

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

SSR2 Review Team Plenary Call #47

11 October 2018



Agenda

1. Welcome, roll call, SOI updates
2. Discuss approach to review of SSR1 Recommendations
3. Review of SSR1 Recommendations 10, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18
4. AOB
5. Confirm action items/decisions reached

Discuss Approach to Review of SSR1 Recommendations

Review of SSR1 Recommendations 10, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18

RECOMMENDATION 1: ICANN should publish a single, clear and consistent statement of its SSR remit and limited technical mission. ICANN should elicit and gain public feedback in order to reach a consensus-based statement.

What was done to implement the recommendation? Was the recommendation fully implemented?

- Public comment was taken on a [draft statement between May-Sept 2012](#); it was subsequently [revised in Oct 2012](#).
- The updated [statement](#) was published on ICANN’s website and incorporated in the [FY 14 SSR Framework](#) and is part of SSR SOP in which SSR Framework and statement is periodically reviewed and updated as needed. This statement also has been incorporated into other ICANN documentation.
- SSR1 implementation report [here](#) (slides 1 - 3)
- FY 15-16 SSR Framework is [here](#).
- SSR2-RT briefing slides on this recommendation [here](#) (slides 5 – 13).

Questions & Answers

1. 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?
 - Answers to this question available here (published in in 2015): <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/ssr-role-remit-2015-01-19-en>
2. How are the definitions of security, stability and resiliency consistently carried through into key documents, such as strategic plans and agreements with contracted parties?
 - Because of the variety of subjects that this question incorporates, it is difficult to address. Different departments work on different aspects of this question and don’t always have visibility to the topics covered in the question. Because of this, ICANN ORG operates in a “Best Effort” model and reaches out to OCTO-SSR if any questions arise surrounding the use of the definitions. To date, ICANN ORG feels that it has stayed consistent with the usage of the definitions between the various types of documents.

Did the implementation have the intended effect? How was the assessment conducted?

Is the recommendation still relevant today? If so, what further work needed? If not, why not?

RECOMMENDATION 2: 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. The process should be repeated on a regular basis, perhaps in conjunction with the cycle of future SSR reviews.

What was done to implement the recommendation? Was the recommendation fully implemented?

- The [statement](#) (and [SSR Framework](#)) informed ICANN’s [Strategic Plan for FY2016—2020](#), which reflects strategic SSR objectives, goals and key success factors (KSFs) for the next five years and was result of input and review by the ICANN community, Staff and Board. SSR elements are highlighted [here](#).
- This, in turn, informed the new [Five-Year Operating Plan](#), which also was developed with community input and includes SSR key performance indicators (KPIs), dependencies, five-year phasing, and portfolios. SSR elements are highlighted [here](#).
- Periodic review of the SSR Framework, including the SSR role and remit statement, are part of the SSR SOP, and also will be reviewed by the next SSR RT in 2015.
- SSR1 implementation report [here](#) (slides 4 - 6)
- SSR2-RT briefing slides on this recommendation [here](#) (slides 4 – 29).

Questions & Answers – **SOME ANSWERS OUTSTANDING**

1. 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.
 - Answer outstanding
2. 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?

- Answer outstanding
Did the implementation have the intended effect? How was the assessment conducted?
Is the recommendation still relevant today? If so, what further work needed? If not, why not?
RECOMMENDATION 3: 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.
<p>What was done to implement the recommendation? Was the recommendation fully implemented?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent terminology and descriptions related to ICANN’s SSR role and remit have been publicized and are encouraged in all ICANN material. • Key terms are added to ICANN’s public glossary on an ongoing basis as part of SOP. • As SSR activities evolve, terminology and descriptions will be updated as part of SOP. • Document of definitions across ICANN org available here (provided to RT in March 2017). • SSR1 implementation report here (slides 7 - 9) <p>Questions & Answers</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In what way has ICANN publicized consistent terminology and descriptions related to ICANN’s SSR role and remit? Where are these published? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Document of definitions is available here: https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=64074062&preview=/64074062/64076676/SSR%20Def_Steve%20Conte.pdf 2. What terms related to SSR have been added to the ICANN public glossary? When were they added? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - See here: https://www.icann.org/icann-acronyms-and-terms/en/G0301
Did the implementation have the intended effect? How was the assessment conducted?
Is the recommendation still relevant today? If so, what further work needed? If not, why not?
RECOMMENDATION 4: 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.
<p>What was done to implement the recommendation? Was the recommendation fully implemented?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Phase I) Many of ICANN’s SSR relationships have been defined and publicized. As part of OCTO SSR Team SOP, this work will be updated periodically to keep pace with SSR activities. Memorandums of Understanding that indicate roles and responsibilities relevant to SSR have been signed with numerous entities; the list is posted here and will be updated as part of SOP, as needed. • (Phase II) Extract and catalogue SSR-related elements of MOUs; Provide additional detail on formal relationships ICANN has with key organizations. This includes: 1) noting the “relationship,” covering informal and formal arrangements; 2) documenting that some relationships are sensitive (not disclosed) and noting the industry best practices and conventions that are used to address this lack of disclosure. • ICANN Security Awareness Resource Locator Developed - All stakeholders should learn how to protect themselves, their families, or their organizations against online threats. The resources on this page can help consumers, business or IT professionals avoid online threats or harm and make informed choices regarding (personal) data disclosure or protection. • The document tracking ICANN SSR related roles and responsibilities has been completed and posted at https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssr-relationships-fy17-23jan17-en.pdf • SSR1 implementation report here (slides 10 - 12) • SSR2- RT briefing on this recommendation here (slides 23 – 27).

Questions & Answers – **SOME ANSWERS OUTSTANDING – CLARIFICATION FROM RT REQUESTED**

1. 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?
 - CLARIFICATION SOUGHT: Could you please provide some concrete examples of discrepancies?
2. In what way are these documents fulfilling the requirement to provide a single focal point for understanding the interdependencies between organizations?
 - MOUs are in place that have been incorporated as part of the agreements. We have several links in place for ICANN security resource locator development, and a document published in January of 2017, that identifies, in detail, all the relationships. This information can be found here:
 - * ICANN's major agreements and related reports are published at:
<https://www.icann.org/en/about/agreements>
 - * Detailed breakdown of ICANN's SSR Relationships is located at:
<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssr-relationships-fy17-23jan17-en.pdf>
 - * ICANN's Security Awareness Resource Locator page can be found at:
<https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/security-awareness-resource-2014-12-04-en>
3. What opportunities have there been for community input into the nature/definition of ICANN's SSR relationships?
 - This document is revisited and revised periodically with new versions being published as such. The community is always able to provide input given ICANN's commitment to transparency but there is no official public comment process on the relationships.
4. How is the document describing SSR relationships with partner organizations being updated?
 - This document was prepared in accordance with recommendation 4. There is no established process in place for updating it.

Did the implementation have the intended effect? How was the assessment conducted?

Is the recommendation still relevant today? If so, what further work needed? If not, why not?

RECOMMENDATION 5: ICANN should use the definition of its SSR relationships to maintain effective working arrangements and to demonstrate how these relationships are utilized to achieve each SSR goal.

What was done to implement the recommendation? Was the recommendation fully implemented?

- (Phase I) Reporting on ICANN's progress toward SSR-related KSFs and KPIs involving SSR relationships is SOP, and can be found in ICANN's regular project management reporting, operating plans, [SSR Framework](#), and SSR quarterly reports.
- (Phase II) Next SSR Framework/report on SSR activities will include information on how key relationships noted in Recommendation 4 are used to achieve SSR goals (as part of SOP).
- The document tracking ICANN SSR related roles and responsibilities has been completed and posted at <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssr-relationships-fy17-23jan17-en.pdf>
- SSR1 implementation report [here](#) (slides 13 - 15)
- SSR2- RT briefing on this recommendation [here](#) (slides 23 – 27).

No questions & answers.

Did the implementation have the intended effect? How was the assessment conducted?

Is the recommendation still relevant today? If so, what further work needed? If not, why not?

RECOMMENDATION 6: 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. ICANN should seek consensus for this across both groups, recognizing the history and circumstances of the formation of each. ICANN should consider appropriate resourcing for both groups, consistent with the demands

placed upon them.

What was done to implement the recommendation? Was the recommendation fully implemented?

- Roles and Responsibilities of SSAC are reflected in ICANN's Bylaws and defined in SSAC's [Operating Procedures](#).
- Roles and Responsibilities for RSSAC are reflected in an [updated charter](#) contained in ICANN's Bylaws.
- SSAC and RSSAC have been asked to reflect their roles and responsibilities in a brief explanatory text for [icann.org](#) (linking to respective charters), and [text](#) as agreed to by the AC's chairs. April 2015
- SSR1 implementation report [here](#) (slides 17-18)

Questions & Answers

1. What is the status of the document currently available at: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/draft-rssac-ssac-roles-responsibilities-05mar15-en.pdf>?
 - The role of the SSAC is published here: <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/ssac-role-2018-02-06-en>. The role of the RSSAC is published here: <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/charter-2013-07-14-en>
2. The recommendation requires that ICANN should seek consensus for this document across both groups. Please provide documentation that this occurred.
 - The documentation to support consensus reached cannot be located, unfortunately due to passage of time since the recommendation was implemented.
3. What specific resourcing for RSSAC and SSAC appears in either the ICANN Operating Plan or the most recent budget?
 - The support for RSSAC and SSAC is included in the ICANN Policy budget. Some of the service relies on other team's services (web team, language services team, communication team) which are not easily quantifiable.

Did the implementation have the intended effect? How was the assessment conducted?

Is the recommendation still relevant today? If so, what further work needed? If not, why not?

RECOMMENDATION 7: 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.

What was done to implement the recommendation? Was the recommendation fully implemented?

- [Note: Recommendation was made before ICANN's current planning, budgeting and portfolio/project management and reporting processes were instituted].
- The Strategic and Operating Plans (see Recommendation 2) were informed by SSR Framework and reflect SSR priorities, objectives and activities. This is SOP for development of ICANN plans and budgets.
- SSR-related priorities, objectives and activities are reported on regularly as part of SOP, including in ICANN's regular [portfolio management reporting](#) and [SSR quarterly reports](#).
- Revamped process for establishing updated SSR priorities and objectives. The ICANN Security, Stability and Resiliency department documented its Mission, Approach, Tasks in its August 2015 [blog](#).
- The SSR Framework document archive is [here](#).
- SSR1 implementation report [here](#) (slides 19 - 21)
- SSR2- RT briefing on this recommendation [here](#) (slides 4 – 29).

Questions & Answers – **SOME ANSWERS OUTSTANDING**

1. How are the objectives specific to the SSR Framework documented in either the Operating Plan or the Strategic Plan?
 - The components of the SSR Framework are included in the ICANN strategic plan. SSR related KPI's in the strategic plan are related FY2016 –2020 Strategic Objective 2: Support a healthy, stable, and resilient unique identifier ecosystem:
 - 2.1) Foster and coordinate a healthy, secure, stable, and resilient identifier ecosystem.
 - 2.2) Proactively plan for changes in the use of unique identifiers and develop technology roadmaps to help guide ICANN activities.
 - 2.3) Support the evolution of domain name marketplace to be robust, stable and trusted. Progress against these KPIs is available here: <https://www.icann.org/accountability-indicators>
2. Where are priorities for SSR activities and initiatives published?
 - We have identified SSR related KPI's in the strategic plan. ICANN's strategic plan is here: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/strategic-plan-2016-2020-10oct14-en.pdf>. More details are

available here: <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/strategic-engagement-2013-10-10-en>

3. In what ways have pragmatic cost-benefit and risk analysis informed the choice of priorities (if any)?
 - Over the last couple of years, risk & opportunity and financial assessments have been progressively entrenched to inform and drive prioritization. The FY18 Strategic Trend Outlook assessment was conducted with every functional team within org, the Board and community. The assessment results inform the annual operating plan update and budget and form the foundation for the next Five-Year Strategic Plan. Financial (cost/benefit) assessments have been a key focus within org, the Board and community in developing annual budgets and driving numerous cost-saving initiatives.
4. 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?
 - As ICANN publishes its SSR frameworks, they are open to community review and comment. In light of the changes that took place during the IANA transition a new SSR Framework is currently in the making and will be published for review.
5. 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)?
 - Answer outstanding

Did the implementation have the intended effect? How was the assessment conducted?

Is the recommendation still relevant today? If so, what further work needed? If not, why not?

RECOMMENDATION 8: ICANN should continue to refine its Strategic Plan objectives, particularly the goal of maintaining and driving DNS availability. Clear alignment of Framework & Strategic Plan.

What was done to implement the recommendation? Was the recommendation fully implemented?

- The Strategic and Operating Plans (see Recommendation 2) were informed by SSR Framework and reflect SSR priorities, objectives and activities. This is SOP for development of ICANN plans and budgets, in which SSR alignment is reviewed as annual plans/budgets are developed.
- Progress on SSR-related priorities, objectives and activities are reported on regularly as part of SOP, including in ICANN’s regular [portfolio management reporting](#) and SSR [quarterly reports](#).
- SSR1 implementation report [here](#) (slides 22 - 24)
- SSR2- RT briefing on this recommendation [here](#) (slides 4 – 29).

No questions & answers.

Did the implementation have the intended effect? How was the assessment conducted?

Is the recommendation still relevant today? If so, what further work needed? If not, why not?

RECOMMENDATION 9: 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.

What was done to implement the recommendation? Was the recommendation fully implemented?

- ICANN’s implementation of DNSSEC in the root has [achieved SysTrust certification](#).
- ICANN launched its [EFQM web page](#) where the focus is on continuous improvement. The EFQM Excellence Model provides mechanisms for the holistic assessment of an organization. These assessments help improve the way ICANN works, so that it can deliver better results.
- SSR1 implementation report [here](#) (slides 25 - 27)
- SSR2- RT briefing on this recommendation [here](#) (slides 38 – 43).

Questions & Answers – **SOME ANSWERS OUTSTANDING**

1. SysTrust certification is referenced in the SSR1 Report as already in place. Please explain how it is claimed to be implementation of SSR1
 - Certification options were assessed after the final SSR1 final report was published. Within the IANA Function’s team, two different audits are completed on an annual basis. SOC3 Certification of Root Zone KSK System, and SOC2 Certification for our Registry Assignment and Maintenance Systems. These audits

evaluate our service organization controls (SOCs) against the “Trust Services Principles and Criteria”. This is a well-established framework that’s certified by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants and the Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants for assessing organization controls over security systems. More information is available here: <https://www.iana.org/about/audits>

2. Beside the certifications/audits done for processes in IANA, what certification activities have been assessed or implemented related to SSR?
 - Answer outstanding.
3. For staff working on SSR-related objectives, is there a certification plan in place as part of career/staff development?
 - Answer outstanding.
4. 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.
 - ICANN IANA functions have implemented the EFQM since 2009, and ICANN has also been implementing the EFQM model org-wide since FY15. The SSR Framework and standard operating procedures have been part of the process improvement assessment focus along with the model adoption. 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?
5. 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?
 - Answer outstanding

Did the implementation have the intended effect? How was the assessment conducted?

Is the recommendation still relevant today? If so, what further work needed? If not, why not?

RECOMMENDATION 10: 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.

What was done to implement the recommendation? Was the recommendation fully implemented?

- Regular public reporting of compliance activities are part of SOP; detailed information is available [here](#).
- Complaints migrated to icann.org and automated; bulk complaint tool launched; Pulse Survey implemented; WHOIS inaccuracy qualities check launched; complaints submission processes & FAQs to address new 2013 RAA requirements completed; compliance auditing and outreach programs in place; new positions created to ensure fulfillment of goals and objectives in this area.
- SSR1 implementation report [here](#) (slides 28 - 30)
- SSR2- RT briefing on this recommendation [here](#)

Questions & Answers

1. 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.
 - ICANN has a dedicated public page for Contractual Compliance Reporting. This page provides three types of data to the ICANN Community. The first section, referred to as Metrics and Dashboards, provides monthly, quarterly and annual data. The second section, referred to as Contractual Compliance Metrics for a rolling 13-month period, provides ten different types of reports for a period of 13-month. The third section, referred to as Additional Contractual Compliance related data, provides links to the metrics and data specifically requested by different working groups or review teams.
 - A summary of the number of complaints and enforcement actions against registries and registrars, including the number of complaints by complaint type can be found at <https://features.icann.org/compliance/dashboard/report-list> .
 - As for enforcement, there are multiple reports to refer to:
 - a) In the Metrics and Dashboards section, there are two reports to provide enforcement data; a report that presents data about the Formal Resolution Process broken out by enforcement reason (<https://features.icann.org/compliance/dashboard/2018/q2/enforcement-complaint-type>) and another that shows the data from a Compliance Approach & Process (<https://features.icann.org/compliance/dashboard/2018/q2/complaints-approach-process-registrars>) perspective for registrar and another for registry related complaints. Same reports can also be found in the

Annual Report section.

- b) in the 13-month rolling section, there is a Formal Notices (<https://features.icann.org/compliance/enforcement-notice>) report that lists enforcement actions by a contracted party and the enforcement reasons for both registrars and registries

2. To what extent does ICANN measure the incidence and impact of registration abuse and/or malicious conduct by contracted parties?

- ICANN Contractual Compliance reports on the total number of registrar abuse report complaints received and processed. In late 2017, compliance reporting included the subject matter category in its monthly metrics; for example - the abuse complaint type now provides the subject of registrar related Domain Name System (DNS) abuse complaints such as spam, pharming, phishing, malware, and botnets in addition to counterfeiting, pharmaceutical, fraudulent and deceptive practices, trademark or copyright infringement, and registrar abuse contact.
- ICANN Contractual Compliance also proactively monitors compliance with the abuse-related obligations of the Registrar Accreditation Agreement and Registry Agreement through audits. At the closure of every audit round, ICANN published an audit report on the Reports & Blogs Page (<https://www.icann.org/resources/compliance-reporting-performance>). ICANN org is developing use of the information from the Domain Abuse Activity Reporting (DAAR) (<https://www.icann.org/octo-ssr/daar>) project for studying and reporting on domain name registration and security threat (domain abuse) behavior across registrars and registry operators.

Did the implementation have the intended effect? How was the assessment conducted?

Is the recommendation still relevant today? If so, what further work needed? If not, why not?

RECOMMENDATION 11: 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.

What was done to implement the recommendation? Was the recommendation fully implemented?

- SSR1 implementation report [here](#) (slides 31-33)
- SSR2-RT briefing on this recommendation [here](#) (slides 4-5)

Questions & Answers - SOME ANSWERS OUTSTANDING – CLARIFICATION FROM RT REQUESTED

1. Is there any quantification or more detailed information on what the working relationship with the APWG has yielded?
 - 1) cross-community collaboration on APWG white papers, see <https://apwg.org/resources/apwg-reports/whitepapers>, including these topics:
 - registrar best/recommended practices
 - web vulnerabilities survey
 - subdomain registration phishing practices
 - whois data and phishing
 - twice annual global phishing surveys
 - 2) cross-posting of SSAC documents for APWG community, again see <https://apwg.org/resources/apwg-reports/whitepapers>
 - 3) cross-fertilization of subject matter expertise
 - incoming SSAC chairperson is originally from APWG community
 - several SSAC members are originally from APWG community
 - registry (e.g., Afiliac, Org) and registrar (Blackknight, GoDaddy) staff have joined APWG
2. 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?
 - An independent consultant was hired to implement this recommendation. The consultant's report states, "The measures of success anticipated by the SSR RT in Recommendation 11 assume the existence of a community-based definition of "success" with corresponding metrics that could serve as the basis for measurement. These do not exist for the new gTLD program nor the IDN ccTLD Fast Track program. This report recommends that success criteria and measurements that have been developed for closely related ICANN activities—particularly the Competition, Consumer Choice, and Consumer Trust Review Team (CCCT RT)—be considered responsive to Recommendation 11, and that the issue of appropriate SSR metrics specific to the new gTLD program and the IDN ccTLD Fast Track be revisited by the second Security,

Stability & Resiliency of the DNS Review Team (SSR RT2).” The report can be found here:

<https://community.icann.org/display/SSR/Rec+%2311?preview=/56140534/64082817/SSR%20RT1%20Recommendation%2011%20Implementation%20Report-%20Final.pdf>

3. 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?
 - As noted in the answers to previous questions, the report from the consultant indicated that the measures of the success need to be defined by the community since they do not exist. Due to unforeseen personal circumstances of the consultant, work on this implementation was delayed. The consultant was able to finish the work prior to April 2017, at which the report was posted.
4. 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.
 - Details regarding ICANN Contractual Compliance’s enforcement of registry operator security threat reporting obligations under Specification 11 have previously been published in response to requests for similar information from the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process Working Group at https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/58735937/New_gTLD_Subsequent_Procedures_Request_for_Data_%28PIC%29.docx?version=1&modificationDate=1502819042000&api=v2.
 - To date, ICANN has issued two breach notices related to Specification 11. Both were on the basis of noncompliance with Section 3(c), regarding transparent operation of the subject top-level domain. Details regarding these notices are published at https://www.icann.org/uploads/compliance_notice/attachment/911/serad-to-westerdal-16mar17.pdf and https://www.icann.org/uploads/compliance_notice/attachment/1049/serad-to-allain-11jul18.pdf.
 - No enforcement actions have been issued to date on the basis of Specification 11 3(b), regarding security threat reporting. Additionally, ICANN Contractual Compliance has recently conducted a registry audit which focused on registry operator compliance with Specification 11 security threat reporting obligations. An audit report regarding this audit round is estimated to be published by the end of October 2018 at the audit reports page, which can be linked to from <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/audits-2012-02-25-en>.
5. In a commercialized world of DNS service provision where data is considered to be a corporate asset, do you feel that either ICANN or the community at large have access to meaningful metrics? I cite the barriers that exist on information on root servers. Is this a barrier to the entire objective, that access to data appears to be challenging?
 - Geoff Huston (asker) clarified that he feels this is a question for the review team to answer, not ICANN org.
6. Do you think it is ICANN staff’s responsibility to gather, analyze and publish this data or do you feel that it’s ICANN’s responsibility to facilitate others to do that?
 - ICANN as an organization looks to community to define what success is especially in a program like that like the New gTLD Program and the IDN Fast Track program from the ccNSO. I don’t believe ICANN imposes measures of success on those groups. And I think it’s a community effort in which we look for guidance from the community on what those measures are. And then depending on what the result is, it would determine whether or not ICANN is the implementer of those measures of success or the shepherd of those measures. One of the challenges that we faced specifically around this recommendation and around those programs was that we didn’t have any community definition of success or those measures, so we couldn’t have any baseline in which to conduct measurements off those.
7. 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 (<https://community.icann.org/display/SSR/Rec+%2311>) did not resolve.
 - The implementation report for recommendation 11 can be found here: <https://community.icann.org/display/SSR/Rec+%2311?preview=/56140534/64082817/SSR%20RT1%20Recommendation%2011%20Implementation%20Report-%20Final.pdf>
8. 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.
 - The link to the report is here: https://community.icann.org/display/SSR/Rec+%2311?preview=/56140534/64082817/SSR_RT1_Recommendation_11_Implementation_Report-Final.pdf. The work was deferred to the SSR2 Review Team as stated in the report. As such, this recommendation was marked as complete because the work could not progress any further without the SSR2 Review Team taking this on.
9. Are there any updates on the status of Coordinated Vulnerability Disclosure Reporting since 2013?

- This link contains the latest information that has been published.: <https://www.icann.org/news/blog/icann-coordinated-disclosure-guidelines>
10. 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?
 - We cannot speak for the first few years after the recommendation was approved by the Board because the staff working on the recommendation are no longer at ICANN org. At the point from when we do have a record of when the work was started, a consultant with the appropriate expertise was brought on board to implement the recommendation. Due to unforeseen personal circumstances of the consultant, work on this implementation was delayed. The consultant was able to finish the work prior to April 2017, at which the report was posted.
 11. 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?
 - Answer outstanding
 12. 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.
 - Answer outstanding
 13. 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.
 - Answer outstanding.
 14. 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.
 - Answer outstanding.
 15. 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.
 - Answer outstanding.
 16. 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?
 - Answer outstanding.
 17. 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?
 - Answer outstanding.
 18. What measurements exist, and are used, for the effectiveness of mechanisms to mitigate domain name abuse, as required in recommendation 11?
 - Answer outstanding.
 19. Which sections of the revised new gTLD registry agreement does OCTO staff feel advance SSR best practices and objectives?
 - The revised new gTLD registry agreement contains SSR elements throughout. Many elements of the contract are there to advance SSR best practices and objectives. Highlights include but are not limited Article 2.3 (Data Escrow), Article 2.7 (Registry Interoperability and Continuity), Article 2.13 (Emergency Transition), Article 2.16 (Registry Performance Specifications) and 2.17 (Additional Public Interest Commitments) and associated Specifications. Article 3 sets out elements that advance SSR through clarifying expectations about such things as timely changes to the root zone.
 20. Within the area of recommendation 11 & 12 activities for which ICANN can be a facilitator or convener – is there more information on the steps that ICANN took over the past five years to facilitate activities that involve other entities that had primary ownership or responsibility on related activities?
 - Answer outstanding. CLARIFICATION SOUGHT: We’re not clear on what the question is asking.

Did the implementation have the intended effect? How was the assessment conducted?

Is the recommendation still relevant today? If so, what further work needed? If not, why not?

RECOMMENDATION 12: 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.

What was done to implement the recommendation? Was the recommendation fully implemented?

Questions & Answers - **SOME ANSWERS OUTSTANDING**

1. 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?
 - Interactions with SOs and ACs are documented through the regular ICANN processes. SSR interactions are not specifically flagged in any way beyond meetings at ICANN being labelled as of interest for those in the community with a security interest. One such effort could be OCTO SSR team member participation in the ccNSO TLD-OPS discussions list (a small subset of ccNSO) but these are not documented by OCTO SSR. More information about the ccNSO TLD-OPS can be found here: <https://ccnso.icann.org/en/resources/tld-ops-secure-communication.htm>
2. Has there been a Global DNS Stability, Security and Resiliency Symposium since 2014?
 - No there has not. There have been other symposia such as IDS.
3. What has changed after the implementation of Rec#12 as compared with the past?
 - Recommendation 12 has driven ICANN's SSR Team - now ICANN's OCTO SSR Team - to continue to build their engagement both on an individual networking level, and to engage heavily with ICANN's GSE Department (Global Stakeholder Engagement). The OCTO Team has worked with GSE since this recommendation.

ICANN's OCTO Team works closely with Global Stakeholder Engagement Team in order to help facilitate and clarify some of the needs of the GSE regional strategies as they're being built. More visibility to the strategies in draft form helps OCTO to make sure we have the right resources and budget in order to support the activities that ICANN's regional VPs want to facilitate within the region. Earlier visibility to the regional strategies gives us a chance to be more responsive and proactive on the ground in supporting the GSE Team in the regions.

Although OCTO SSR is completely request-driven, we used to be completely ad hoc request-driven, which means that a request would come in, we would go and satisfy that. This was cost-prohibitive and inefficient. Now we are more deliberate in our actions, especially traveling and being physically in the region. We work with the GSEs prior to any travel to try to utilize team members time with meetings and presentations that are relevant during their travel to maximize efficiency. So, we set up meetings with key delegates in the region or we might be doing a training on DNSSEC but at the same time, while we're out in that region, we might also meet with local law enforcement or the regional Interpol, for example.
4. 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?
 - The Identifier System Attack Mitigation Methodology paper is a non-exhaustive list of attacks against the Identifier System that has been put forth for consideration within ICANN and by Identifier System security experts throughout the community. Although there have been some agreements/renewals/specifications/MOUs since February 2017, nothing specifically from this paper has been included in the contracts.
5. 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?
 - Yes
6. '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?
 - Answer outstanding.
7. What are some examples of significant MoUs with international entities that have SSR-practices embedded within them?
 - Answer outstanding.
8. With regards to establishing best practices and integrating these into agreements to which ICANN enters: The SSR1 report is 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

<p>that ICANN has entered into?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Answer outstanding.
<p>Did the implementation have the intended effect? How was the assessment conducted?</p>
<p>Is the recommendation still relevant today? If so, what further work needed? If not, why not?</p>
<p>RECOMMENDATION 13: ICANN should encourage all Supporting Organizations to develop and publish SSR-related best practices for their members.</p>
<p>What was done to implement the recommendation? Was the recommendation fully implemented?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As part of SOP, ICANN staff contacts all SOs and ACs (via chairs) to encourage identification and publication of a best practices repository page that is responsive to their constituencies. The ccNSO currently publishes SSR-related best practices information for their members. • ICANN staff engages in a variety of ongoing activities to encourage global use of SSR best practices, as part of SOP (see Recommendation 12). • Activity in this area is ongoing as part of SOP and ICANN builds on its activities annually. In 2015, for example, ICANN anticipates the creation of a set of resources of best practices for securing collaborative community assets. These resources will help SOs and ACs make informed decisions regarding identity management and data protection. From these, SOs and ACs could set requirements for how community assets should be made secure, stable and resilient. • SSR1 implementation report here (slides 37-39) <p>Questions & Answers - SOME ANSWERS OUTSTANDING</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In what way are the resources on the ICANN Security Awareness Resource Locator supposed to help Supporting Organizations secure collaborative community assets? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In order to help the community learn how to protect themselves against online threats, the ICANN Security Awareness Resource Locator was published. An example of how some of the content of this page was utilized can be found here: https://ccnso.icann.org/en/resources/cybercrime-resources.htm 2. 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? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Answer outstanding.
<p>Did the implementation have the intended effect? How was the assessment conducted?</p>
<p>Is the recommendation still relevant today? If so, what further work needed? If not, why not?</p>
<p>RECOMMENDATION 14: ICANN should ensure that its SSR-related outreach activities continuously evolve to remain relevant, timely and appropriate.</p>
<p>What was done to implement the recommendation? Was the recommendation fully implemented?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outreach activities have been expanded and are reviewed annually as part of SOP (Standard Operating Procedure). The Security team provides both a service function to ICANN's Global Stakeholder Engagement team as subject matter experts, and a community function in outreach and engagement in SSR matters. A new Engagement Interface allows the community to see upcoming SSR and related outreach and engagement activities. This is an on-going obligation. • SSR1 implementation report here (slides 40-42) • SSR2-RT briefing on this recommendation here (slides 28-32) <p>Questions & Answers</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the ICANN Engagement Interface, are all the SSR-Related outreach activities recorded or listed? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes, Global Stakeholder Engagement does have a tool where we capture our engagement events, called ICANN CRM. We are working to streamline the ICANN CRM in FY19-FY20 so that it captures all of the SSR-related outreach activities. Starting with FY19, Global Stakeholder Engagement will be reporting on its work across five areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity Development (which includes technical training and related engagement in the regions to support stakeholders become active participants in ICANN's technical and policy work)

- GSE Administration (This project covers administrative functions for the Global Stakeholder Engagement team, such as management of department budget, personnel, visas, allocation of resources.)
- Engagement Measurement and Planning (Project coordinates GSE Engagement, Measurement & Planning function, maintaining team goals and measurement of engagement. Management of GSE processes and procedures, inputs into ICANN CRM.)
- Cross-Organizational Collaboration (This project covers cross-regional and functional coordination activities for GSE with other ICANN Org departments (contributions to ICANN Strategic & Operational Planning, Community Engagement & Policy, event tracking, GDD-GSE engagement collaboration, support for Policy implementation, inputs to Enterprise Risk Management, inter-departmental collaboration). Travel and logistics for participation in ICANN Org workshops, regional meetings).
- Facilitation of Regional Participation in ICANN (This project covers Global Stakeholder Engagement work for enhancing cooperation and partnerships regionally to lower barriers to participation among stakeholder groups, and increase regional engagement within ICANN in its technical & policy work. This project includes the regional engagement plans and strategies, facilitation of regional events such as ICANN Readouts, regional DNS Forums, regional event sponsorships, contributions and collaborations).

2. When is the Annual Report for FY 2016-2017 going to be published as a community resource?

- The draft SSR Framework is expected to be published for Public Comment within 2018.

Did the implementation have the intended effect? How was the assessment conducted?

Is the recommendation still relevant today? If so, what further work needed? If not, why not?

RECOMMENDATION 15: ICANN should act as a facilitator in the responsible disclosure and dissemination of DNS security threats and mitigation techniques.

What was done to implement the recommendation? Was the recommendation fully implemented?

- ICANN published a [Coordinated Vulnerability Disclosure](#) document in 2013. While the framework and SOP is in place, staff notes that because facilitation of responsible disclosure is an on-going obligation the work in this area is ongoing.
- Staff collaborates with operators and trusted security community entities on DNS security threats and mitigation techniques. This is related to Recommendation 28.
- The Identifier System Attack Mitigation Methodology report can be found at: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/identifier-system-attack-mitigation-methodology-13feb17-en.pdf>
- SSR1 implementation report [here](#) (slides 43-45)
- SSR2-RT briefing on this recommendation [here](#) (slides 33-35)

Questions & Answers

1. Are there any metrics or statistics available for ICANN’s engagement with operators and trusted community entities on DNS security threats and mitigation techniques?
 - Such events are normally kept confidential unless the effected parties wish to discuss them openly. We do not have statistics.
2. Is there any record of the methodology in the Coordinated Vulnerability Disclosure Document ever being invoked since 2013?
 - The most noted was the JASBUG. After that, the only issue that invoked a process was the recent Adobe issue. ICANN has notified DNS providers of bugs when/if we find them but this does not invoke the process.
3. Are there any statistics available for the processes identified in the Coordinated Vulnerability Disclosure Document?
 - There are no statistics available for the processes as the process itself has been invoked frequently enough to warrant the investment of resources to track specific details.

Did the implementation have the intended effect? How was the assessment conducted?

Is the recommendation still relevant today? If so, what further work needed? If not, why not?

RECOMMENDATION 16: 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.

What was done to implement the recommendation? Was the recommendation fully implemented?

- [Outreach activities](#) and processes solicit input on the SSR Framework have been expanded and are part of ICANN's SSR SOP; activities are ongoing and are reviewed annually. For example: the Security team's ongoing work with security communities including the Anti Phishing Working (APWG), the Messaging, Malware and the Mobile Anti-Abuse Working Group (MAAWG) has resulted in participation by members of those communities in SSAC; through engagement with the International Criminal Law Network (ICLN) and Commonwealth Cybercrime Initiative (CCI), the Security team emphasizes the value of multistakeholder approaches to cybersecurity issues.
- Several [Regional Engagement Strategies](#) include SSR best practices and SSR topics are addressed by ICANN across all global regions. This is related to Recommendations 4, 5 and 14.
- At the request of stakeholders, the OCTO SSR team supports a variety of capability-building initiatives, such as DNSSEC training, ccTLD attack and contingency response training, law enforcement training, outreach at Network Operator Group meetings such as Caribbean Network Operators Group (CaribNOG), Middle East Network Operators Group (MENOG), among others.
- SSR1 implementation report [here](#) (slides 46-48)
- SSR2-RT briefing on this recommendation [here](#) (slides 38-41)

Questions & Answers

1. 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?
 - No. They are called Frameworks but had been named incorrectly on the SSR document archive. This page <https://www.icann.org/ssr-document-archive> has been updated with this correction.
2. What public engagement was done for the creation of the Frameworks and Annual Reports?
 - Outreach activities and processes solicit input on the SSR Framework have been expanded and are part of ICANN's SSR SOP; activities are ongoing and are reviewed annually. For example: the Security team's ongoing work with security communities including the Anti Phishing Working (APWG), the Messaging, Malware and the Mobile Anti-Abuse Working Group (MAAWG) has resulted in participation by members of those communities in SSAC; through engagement with the International Criminal Law Network (ICLN) and Commonwealth Cybercrime Initiative (CCI), the Security team emphasizes the value of multistakeholder approaches to cybersecurity issues. Information is available here: <https://www.icann.org/news/blog/identifier-systems-ssr-activities-reporting-en>
3. Is there a record showing how Community participation and input into the SSR Framework was incorporated?
 - Whenever a new framework is drafted it goes out for comment, which has its own ICANN processes.
4. 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?
 - Outreach by the SSR team is documented in various forms, for example through the engagement portal, SSR Activity reports and statistically through ICANN KPIs. All engagements are used as constant input into the development of the SSR frameworks and activities. SSR staff are currently writing a revision of the SSR Framework that will take into account the changes that occurred in the transition. That is taking longer than originally planned due to the need for a new approach.

Did the implementation have the intended effect? How was the assessment conducted?

Is the recommendation still relevant today? If so, what further work needed? If not, why not?

RECOMMENDATION 17: 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.

What was done to implement the recommendation? Was the recommendation fully implemented?

- See Recommendation 2 for information on how activities and initiatives relate to SSR priorities, objectives and goals and are integrated into ICANN's planning, budgeting and project reporting efforts.
- SSR1 implementation report [here](#) (slides 49-51)
- SSR2-RT briefing on this recommendation [here](#) (slides 4-29)

Questions & Answers

1. 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?

- All goals are incorporated into our internal systems that track activities to the strategic priorities. At-task is one of these systems.

2. Are there any metrics or statistics available for ICANN’s engagement with operators and trusted community entities on DNS security threats and mitigation techniques?

- Such events are normally kept confidential unless the effected parties wish to discuss them openly. I do not believe we have statistics.

3. Are there any statistics available for the processes identified in the Coordinated Vulnerability Disclosure Document?

- There are no statistics available for the processes as the process itself has been invoked frequently enough to warrant the investment of resources to track specific details.

Did the implementation have the intended effect? How was the assessment conducted?

Is the recommendation still relevant today? If so, what further work needed? If not, why not?

RECOMMENDATION 18: ICANN should conduct an annual operational review of its progress in implementing the SSR Framework and include this assessment as a component of the following year’s SSR Framework.

What was done to implement the recommendation? Was the recommendation fully implemented?

- Implemented as part of the [FY 13 & FY 14 SSR](#) Frameworks and will be repeated annually.
- The previous status of SSR RT implementation was published in [Appendix C](#) of the ATRT2 Report
- Elements of the SSR Framework are reflected in the Strategic and Operating Plans and budgets, with the status/progress being reviewed and reported annually for public input prior to the issuance of the following-year’s Ops Plan and budget. Information is posted [here](#).
- SSR objectives and goals are integrated into ICANN’s [Organizational \(structural\) reviews](#), as appropriate; these are scheduled every five years.
- SSR1 implementation report [here](#) (slides 52-54)
- SSR2-RT briefing on this recommendation [here](#) (slides 14-16)

No questions & answers.

Did the implementation have the intended effect? How was the assessment conducted?

Is the recommendation still relevant today? If so, what further work needed? If not, why not?

RECOMMENDATION 19: 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.

What was done to implement the recommendation? Was the recommendation fully implemented?

- The publication of the [annual SSR Framework](#) tracks progress against the activities committed to in the previous year’s Framework. This tracking mechanism, along with ICANN’s regular project management reporting, and operating plans and budgets, provide more details on SSR (see Recommendation 2 for more information) and are all part of ICANN’s SOP.
- SSR1 implementation report [here](#) (slides 55-57)
- SSR2-RT briefing on this recommendation [here](#) (slide 17)

Questions & Answers - **SOME ANSWERS OUTSTANDING**

1. 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)?

- Answer outstanding.

Did the implementation have the intended effect? How was the assessment conducted?
Is the recommendation still relevant today? If so, what further work needed? If not, why not?
RECOMMENDATION 20: ICANN should increase the transparency of information about organization and budget related to implementing the SSR Framework and performing SSR-related functions.
<p>What was done to implement the recommendation? Was the recommendation fully implemented?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Phase I) A planning framework and process is in place to provide public information about SSR-related plans, budgets and activities (as outlined in Recommendation 2). This is integrated with ICANN's SSR Framework and reports on SSR activities and expenditures. Periodic SSR activity reporting augments this public information. • (Phase II) Exploration was underway to identify mechanisms that provide more detailed public information on SSR-related budgets and expenditures across multiple ICANN departments. Staff also explored after-event-reports (for relevant threats) that include budget and resource impacts related to managing the event; A template for a public version of these reports has been published and can be found at: https://community.icann.org/display/SSR/Rec+%2320. This report will be published annually for every fiscal year, starting FY18. • SSR1 implementation report here (slides 58-60) • SSR2-RT briefing on this recommendation here (slides 30-37) <p>Questions & Answers</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 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? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No after-event reports have been published that include resource impacts related to managing the events. ICANN publishes an information security event log here: https://www.icann.org/cybersecurityincidentlog 2. 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recommendation 20 was implemented in March – April 2017. The public information on SSR-related budget and expenditures across multiple ICANN departments was posted for FY18 and can be found here: https://community.icann.org/x/CqNYAw 3. Department spending on EBERO? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The amount of FY17 Professional Services budget (\$2.3m) comprises the following main items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - data escrow services: \$930k - WHOIS studies (ARS design/analysis, parsing, accuracy testing, ARS phase 3): \$638k - EBERO services: \$353k - Background checks for registrar accreditation: \$100k The above items add up to \$2.0m. The remaining professional services included in the total are miscellaneous smaller items.
Did the implementation have the intended effect? How was the assessment conducted?
Is the recommendation still relevant today? If so, what further work needed? If not, why not?
RECOMMENDATION 21: 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.
<p>What was done to implement the recommendation? Was the recommendation fully implemented?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Phase I) A planning framework and process is in place to provide public information about SSR-related plans, budgets and activities (as outlined in Recommendation 2). This is integrated with ICANN's SSR Framework and reports on SSR activities and expenditures. Periodic SSR activity reporting augments this public information. • (Phase II) Exploration was underway to identify mechanisms that provide more detailed public information on SSR-related budgets and expenditures across multiple ICANN departments. Staff also explored after-event-reports (for relevant threats) that include budget and resource impacts related to managing the event; A template for a public version of these reports has been published and can be found at: https://community.icann.org/display/SSR/Rec+%2320. This report will be published annually for every fiscal year, starting FY18.

- SSR1 implementation report [here](#) (slides 61-63)
- SSR2-RT briefing on this recommendation [here](#) (slides 30-37)

Questions & Answers

1. 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?
 - ICANN's planning process ensures that activities planned and budgeted for, including those related to SSR, are identified by specific objectives. More information about the planning process is available here: <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/planning-en>
2. 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?
 - No. There was no plan in place to ask for public comment on the template. The FY18 report has been published and it can be found here: <https://community.icann.org/x/DKNYAw>
3. Can ICANN provide an update as to the status of phase two (identifying mechanisms that provide detailed public information on SSR-related budgets), and the steps still to be taken to ensure this recommendation is properly implemented?
 - Recommendation 20 was implemented in March – April 2017. The public information on SSR-related budget and expenditures across multiple ICANN departments was posted for FY18 and can be found here: <https://community.icann.org/x/DKNYAw>
4. Is there a link to the template described in the staff implementation report?
 - Since the template has now been put to use, the actual report for FY18 has replaced the template and it can be found here: <https://community.icann.org/x/DKNYAw>
5. Where is the budgetary information as it pertains to the SSR? And where is the cost benefit analysis for making these decisions?
 - The budgetary information relative to SSR can be found mainly under Objectives 2 and 3 in the Operating Plan and in the Budget by portfolio. As an example, see links to the F19 documents:
 FY19 Operating Plan: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/adopted-opplan-fy19-30may18-en.pdf>
 FY19 Adopted Budget by Portfolio & Project: <https://www.icann.org/resources/files/1215649-2018-05-18-en>

Did the implementation have the intended effect? How was the assessment conducted?

Is the recommendation still relevant today? If so, what further work needed? If not, why not?

RECOMMENDATION 22: 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.

What was done to implement the recommendation? Was the recommendation fully implemented?

- (Phase I) A [planning framework and process](#) is in place to provide public information about SSR-related plans, budgets and activities (as outlined in Recommendation 2). This is integrated with ICANN's SSR Framework and reports on SSR activities and expenditures. Periodic SSR activity [reporting](#) augments this public information.
- (Phase II) Exploration was underway to identify mechanisms that provide more detailed public information on SSR-related budgets and expenditures across multiple ICANN departments. Staff also explored after-event-reports (for relevant threats) that include budget and resource impacts related to managing the event; A template for a public version of these reports has been published and can be found at: <https://community.icann.org/display/SSR/Rec+%2320>. This report will be published annually for every fiscal year, starting FY18.
- SSR1 implementation report [here](#) (slides 64-66)
- SSR2-RT briefing on this recommendation [here](#) (slides 30-37)

Questions & Answers

1. 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?
 - The OCTO SSR team does not have projects specific to the new gTLD program. These would fall mainly under GDD, which the OCTO SSR team may support.
2. 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?
 - The public information on SSR-related budget and expenditures across multiple ICANN departments was

<p>posted for FY18 and can be found here: https://community.icann.org/x/DqNYAw. This report is updated annually and covers direct costs resulting from the activities required to perform the SSR Functions, direct costs of shared resource and the costs of support functions allocated to SSR.</p>
<p>Did the implementation have the intended effect? How was the assessment conducted?</p>
<p>Is the recommendation still relevant today? If so, what further work needed? If not, why not?</p>
<p>RECOMMENDATION 23: 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.</p>
<p>What was done to implement the recommendation? Was the recommendation fully implemented?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ICANN has in place funding allocated to allow SSAC and RSSAC to conduct work. The support funding has never been linked to, or conditioned by, any performance/output/content evaluation, thus maintaining adequate independence. • Established processes and procedures for WGs and ACs also support their decisions being reached in an objective manner that is free from external or internal pressure. • A publicly documented budget process for SO/AC input on the budget is SOP; for example, these requests have been published for FY 15. • SSR1 implementation report here (slides 67-69) <p>Questions & Answers</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 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? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - These are documented in the operational procedure. Both committees are undergoing review to improve the work as well. RSSAC Operational Procedures: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-000-op-procedures-23oct17-en.pdf. SSAC Operational Procedures: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/operational-procedures-27feb18-en.pdf.
<p>Did the implementation have the intended effect? How was the assessment conducted?</p>
<p>Is the recommendation still relevant today? If so, what further work needed? If not, why not?</p>
<p>RECOMMENDATION 24: ICANN must clearly define the charter, roles and responsibilities of the Chief Security Office Team.</p>
<p>What was done to implement the recommendation? Was the recommendation fully implemented?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Office of the CTO (including OCTO SSR), and the Office of the CIO closely coordinate to address the range of ICANN’s internal and external SSR responsibilities. The OCTO SSR team works on externally focused ICANN-related SSR issues, the CIO and team work on internally focused security issues, and the OCTO Research team looks towards future SSR risks and opportunities within ICANN’s limited scope and remit. • SSR1 implementation report here (slides 70-72) • SSR2-RT briefing on this recommendation here (slides 19-22) <p>No questions & answers.</p>
<p>Did the implementation have the intended effect? How was the assessment conducted?</p>
<p>Is the recommendation still relevant today? If so, what further work needed? If not, why not?</p>
<p>RECOMMENDATION 25: ICANN should put into place mechanisms for identifying both near and longer-term risks and strategic factors in its Risk Management Framework.</p>

What was done to implement the recommendation? Was the recommendation fully implemented?

- The [DNS Risk Management Framework](#) was [approved](#) by the Board in Nov. 2013.
- The risk management framework was introduced to the community at ICANN50 and ICANN51, with suggested risks from the community.
- ICANN has an Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) Dashboard that lists risks to be monitored and addressed.
- A [DNS Risk Assessment and DNS Resilience Model](#) was published in May 2014.
- An enterprise risk management framework is in place in the ICANN organization.
- SSR1 implementation report [here](#) (slides 73-75)
- SSR2-RT briefing on this recommendation [here](#)

Questions & Answers

1. 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?
 - ICANN org has established a revised risk management framework. This includes thus far establishing an org Risk Management Committee of the org execs, gaining approval for the org's first risk management policy, establishing a Function Risk Liaison Network in which each function is represented in a cross-functional team, and refreshed the risk register, which would be including risks into a formal framework. This framework is moving towards the most important elements of the Risk Management target operating model.
2. 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?
 - ICANN org has established a revised risk management framework. This includes thus far establishing an org Risk Management Committee of the org execs, gaining approval for the org's first risk management policy, establishing a Function Risk Liaison Network in which each function is represented in a cross-functional team, and refreshed the risk register, which would be including risks into a formal framework. This framework is moving towards the most important elements of the Risk Management target operating model.
3. 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?
 - The risk management framework applies to all ICANN org risks. The role of the VP, Risk Management (not Enterprise Risk Management) is to facilitate the application of the risk management framework.
4. Is there a final DNS risk assessment document (the linked to document is labelled 'draft') <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/dns-risk-consultation-28may14-en.pdf>, and have there been any updates since 2014?
 - There is no final document. DNS risk is included in ICANN's overall risk management.
5. 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 <https://features.icann.org/dns-risk-management-framework-report-and-implementation?language=fr>, and any follow up arising from such briefings.
 - There is no operational "DNS Risk Management Framework." ICANN org now has a risk management framework which covers all risks faced by ICANN org, not just the DNS. Regarding briefings to the BRC about the risk management framework, the BRC meetings have publicly available minutes. Minutes are published to this page: <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/minutes-2014-03-24-en>
6. 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?
 - We have not yet developed mechanisms to communicate more broadly on risk management. ICANN risk management will work with ICANN managements and the BRC on next steps.

Did the implementation have the intended effect? How was the assessment conducted?

Is the recommendation still relevant today? If so, what further work needed? If not, why not?

RECOMMENDATION 26: ICANN should prioritize the timely completion of a Risk Management Framework.

What was done to implement the recommendation? Was the recommendation fully implemented?

- See recommendation 25.
- The [Risk Committee of the Board](#) has agreed to the ERM strategy that the organization should pursue, and that this strategy includes at the minimum annual updates on risk assessments, mitigation plans assessment and risk governance.

- SSR1 implementation report [here](#) (slides 76-78)
- SSR2-RT briefing on this recommendation [here](#)

No questions & answers.

Did the implementation have the intended effect? How was the assessment conducted?

Is the recommendation still relevant today? If so, what further work needed? If not, why not?

RECOMMENDATION 27: ICANN’s Risk Management Framework should be comprehensive within the scope of its SSR remit and limited missions.

What was done to implement the recommendation? Was the recommendation fully implemented?

- See recommendation 25.
- The [Risk Committee of the Board](#) has agreed to the ERM strategy that the organization should pursue, and that this strategy includes at the minimum annual updates on risk assessments, mitigation plans assessment and risk governance.
- SSR1 implementation report [here](#) (slides 79-81)
- SSR2-RT briefing on this recommendation [here](#)

Questions & Answers

1. Please provide details of how the risk management has been staffed since SSR1 recommendations have been adopted by the Board.
 - Board Risk Committee, Risk Management Committee made up of the ICANN org executive team which provides oversight, VP Risk Management, Function Risk Liaisons who are staff members who represent each function for implementing the risk framework, and all organization personnel who own the risks inherent in their activities.
2. 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?
 - The ICANN organization staff members that were responsible for implementation of this recommendation are no longer with ICANN. Unfortunately, there is no historical record of how they assess “comprehensiveness” of the Risk Management Framework.

Did the implementation have the intended effect? How was the assessment conducted?

Is the recommendation still relevant today? If so, what further work needed? If not, why not?

RECOMMENDATION 28: ICANN should continue to actively engage in threat detection and mitigation, and participate in efforts to distribute threat and incident information.

What was done to implement the recommendation? Was the recommendation fully implemented?

- Identifier Systems SSR Activities Reporting: <https://www.icann.org/news/blog/identifier-systems-ssr-activities-reporting-834ea389-0f61-41d1-809e-b7a458633b87>
- As part of our continuing commitment to transparency and accountability, the Identifier Systems SSR department publishes an activities report. The report describes the activities ICANN performs to maintain the security, stability, and resiliency of the Internet's global identifier systems. These activities include collaboration with ICANN, security and operations, and public safety communities, where our staff serves several roles.
- The 1H 2015 activities report highlights ICANNs collaboration and stakeholder activities from January 1 through June 15, 2014. It summarizes activities performed as part of the identifier system SSR threat awareness and preparedness remit. It also provides progress reports on analytics or productivity improvement projects as well.
- [Coordinated Vulnerability Disclosure Reporting at ICANN](#)
- Posted the following Blogs:
 - [Threats, Vulnerabilities and Exploits –oh my!](#) 10 August 2015
 - [What is ICANN IIS-SSR?](#) 4 August 2015

[Is This a Hack or an Attack?](#) 15 September 2015

[Top Level Domain Incident Response Resource Now Available](#) 28 September 2015

- SSR1 implementation report [here](#) (slides 83-84)
- SSR2-RT briefing on this recommendation [here](#) (slides 36-37).

No questions & answers.

Did the implementation have the intended effect? How was the assessment conducted?

Is the recommendation still relevant today? If so, what further work needed? If not, why not?

- AOB
- Confirm Action Items / Decisions Reached