every five years, so the last one finished in 2012. That was before, for example, the new gTLDs rolled out. So clearly, there are things that happened between these Review Teams, and it's not really the Review Team's job to have a crystal ball. Nevertheless, we wanted to be cognizant of the fact that there will be things that develop, and the extent to which we can have a perspective on the evolving landscape in our recommendations without leading by too much is the extent to which our report maybe carries a little more impact down the road. So as opposed to being a retrospective of what's SSR today and yesterday, what's SSR in this general timeframe?

Then finally, the last sub item was considering the IANA transition and if there were any SSR issues that we thought needed to be examined there around that topical event. Next slide.

By the way, this is fully meant to be a conversational presentation, so I'll be polling periodically if anybody has anything to say with my eyes. So if you have something to say,

---

just raise your hand or let me know. I'm happy to stop and pause or back up.

This slide is a general timeline of where we were, where we are, and where we'd like to be. We met for our first face-to-face in March at ICANN. In May 2017, we delivered our Terms of Reference to the Board. Then between May and September, we've been getting a lot of briefings. We've been analyzing a lot of data. We've been reviewing a lot of documents. Basically, a lot of the groundwork and the heavy lifting has happened in there.

At this point, we're in the stage of formulating our findings. It's necessarily a bit of an iterative process, so we'll get to a point where we'll need to back up and review more things or we'll rediscover something or we'll review other things that we think we've already closed. But nonetheless, we're mostly at the point of beginning to formulate our findings.

Our intent, we have a drafting session on the calendar for mid-January where we intend to do the drafting of our report, at which point we'll release it for public comment. Subsequent to that, we'll send an iterated version to the Board and nominally after that, Board action.

Any comment or questions? No. Next slide.

---

Here are some of the key milestones that we've got to today. I'm going to do a little bit of slide reading, so apologies for that. In March, we began gathering information for the SSR review. We started our outreach to various teams. We had at that time three co-Chairs. It was Denise Michel, Emily Taylor, and myself. Unfortunately, Emily Taylor had to step down due to a conflict of interest.

Then in May, we were continuing with our briefings. We did some due diligence, outreach gathering trips, and we formed the five subtopics into actual sub teams so that people with interests and expertise could focus up on the things that they found most relevant then we could dovetail those back into the main Plenary.

In September, we issued an RFP for a consultant to come in and do an SSR1 gap analysis, an analysis of the gap between implementation of recommendations.

Then we find ourselves here at ICANN 60. Next slide. What are we doing here this week? This is our intention for the week. We're here to meet with the community, with you all. We showed up a day early, Friday, and we had a full-team plenary meeting face-to-face and we actually got a lot of really good work done. And we're actually going to stick around, so on this coming Friday we're going to meet again. Our intention is basically to have this

---

entire week full of conversations and at the end of it at our Friday meeting to factor those conversations and what we've learned and heard into our ongoing thinking and work product. Next slide, please.

Now it's your turn. This has been a million mile an hour view of what we've been up to, what we're thinking, and where our heads are at. What we want to do is have as much outreach here as we can. What we would really like to do is hear from you all. That's what we're saying to everyone we're meeting with this week.

I think what we felt is we'd like to structure a simple question to you, not to constrain anything you have to say, but to get the juices flowing. We would really like right now if you're up to it here: if you had to pick one thing from your perspective that you think the SSR Team should include in what we do, what we consider, what we review, what would that be? I say one thing, but whatever you guys want. But if literally you had to sit down and think, "Well, this," we'd love to hear it. Next slide.

I'm going to stop there, but this slide – you guys have this deck. It's available to you. There are a number of slides after it that we could go over in detail all the things that we've done, but there's a lot more detail in there if you want to take a look at it. But certainly, there's also an outreach slide in there whereby we give



---

a lot of coordinates for how you can reach us. We have an e-mail list. Everything that we do is public. We have recordings. Every e-mail conversation is publicly archived. So we're very much interested in hearing feedback now or in the future at any point.

With that, I'd like to hear if you guys have any comments, questions, suggestions – anything at all.

ALAN BARRETT:

Hi. I don't think the RIRs have any kind of a consolidated position on this, so this will be my personal opinion. You asked me to pick one thing. I think DNS root zone keys are important, and we should figure out how to rotate them without having to have another undefined delay.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Great, thank you. KSK roll. Yeah, that's the exact kind of stuff we love to hear from people on.

DOUGLAS ONYANGO:

Hello. My question is related to the mandate and the process that the team has. I wanted to ask if we are going to do reviews every five years but from the timeline you just proscribed the review itself is thinking two years, so my question is around your

---

thoughts on this timeline: two years to review every five years.  
Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: Hi. My understanding is that the schedule of these reviews is set by the ICANN Board. Actually, it's in the Bylaws, isn't it? Yeah, every five years. So I wasn't quite clear on your question about two years.

DOUGLAS ONYANGO: It was the schedule, the timeline. Can we go back to the slide?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think the comment was that our timeline covered a two-year stretch, so when does the clock start for the next five-year rotation?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, I think ICANN staff can answer that.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you. Yes, the scheduling is hardcoded into the Bylaws, and there is no ability to change that. The triggering event that gets the clock ticking for the next five years is actually the date that the Review Team is convened. So it's five years from the

---

date the Review Team is convened. So as you can see, it perpetuates every five years from that point, unless there is some interest in the community to change that through change of the Bylaws. Thank you.

KEVIN BLUMBERG:

I'm on the ASO AC, I own my own Internet company in Canada, do various outreach, I'm the president of Internet Exchange, and I don't know how to answer your question. I'm being completely honest. What Alan brought up was a very valid one, but even as an operator I don't know what the scope necessarily of the types of things that you are concerned about reviewing to be able to give you an answer. I think I'm fairly well versed as an operator, but if you could expand on the types of things you're looking for in terms of overall without specifying one, that might help because I don't know how to answer you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Sure. I can certainly tell you what I think, but I'm not going to step on anyone on the Review Team if they want to jump on this. I think we wrestled with this a lot. We issued our Terms of Reference to the Board in May, and in the Terms of Reference we define the scope. We debated it a lot, as we should. What we basically were cycling around was we ultimately are planning to produce recommendations to the ICANN Board to implement.

---

So whatever we do, it needs to be something that ICANN can do something about.

But what we identified was that a lot of SSR issues are systemic in nature whereby something that affects something that affects something that affects something can be potentially an SSR issue that stems all the way back to that root cause. So whereas, you may make a change in one place that seems innocuous, it can have a cascading butterfly effect elsewhere whereby, once you know that, you can say, “Oh, I don’t want to do that.”

So that’s very prosaic and whatever, but what I’m getting at is we defined our scope to say we will consider issues very broadly, but we will only recommendation things very narrowly that could be effectuated by ICANN. In other words, we don’t want to produce a recommendation to say, “Go and do something you can’t do.”

It wasn’t easy to negotiate amongst the team something that we were all basically on the same page about. So to answer your question, the easiest thing to do is to say in our Terms of Reference which is public we have our scope defined. But I don’t want to just pitch that at you right now.

So the things that consider, like KSK roll, ICANN has a role in things that happen with the KSK. We could certainly wind up recommending something outside of ICANN’s purview, which we

---

wouldn't want to do. But things like that fall within the bucket. If you imagine the sorts of things that are addressed at an ICANN meeting, nominally those would be above board for us to at least start talking about. I don't know if that makes sense.

GEOFF HUSTON:

Let me far more specific, Kevin. The registries operated by the PTI with respect to addresses are not what is. They're what was. We gave this to that RIR, we gave this to that RIR. If you actually look inside the RIR's registries, it's different because they're what is.

How are folk who are trying to do attribution, and there are a lot in terms of tracking down abuse or whatever, meant to understand the difference between those two registries? How is that explained? Is this a security issue where literally following the snail trail misleads you from time when you're jumping across registries because they are different.

So that seems to me to be one of those more specific things which you can say, "Well, it's an issue. I'm not sure whether it's an issue that affects this Review Team or not." But it's up there in those kinds of things that are in our environment across what ICANN does in PTI and across what the RIRs don't quite mesh. And whether we should talk about it or not is honestly up to you folk at the ASO. If you think we should make a comment, tell us

---

about it. I feel a bit stupid prompting you, but that was trying to cloak your question in specifics.

KEVIN BLUMBERG: I appreciate that, Geoff. You've actually brought up an interesting one because – and I'm going to speak for myself – WhoWas does exist in one region. You can get that data. What it actually brings up is a consistency issue. If you're not providing consistently the same data or a means of gathering the same data – and I know there has been a lot of work over the years to have standardized formatting – that is an issue. That is a stability issue because you don't know how to get the data or where to get it in the same format. So there you go.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Great, thank you. Is there anybody in the chatroom that has a comment. Just polling. No? Okay. Anybody else? This has been already very helpful, so this is exactly the kind of thing that both we were hoping to hear and also I want to make sure that if there are any other comments or questions, that you feel free to let you know. I'm warning you guys, in the last session we gave everybody a lot of time back.

ALAIN AINA: Yes, Eric?

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL:                    Yeah, Alain.

ALAIN AINA:                        Okay, I think because here we are talking to the ASO, I think it may be good that we are here because ASO and RIR deal most of the time with the IANA functions. So the ASO to tell us in terms of security, stability, and resiliency what we should be looking for and to which extent. I think we should be looking at the IANA services to them, so I think this kind of engagement can be helpful for us.

ALAN BARRETT:                    Okay, let me try to say something about what I think the RIRs look for from ICANN. I think there are two relationships that the RIRs have with ICANN. One is the IANA function and one is our role as the ASO which lets us do things like appoint ICANN Board members and ICANN ratifies policy.

I think that the SSR side of it maybe should only focus on the IANA function because the other bits don't seem to me to have very interesting security issues. You could probably invent some and make a case for it, but I don't think they're that obvious.

---

For the IANA function, everything is already published. The IANA operator now PTI publishes what they allocate to the RIRs. As someone alluded to earlier, maybe it was Geoff, we could certainly do a better job of helping people follow the trail of IANA allocated to RIR 1 and then it got transferred to RIR 2 and it's then been assigned to ISP A who sub assigned it to Customer 7. All that information is there, but it's not always easy to follow the steps in that trail. I'm sure we could do better, and maybe that's within the scope of this SSR Team.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, thank you.

[DOUGLAS ONYANGO]: Can I again? So I think the [inaudible] also has a role in doing a review of the IANA functions. I think this is every five years or something? No?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's every two years.

[DOUGLAS ONYANGO]: Every two years, okay. So how do you see this review fit in this SSR review?



---

ALAN BARRETT:

I think it's quite independent. The RIRs have what we call an SLA, basically a contract with ICANN for performing the IANA functions. ICANN has subcontracted that to PTI, and there is provision in that contract for it to be renewed or re-evaluated every few years. I think it might be every five years, but maybe it's three. I'm not certain.

We also get monthly reports from PTI about how they're performing. There are very few requests. The RIRs, between the five of them, make maybe four or five requests every year. So there's not a lot of work and it tends to be done pretty efficiently. But if you want to look at that efficiency or accuracy as being within the scope of the SSR Team, I suppose it might make sense to at least look at it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Thanks. One of the things that we did consider looking at [and] we have a sub team spun up for – unfortunately, our rapporteur couldn't make it to this ICANN – is the IANA transition and PTI. I certainly don't think we want to look any more broadly than we feel like we have to, but we've [started] looking at the processes ensuring that the processes are cogent and that they're public and everything that they're espoused to be. So, yeah, if it turns out that we're not looking at them in the right and that you have

---

opinions about that, then we'd certainly be all yours. But, yeah, we've identified that was our Topic #5.

Any other questions or comments? Okay, well, maybe – I don't remember which of our backup deck has the outreach coordinates on it, which of the slides in there does. Yeah, there we go, so feel free. I believe that you all will have access to this deck and so thereby access to these coordinates. If you'd like to hit us up, we're definitely all ears. Thanks for your time today.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**