

ABU DHABI–Engagement Session with the Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency of the DNS Review Team
Sunday, October 29, 2017 – 13:30 to 15:00 GST
ICANN60 | Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Hey, everyone. This is Eric Osterweil, one of the co-Chairs. We're going to just give a couple more minutes for people to take the long walk to Suite 14. While we wait, anybody that wants to sit at the table instead of in the back is perfectly welcome to do so.

Okay, everyone. Again this is Eric Osterweil, one of the co-Chairs of the team. I think before we kick off and go through the presentation material, I think what I'll do is I'll surprise my fellow teammates by asking them to go around the table and to introduce themselves, and then we'll go from there. Why not start with Steve?

STEVE CONTE: Steve Conte. Support Staff for ICANN for the Review Team.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I'm Eric Osterweil from Verisign, one of the co-Chairs.

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.

Review Team

DENISE MICHELLE: I'm Denise Michelle with Facebook. I was appointed by the GNSO to the Review Team.

ŽARKO KECIĆ: Žarko Kecić from .RS and appointed from ccNSO.

BOBAN KRSIC: Boban Krsic from DENIC, appointed by the ccNSO.

GEOFF HUSTON: Geoff Houston, APNIC. I was appointed by SSAC.

ALAIN AINA: Alain Aina, WACREN, appointed by ccNSO.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Jennifer Bryce, ICANN support staff.

ALICE JANSEN: Alice Jansen, ICANN Org.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Negar Farzinnia, ICANN Org

Review Team

NOORUL AMEEN: Noorul Ameen, appointed by GAC and representing [third] India.

NORM RITCHIE: Norm Ritchie, appointed by the GNSO.

RAMKRISHNA PRIYAR: Hey, good afternoon, Ramkrishna Priyar representing from At-Large community.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: And one more person. Kaveh, we're just going around the table introducing ourselves, so if you wouldn't mind.

KAVEH RANJPBAR: Kaveh Ranjbar, [inaudible] delegate to the SSR2.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thank you very much. I think that's everyone. Do we have anyone in the chat room that wants to say anything?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Review Team member Mr. Matogoro is in the chat room. He says he's representing ALAC to the Review Team and he's going to be participating remotely today.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Great. Thank you very much, everyone. Again, Eric Osterweil, one of the co-Chairs, and today we're going to go through basically our status check and read up from where we are right now with the SSR2 Review Team and its work, and what our view currently looks like. Next slide, please.

So to start, let me frame where our perspective comes from. When we considered our remit as the SSR2 Review Team, we started by looking at what ICANN's overarching principles are and our perspective jointly is that security, stability and resiliency runs through the fabric of all of ICANN. Whichever part is doing whatever, there is a core component of SSR relating to that.

As a community, our job is to basically assess, in our opinion, how we're doing and to that end, that's why every five years there's a chartered SSR Review Team to come through and do that assessment from the community and that's mandated in a number of very explicit ways in the current set of Bylaws. Next slide, please.

So what we've done here is we've just digested a summarized version of what's in the Bylaws, just a few bullet points and then of course chapter and verses referenced in [46(c)]. And the

assessment that we are undergoing or undertaking now hinges on the extent to which ICANN is successfully implementing the security, stability, and resiliency in regards to the unique identifier space that it has purview over.

The effectiveness of the SSR efforts as they relate toward DNS and the extent to which the SSR addressment is able to be resilient forward-looking into the future, and in this case as the second SSR Review Team, also the extent to which the previous recommendations from the first SSR team were implementing. And again this is just kind of like a digest summary. You can see what the reference is if you'd like to go look at it yourself. Next slide, please.

But needless to say, this is a lot of work and there's a huge amount of ground to cover. As we begun by assessing what the scope of the team should or shouldn't be and where we should and shouldn't look, we were basically faced with quite a large bit of material that it was our job to review, and that was something that we have been able to do so far very well with the huge breadth of expertise that the team has brought to the table from our various backgrounds.

And it should go without saying our objective in doing this was to be very thorough. Our intent is for the report that we produce to be helpful and meaningful and implementable and that

necessarily has meant, and it's not any surprise on our team, that this takes a while, that it's not a quick operation, not to do it conscientiously. Next slide, please.

This is a list of our membership and you can see the various constituencies, the regions that we represent. We have also listed at the bottom two of our members that have had to step down from the team for various reasons, but you hopefully can get a sense for the fact that we broadly represent a global community from a lot of backgrounds. Next slide, please.

And so as we started to digest our work and approach it, we broke our focus down into five categories. The first one was very clearly to consider the 28 recommendations from the first SSR Team's report and to assess how well they've been implemented today.

The second sub area that we are investigating is in regards to how ICANN itself is operating SSR components for its portion of the Internet space. And then in relation to that but different, also the broader DNS SSR issues was our third sub area.

Fourth is it sounds a little prosaic but with the gist of the For Future section is mostly to make sure that as we produce a report, as we start to complete our work, our hope is that what we produce has relevance going forward so that it's less of a

retrospective as of today and yesterday these are the SSR issues and recommendations reproduced and has some aspect of as the world evolves at least until the next Review Team is chartered and underway, is there the opportunity for our work to also carry meaning during that period as well. And then finally the impact of the IANA transition has related potentially to SSR issues. Next slide, please.

This is a rough time and of both where we've gotten to now and where we forecast it we will be, generally speaking. You can see that we had our first face-to-face meeting at ICANN in March, then we worked very, very hard to produce our Terms of Reference and we delivered those to the Board in May.

And since then for the last several months we've been in a process of having briefings, collecting data, analyzing them, digesting them, and factoring them into the overall framework, the five areas that we identified and we're in the process now of formulating our findings and, you know, a certain amount of expected iteration as we formulize some findings, some more digging, etc.

Our intention is to begin the drafting of our report in early 2018 and subsequently deliver a final report and nominally at some point in the future Board action. Next slide, please.

Just a couple of points to underscore what those bubbles mean, some key milestones. We launched our team with three co-Chairs in March of 2017 and one of the two people that has stepped down from the team was sadly one of our co-Chairs, Emily Taylor.

We've been conducting – I don't know whether it's dozens – dozens of briefings and due diligence, gathering information. We've gone and done fact finding all across the five areas that we identified through May and we've actually issued an RFP for a gap analysis contractor to come through and to really put a fine point on the gap analysis of the SSR1 implementation status.

And we're here as our ongoing outreach as we've started to really get a hand on what we think we're up to and what we're facing to continue to have touch points with the community, get course corrections from people and then just perspectives that hopefully fit but certainly don't have to be from within our own team clearly. We have a drafting session on the books for our report in January 2018. Next slide, please?

So what are we doing here at ICANN60? We're here to meet with SOs and ACs, constituencies and everyone else so I'm glad that you all felt like coming to the room today and we'll be reaching out to various... we have been and we'll continue to reach out to other groups throughout the week. And we showed up early on

Friday to have, I think, a really productive session and we're sticking around all week and following up ICANN60 with another all-day face-to-face session for the subteam.

Through all this, we have structured conversations that we've put on the calendar, outreach sessions and we're all ears walking on the hallways as well and I think our primary goal here at ICANN60 is to hear from other people. Next slide, please.

I'll just skip right to the point. We're all ears on what other people's perspective on SSR is. I think the five sub categories that we've identified for our work allow us to ingest a lot of different perspectives. Certainly this isn't cast in stone but it seems to have worked pretty well so far.

Nevertheless, there is nothing that I think we've woven into any of our thinking or work that makes it difficult for us to take valid input and then do course corrections if necessary. We've used this deck a few times already this week and as we get to different groups, we ask them to give us at least—like if you could just boil down something you think we ought to be looking into into one category or one thing, you should add us and I think nominally if anybody in the room has any input, we're certainly interested in that.

I think we are fully prepared to give people back time if there's not a lot of input that you want to give to us but, nevertheless, I think we're all real proud of the work that we've done so far. I think we've actually made really substantive progress and the team's got a lot of energy so we're really excited. So by all means if you have questions, comments or input, we would love to hear from you.

And with that — and Steve has the mic so if someone has anything to say I think at this point we would love to hear from anybody that has anything to say.

ANUPAM AGRAWAL:

Hi, this is Anupam from ISOC Kolkata. Just a simple question on the reason of appointing a third party for gap analysis, I thought that that is what you guys are doing as part of SSRT2.

DENISE MICHELE:

Thank you for the question. Alain might want to address this as well, but as you've seen in the slides, we have a rather large set of topics to sort through. We did initial due diligence and review of all the recommendations. It took us over five months to get all the information together from ICANN on just initial information on the details of the implementation.

Given the breadth of work for this group of volunteers, it was decided that it would be useful to have a separate professional gap analysis done as an important additional data point. So the full team will be sitting down after we get that separate analysis and again going through not only the gap analysis results but all of the information and responses and data related to the 28 recommendations of SSR1.

So it's not a substitute by any means for the due diligence and research that the team has done and will continue to do. I view it as more of an additional neutral data point that will factor in. And Alain may want to expand on this.

ALAIN AINA:

Just to add to what we said that we as a team plan to continue analyzing the data, interacting, and work with the contractor. We made that decision to get an external to do the gap analysis. But it's not going to be just only the external contractor going to do it, it's going to be done in coordination with us.

DENISE MICHELE:

Feel free to come to the table and sit down. We don't stand on formalities here.

ANUPAM AGRAWAL: Okay. A simple follow-up, the new contractor, whoever is appointed, are they going to be interviewing the SSR Team or they're going to interact with you guys to understand? Sorry, the SSAC Team, are they going to interview or talk with them to see whether the implementations have been done or not or they're going to talk with the Review Team?

ALAIN AINA: They will talk to us and probably also talk to staff and to any other parties involved.

DENISE MICHELE: Were you referring to the selection of the applicant or when they do the work?

ANUPAM AGRAWAL: [When they do the work].

DENISE MICHELE: Sure, sure, yeah, we would expect the consultant doing the work to talk to the relevant entities that are involved in the implementation and impact of the 28 recommendations, which are quite wide-ranging. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thanks, everyone. Clearly our objective here is for this person to evaluate where things came from, how they're going, and what the current team feels like we need. Does that kind of answer your question? Awesome, cool. Any other comments or questions?

ALAIN AINA: Maybe say that the application time for this thing has been extended up to 7th of November so it's still open so if anyone here is interested in applying for this consultation, it's still open.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes, and I think those are perfectly fair questions so I'm glad that you asked it and I think that sort of underscores that we're a volunteer effort and we've done a number of things like, for example, a fact finding trip where we've also spent our personal time and hopped on a plane and gone and looked into stuff. And so it really is—at some point it's helpful to have some help with something that it may wind up being reasonably mechanical, maybe not. We'll see as we go forward with doing this gap analysis.

The other stuff we've just actually recently returned from a fact finding trip to ICANN's headquarters in Los Angeles where a

number of us basically showed up and interviewed and got a bunch of really interesting information back.

There's a number of things that we felt the team really needed to do ourselves even in our own time with our own personal expense, and some of the things where it felt like this might make sense. These are the sorts of things where we're happy to get full transparency because we're very curious if anyone has input, perspective, suggestions, etc.

Okay, anybody else have anything that [cares about] with SSR? Okay, well, I am willing to dance for a little bit but I'm also more than willing to return time to our calendars and to the local coffee houses.

I guess maybe what I'll do is I'll just take a look around and see if the description of our five sub categories, if people understood the breakdown that we have in mind as I described it, perhaps imperfectly, and if anybody has any perspectives over whether that makes sense or doesn't make sense.

So looking around to see is there anything in the chat room? No chat room, okay. So the five categories there, it's very well stated in our charter and our mandate to review SSR1 so that is something we can probably describe but maybe is self evident.

The ICANN component, the second one, was really about in its role of operating various parts of the identifier space, can we investigate whether there are any SSR issues that are worth issuing recommendations about or assurances barring any need for recommendation about how the identifier space management is effectuated by ICANN.

The third one was more prosaically if you consider the identifier space, if you consider the DNS, what are the aspects of it that within ICANN's purview have SSR components and are there any recommendations that we ought to make around that? So maybe subgroup 2 is inward facing, subgroup 2 is outward facing might be one way to describe it.

And the future challenges, I think in the past a number of people have asked us about that so certainly if anyone has any questions, we're more than happy to address that because it could be viewed as a very slippery slope but is one we felt was important to address because the Review Teams are expected to come along every five years and in five years lots can change.

For example, when the SSR1 Report was issued, the new gTLDs had not been launched yet so between SSR1 and SSR2, there is a fairly significant change in the landscape around what ICANN does. And so clearly we couldn't have anticipated that, we're not proposing to anticipate things like that but our hope is that our

report is issuing recommendations that at least have some utility before the next five-year mission shows up.

And then finally the IANA transition was something that we felt was significant enough that we wanted to again assure ourselves, do some investigation around whether there were any SSR issues that needed recommendations from us.

So we had a lot of back and forth about that as we did when we were sort of describing and coming to our Terms of References scope, but that doesn't mean that we're not open to input. So again I'll cast around if anybody—did that sort of do a perception [audit], but did that make sense to people those five categories is a reasonable start?

DENISE MICHELE: I really think you should sit at the table.

NOROOOL AMEEN My questions are very simple so it's not highly non-technical questions but I hope that is fine. What I read is that ICANN is going to finalize their Operating Plan for 2022-2025 and the process will start sometime very soon. Now that lines up this entire team, the review process in the middle of the next Strategic Plan of ICANN. So how is this getting aligned

somewhere because that leaves a small amount of a period of two, two and a half years where the SSAC Team does what they want based on the Strategic Plan which has been agreed by the Board but then there is no one to comment about it?

DENISE MICHELE:

Thank you for that question. That would be an appropriate question to direct to the staff and the Board as they're responsible for developing and approving the Strategic Plan for ICANN.

Whether and how they incorporate the output from the SSR2 Team is really up to the Board to decide whether or not they're going to implement any recommendations that this Review Team issues. And whether and how that's factored into the next Strategic Plan would be up to the staff and the Board, I suppose. Is there any staff or Board members who'd like to address strategic planning and timing on this?

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

And while Steve comes up, I'd like to remind everyone to please state your name for the microphone. Thank you.

STEVE CONTE: Thanks Eric. Denise, I think you hit in on the head. It's really going to be a question of the executive staff working with the Board to determine priorities. My understanding is that when the recommendations go to the Board that the intention is to approve them and turn them into an implementation status. So we would be looking at that holistically understanding that the recommendations aren't going to one specific department or one specific unit so we'd have to holistically look at that and work that within our own teams, float that up to the Executive Team so they could have the right conversations with the Board and determine the prioritization and the introduction into the budget and into the Strategic Plan.

I'm not executive staff, please don't quote me on that, but I think that's the process that we'd be following.

ALAIN AINA: But Steve, there is an SSR framework which expired last year so we expect to have a new SSR framework, right?

STEVE CONTE: Yes. One of the recommendations that came out of the first SSR, I believe it was, was that ICANN establish a SSR framework document that is a living document that gets refreshed

regularly. The last one did come out last year over the very end of the year before.

I know that the SSR Team is looking to slot that and to refresh that and continue to be the life of the document. Whether or not—I'm trying to think of the framework itself—whether or not that incorporates any of the recommendations of either the last SSR or the current SSR Team remains to be seen. It's mostly a living document expressing and it's available on the ICANN website expressing ICANN's vision of definition of SSR and the activities that are taking place around it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Well, without getting into any of the low-level details of which we haven't even really drafted yet anyway, that really summarizes where we as the SSR2 Review Team have gotten to so far and where we anticipate and hope to be in the not too distant future.

We are certainly again very interested in community engagement and outreach so if we haven't reached out to you and at some point you'd like to reach out to us, all of our communications and all of our sessions are public. Our mailing list is public and we're certainly interested in hearing from people whenever there's something here. If there are no other

questions or comments from maybe other people in the team either?

DENISE MICHELE:

Do we still have opportunities to participate? You read my mind. So in addition to all of our meetings and conference calls being open and recorded and documented in some place on the wiki, we have an e-mail address to provide input directly to the team.

We'll be continuing meetings with various Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees and constituencies throughout this week, and then we also, as ICANN has stipulated, have an observer status as well for those individuals who want that level of engagement and information from the Review Team.

And then finally, as the final bullet indicates, the team has a wiki that staff maintains and puts all the team documents on there.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Well, I know we were slotted for quite a bit longer than we've taken but we are [inaudible] close to returning time to your calendars so I'll maybe solicit one more time if anybody has any comments or questions they'd like to discuss with the team while we're all here, we're very willing to discuss whatever, but if

Review Team

not, thank you for coming and please consider reaching out to us in the future if anything occurs to you or if you have any thoughts. Thank you very much.

DENISE MICHELE: And you're welcome to stay here and enjoy the air conditioning and free Wi-Fi for the next hour. We've got the room.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]