

# For Best Audio: Join via Telephone Using Dial-Out

Connecting via the audio bridge is always preferable to the AC audio connection.

Upon logging into Adobe Connect, a pop-up window will appear for the AC to call your phone. This preferred method will assure the best audio for the meeting.

Join Audio Conference

How would you like to join the meeting's audio conference?

Dial-out [Receive a call from the meeting]

+1 (USA) 310-111-11111

Dial-in to the Audio Conference via Phone

Using Microphone (Computer/Device)

Join Listen Only

After 2 background noise occurrences, staff will mute the offending line (either Telephone or Adobe Connect).

After two failed attempts to speak over the audio, participants will be invited to type their comments in the chat or take them to the mailing list.

**PLEASE ALWAYS MUTE WHEN NOT SPEAKING!**

**\*6 to mute and \*6 to unmute**

For any questions, dial out requests, apologies, please email: [mssi-secretariat@icann.org](mailto:mssi-secretariat@icann.org)

# **SSR2 Review Team Plenary Call #41**

30 August 2018



# Agenda

---

1. Welcome, rollcall
  - a. Staff to provide update on Barcelona
2. Finalize ToR and scope
3. Draft communique - team to share feedback
4. Agree approach to work plan
5. Outreach/comms plan - establish approach and penholder
6. SSR1 recommendations - staff to provide update from leadership discussion 28 August (if time permits)
7. AOB

# Finalize ToR and Scope

# Draft communique - team to share feedback

# Agree approach to work plan

# Outreach/comms plan - establish approach and penholder

# SSR1 recommendations - staff to provide update from leadership discussion 28 August



# Overview

---

The following slides contain questions the review team has asked regarding SSR1 implementation.

The questions are posted to the 'Briefing Materials' page of the wiki here: <https://community.icann.org/x/zgRpBQ>

# SSR1 CTO Briefing

<b>Rec 1</b>	<b>ICANN should publish a single, clear and consistent statement of its SSR remit and limited technical mission.</b>
1.1	Q: Since the version developed in 2012, what changes have been made to the SSR remit and technical mission statement? Who has made those changes? How has the community been allowed to review and comment on those changes? When were the last changes made to this statement?
1.2	Q: How are the definitions of security, stability and resiliency consistently carried through into key documents, such as strategic plans and agreements with contracted parties?
<b>Rec 4</b>	<b>ICANN should document and clearly define the nature of the SSR relationships it has within the ICANN Community in order to provide a single focal point for understanding the interdependencies between organizations.</b>
4.1	Q: What accounts for the inconsistencies between the different documents on the ICANN website that describe the nature of the SSR relationships it has within the ICANN community?
4.2	Q: In what way are these documents fulfilling the requirement to provide a single focal point for understanding the interdependencies between organizations?
4.3	Q: What opportunities have there been for community input into the nature/definition of ICANN's SSR relationships?
4.4	Q: How is the document describing SSR relationships with partner organizations being updated?
<b>Rec 14</b>	<b>ICANN should ensure that its SSR-related outreach activities continuously evolve to remain relevant, timely and appropriate.</b>
14.1	Q: When is the Annual Report for FY 2016-2017 going to be published as a community resource?
14.2	Q: In the ICANN Engagement Interface, are all the SSR-Related outreach activities recorded or listed?

# SSR1 CTO Briefing

<b>Rec 15</b>	<b>ICANN should act as a facilitator in the responsible disclosure and dissemination of DNS security threats and mitigation techniques.</b>
15.1	Q: Is there any record of the methodology in the Coordinated Vulnerability Disclosure Document ever being invoked since 2013?
15.2	Q: Are there any statistics available for the processes identified in the Coordinated Vulnerability Disclosure Document?
15.3	Q: Are there any metrics or statistics available for ICANN's engagement with operators and trusted community entities on DNS security threats and mitigation techniques?
<b>Rec 16</b>	<b>ICANN should continue its outreach efforts to expand Community participation and input into the SSR Framework development process. ICANN also should establish a process for obtaining more systematic input from other ecosystem participants.</b>
16.1	Q: What public engagement was done for the creation of the Frameworks and Annual Reports?
16.2	Q: Is there a record showing how Community participation and input into the SSR Framework was incorporated?
16.3	Q: Are the documents that used to be called Frameworks, now to be SSR Annual Reports? If so, what is the community engagement mechanism being used for the Annual Reports?
16.4	Q: The implementation report specifically mentions capability building initiatives that would affect greater engagement in the development of the SSR Frameworks or Annual Reports. What initiatives have taken place? Who has participated? How have they expanded participation and input into the SSR Framework development process?
<b>Rec 19</b>	<b>ICANN should establish a process that allows the Community to track the implementation of the SSR Framework. Information should be provided with enough clarity that the Community can track ICANN's execution of its SSR responsibilities.</b>
19	Q: In ICANN's Portfolio Management system, the only SSR-related activity that appears is KSK Rollover. Is there another place where SSR-activities are tracked so that the community can see progress on current year activities (for instance the KPI Dashboard seems to be entirely related to the OCTO's work with the technical and public safety communities)?

# SSR1 Operations and Finance Briefing

<b>Rec 2</b>	<b>ICANN's definition and implementation of its SSR remit and limited technical mission should be reviewed in order to maintain consensus and elicit feedback from the Community.</b>
2.1	Q: Recommendation 2 directs that the definition of ICANN's SSR remit and limited technical mission should be reviewed in order to maintain consensus and elicit feedback from the Community. Please provide details of reviews and community feedback that have occurred since 2013.
2.2	Q: As ICANN's SSR remit and limited technical mission statement has evolved, how has comment from the community been incorporated? For instance, is there a summary of the comments on the FY 2014 Framework? Where is this published?
<b>Rec 7</b>	<b>ICANN should build on its current SSR Framework by establishing a clear set of objectives and prioritizing its initiatives and activities in accordance with these objectives.</b>
7.1	Q: How are the objectives specific to the SSR Framework documented in either the Operating Plan or the Strategic Plan?
7.2	Q: Where are priorities for SSR activities and initiatives published?
7.3	Q: In what ways have pragmatic cost-benefit and risk analysis informed the choice of priorities (if any)?
7.4	Q: In addition to the ability to comment on draft ICANN budgets and plans, how is the community able to provide input into the objectives, initiatives and activities related to SSR at ICANN?
7.5	Q: The SSR1 Report indicates that ICANN will "improve and publish a process for establishing updated SSR priorities and objectives." Where has this been published? Was there a mechanism for community review of the process (if so, please provide links)?

# SSR1 Operations and Finance Briefing

<b>Rec 9</b>	<b>ICANN should assess certification options with commonly accepted international standards (e.g. ITIL, ISO and SAS-70) for its operational responsibilities. ICANN should publish a clear roadmap towards certification.</b>
9.1	Q: SysTrust certification is referenced in the SSR1 Report as already in place. Please explain how it is claimed to be implementation of SSR1.
9.2	Q: Beside the certifications/audits done for processes in IANA, what certification activities have been assessed or implemented related to SSR?
9.3	Q: For staff working on SSR-related objectives, is there a certification plan in place as part of career/staff development?
9.4	Q: When was the EFQM model implemented within ICANN, and please provide details of how the SSR Framework and standard operating procedures have been evaluated and updated in the light of EFQM adoption to demonstrate process improvements over time.
9.5	Q: Has ICANN ever published a document that would include “a clear roadmap towards certification?” If so, where? Was there a mechanism by which community comment or engagement took place for such a document?
<b>Rec 17</b>	<b>ICANN should establish a more structured internal process for showing how activities and initiatives relate to specific strategic goals, objectives and priorities in the SSR Framework.</b>
17.1	Q: What is an example of a more structured internal process for showing how activities and initiatives relate to specific strategic goals, objectives and priorities in the SSR Framework? Has this been incorporated into the internal “At Task” system or other internal management systems?
17.2	Q: Are there any statistics available for the processes identified in the Coordinated Vulnerability Disclosure Document?
17.3	Q: Are there any metrics or statistics available for ICANN’s engagement with operators and trusted community entities on DNS security threats and mitigation techniques?

# SSR1 Operations and Finance Briefing

<b>Rec 20</b>	<b>ICANN should increase the transparency of information about organization and budget related to implementing the SSR Framework and performing SSR-related functions.</b>
20.1	Q: Provide documentation of, and links to, mechanisms that have been used since 2012 to provide more detailed public information on SSR-related budgets and expenditures across multiple ICANN departments
20.2	Q: Have any after-event reports (for relevant threats) been published that include budget and resource impacts related to managing the event? What would be an example of this kind of after-event-report?
<b>Rec 21</b>	<b>ICANN should establish a more structured internal process for showing how organization and budget decisions relate to the SSR Framework, including the underlying cost-benefit analysis.</b>
21.1	Q: Is there a link to the template described in the staff implementation report?
21.2	Q: Is there a plan for getting public comment on the template prior to using it for publishing information on budget and resource impacts related to SSR events?
21.3	Q: Where is the budgetary information as it pertains to the SSR? And where is the cost benefit analysis for making these decisions?
21.4	Q: Where is the evidence that a more structured internal process has been developed for SSR budgetary considerations? How do these decisions map onto ICANN's planning framework and process?
21.5	Q: Can ICANN provide an update as to the status of phase two (identifying mechanisms that that provide detailed public information on SSR-related budgets), and the steps still to be taken to ensure this recommendation is properly implemented?
<b>Rec 22</b>	<b>ICANN should publish, monitor and update documentation on the organization and budget resources needed to manage SSR issues in conjunction with introduction of new gTLDs.</b>
22.1	Q: Recommendation 22 is specifically about the new gTLD program. What documentation, specific to the new gTLD Program, on the organization, budget and resources needed to manage SSR issues in this area is available?
22.2	Q: Since the publication of the SSR1 report, what materials have been published by the SSR team that are specific to the implementation of the new gTLD Program? How has that work been budgeted and resourced?

# SSR1 Compliance Briefing

<b>Rec 10</b>	<b>ICANN should continue its efforts to step up contract compliance enforcement and provide adequate resources for this function. ICANN also should develop and implement a more structured process for monitoring compliance issues and investigations.</b>
10.1	Q: Please provide a summary of the number of complaints and enforcement actions against registries and registrars taken by contractual compliance on the basis of SSR obligations in the past 5 years.
10.2	Q: To what extent does ICANN measure the incidence and impact of registration abuse and/or malicious conduct by contracted parties?

# SSR1 Risk Management Briefing

<b>Rec 25</b>	<b>ICANN should put into place mechanisms for identifying both near and longer-term risks and strategic factors in its Risk Management Framework.</b>
25.1	Q: Since the publication of the SSR1 Final Report, what mechanisms have been put into place to incorporate near and long-term risks into a formal, strategic Risk Management Framework for ICANN?
25.2	Q: Since the Board approval of the 2014 Risk Management Framework provided by an external consultant, what further review, consultation or further work has been done on the approved Framework?
25.3	Q: Please provide evidence of briefings to the Board Risk Committee on the risk assessment and proposed mitigation measures, as per Board Resolution dated 21 November 2013 <a href="https://features.icann.org/dns-risk-management-framework-report-and-implementation?language=fr">https://features.icann.org/dns-risk-management-framework-report-and-implementation?language=fr</a> , and any follow up arising from such briefings.
25.4	Q: What efforts have been made since 2014 to demonstrate that ICANN's risk management framework follows the standards of transparency and community participation, required by the SSR1?
25.5	Q: Please clarify whether the portfolio of the new VP of Enterprise Risk Management extends into risks relating to ICANN's role with regard to the internet's set of unique identifiers, and future threats relating to unique identifiers?
25.6	Q: Is there a final DNS risk assessment document (the linked to document is labelled 'draft') <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/dns-risk-consultation-28may14-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/dns-risk-consultation-28may14-en.pdf</a> , and have there been any updates since 2014?
<b>Rec 27</b>	<b>ICANN should prioritize the timely completion of a Risk Management Framework.</b>
27.1	Q: The staff report for implementation of SSR1's Recommendations indicates that this Recommendation is complete. How did staff assess the "comprehensiveness" of the Risk Management Framework to come to this conclusion?
27.2	Q: Please provide details of how the risk management has been staffed since SSR1 recommendations have been adopted by the Board.



# SSR1 GDD Briefing

Rec 11	<b>ICANN should finalize and implement measures of success for new gTLDs and IDN fast track that expressly relate to its SSR-related program objectives, including measurements for the effectiveness of mechanisms to mitigate domain name abuse.</b>
11.1	Q: What measurements exist, and are used, for the effectiveness of mechanisms to mitigate domain name abuse, as required in recommendation 11?
11.2	Q: Please provide details of the measures of success relating to new gTLDs and IDNs that expressly address SSR related program objectives. The link in the SSR1 Report did not resolve.
11.3	Q: Please provide details of how SSR objectives are explicitly referenced in ICANN’s standard operating procedures, Service Level Agreements and monitoring, emergency back- end registry operators and data escrow, Trademark Clearinghouse, root zone scaling management, DNSSEC-related activities, and Compliance Dept. activities
11.4	Q: Noting IAG-CCT produced 70 metrics of which a single one (1.13) related to security issues; please provide details of the information gathered according to that metric. The web page of metrics and measures does not include information relating to 1.13.
11.5	Q: The SSR1 Report refers to Specification 11 as applying to all new gTLD registries. Please provide reports on the number and type of security threats reported by registries under their Specification 11 obligations. Please give details of enforcement action(s) taken by ICANN’s contractual compliance department in relation to Specification 11.
11.6	Q: How many new gTLD applications were failed (or placed in contention or required to take additional steps) on the basis of the (i) the security and stability review or (ii) the string similarity review.
11.7	Q: In relation to the IDN ccTLD Fast Track, please give details of any strings that have failed those security and stability checks for security and stability related reasons rather than for consumer confusion – a CCT Review issue.
11.8	Q: Considering staff and community feedback, how effective is the EPSRP mechanism (the second security and stability review in the IDN ccTLD Fast Track) in detecting and preventing stability and security issues other than consumer confusion?
11.9	Q: Are there any updates on the status of Coordinated Vulnerability Disclosure Reporting since 2013?

# SSR1 GDD Briefing

11.10	Q: Please provide a copy of the report referred to in bullet point 9 of recommendation 11 implementation in the Final Implementation Report. Given that the SSR objectives referred to in the report remain 'to be defined' please provide an explanation as to why this recommendation is said to be complete.
11.11	Q: To what extent was the commissioning of the CDAR report, the Root Stability Study Workshop and the new gTLD program security and stability impact triggered by the SSR1 recommendation, and why is the SSR1 Report not referenced in the published materials relating to those initiatives?
11.12	Q: What was happening in the 5 years between when the recommendation was approved by the Board and when a draft consultant report was posted in April 2017?
11.13	Q: On the status and deliverables of Rec 11 it says that ICANN has implemented measures of success for the gTLDs, but we haven't seen how you've implemented measures of success for new gTLDs and IDNs. That's the first check mark, but what we've been provided with is a draft report of some ideas that you could do. How is that considered full implementation of this recommendation?
11.14	Q: The SSR1 review team called out a number of activities that were operational and within staff's purview and contained in the SSR framework and called for implementation of measurements and metrics. Was that work done and is it captured anywhere? To clarify, as part of the SSR1 report related to rec 11, the SSR1 review team noted ICANN administration of the new gTLD Program, IDN program, significant SSR related issues that are in the framework. They called for more specific goals, measurements and impact assessment. Was that work done and is it captured somewhere else?
11.15	Q: Is there more information on the steps that ICANN has taken in the past five years to facilitate data access and activities that involved other entities that had ownership or responsibilities on related activities?
11.16	Q: Broadly, in looking at the dashboard for rec 11 and all the checkmarks including operational items, it's really unclear how staff defined and measured success related to SSR. It's hard to see how the basic spirit of this recommendation was implementation, especially with an idea paper from a consultant. But in terms of the last 5 years and what staff did to implement, it's unclear. Can you gather more information and provide more clarity and facts?

# SSR1 GDD Briefing

<b>Rec 12</b>	<b>ICANN should work with the Community to identify SSR-related best practices and support the implementation of such practices through contracts, agreements and MOUs and other mechanisms.</b>
12.1	Q: In what way have the recommendations contained in the paper, “Identifier System Attack Mitigation Methodology,” been integrated into contracts, agreements and MoUs as envisioned by SSR1 recommendation 12?
12.2	Q: Is there a central, up-to-date resource to see how the ISSSR team, and other professionals in the SSR field, have worked with SOs and ACs to identify additional, targeted best-practices for their constituents? Are there pointers to or records of those engagements?
12.3	Q: What are some examples of significant MoUs with international entities that have SSR-practices embedded within them?
12.4	Q: Is the only place where ICANN has documented work on recommendations for web application protection and development of resources for security awareness in the report from the 4th Global DNS Stability, Security and Resiliency Symposium?
12.5	Q: Has there been a Global DNS Stability, Security and Resiliency Symposium since 2014?
12.6	Q: With regards to establishing best practices and integrating these into agreements to which ICANN enters: It’s linked to a paper that raises a whole host of issues and addresses proposed activities but it’s unclear how that then relates to integrating those into agreements into which ICANN has entered over the past 5 years. Can you provide more specific information on how best practices are reflected in agreements that ICANN has entered into?
12.7	Q: ‘Addressing SSR practices in MOUs’ links to a page that holds all of the MOUs. Can you provide some quantification of SSR-related practices in MOUs and more information on which ones contain SSR-related practices, which practices they contain, and how all that’s tracked or the implementation is assessed?
12.8	Q: Which sections of the revised new gTLD registry agreement does OCTO staff feel advance SSR best practices and objectives?

# SSR1 Policy Briefing

<b>Rec 6</b>	<b>ICANN should publish a document clearly outlining the roles and responsibilities for both the SSAC and RSSAC in order to clearly delineate the activities of the two groups.</b>
6.1	Q: What is the status of the document currently available at: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/draftrssac-ssac-roles-responsibilities-05mar15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/draftrssac-ssac-roles-responsibilities-05mar15-en.pdf</a> ?
6.2	Q: The recommendation requires that ICANN should seek consensus for this document across both groups. Please provide documentation that this occurred.
6.3	Q: What specific resourcing for RSSAC and SSAC appears in either the ICANN Operating Plan or the most recent budget?
<b>13</b>	<b>ICANN should encourage all Supporting Organizations to develop and publish SSR-related best practices for their members.</b>
13.1	Q: In what way are the resources on the ICANN Security Awareness Resource Locator supposed to help Supporting Organizations secure collaborative community assets?
13.2	Q: Have any recent steps been taken to encourage SOs and ACs to produce and publish best practices repositories for SSR-related information? Is the 2012 information on the ccTLD website the most recent example of SSR-related information published by a Supporting Organization?
<b>Rec 23</b>	<b>ICANN must provide appropriate resources for SSR-related Working Groups and Advisory Committees, consistent with the demands placed upon them. ICANN also must ensure decisions reached by Working Groups and Advisory Committees are reached in an objective manner that is free from external or internal pressure.</b>
23.1	Q: Recommendation 23 calls for a mechanism for Working Groups and Advisory Councils to support their decisions in an objective manner that is free from external or internal pressure. Where is such a mechanism documented – specifically regarding the work of SSAC and RSSAC?

# SSR1 Comms Briefing

<b>3</b>	<b>Once ICANN issues a consensus-based statement of its SSR remit and limited technical mission, ICANN should utilize consistent terminology and descriptions of this statement in all materials.</b>
3.1	Q: In what way has ICANN publicized consistent terminology and descriptions related to ICANN's SSR role and remit? Where are these published?
3.2	Q: What terms related to SSR have been added to the ICANN public glossary? When were they added?

# AOB