JENNIFER BRYCE: Good morning, everybody, and welcome to day one of the three-day SSR2 meeting in Los Angeles. Today is the 25th of January 2019. My name is Jennifer Bryce, ICANN Organization, and we'll go around the room and, everybody, if you wouldn't mind just saying your name for the record, and then I'll have a couple of administrative items to cover before I hand over to Russ. Thank you. So, to my left.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Negar Farzinnia, ICANN org.

NORM RITCHIE: Norm Ritchie.

BOBAN KRISC: Hi. Good morning. This is Boban Krsic.

LAURIN WEISSINGER Laurin Weissinger.

KC CLAFFY: KC Claffy.

ALAIN AINA: Alain Aina.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

RAMRISHNA PARIYAR: This is Ramkrishna.

MATOGORO JABHERA: Matogoro.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Russ Housley.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. And Brenda Brewer, ICANN organization is also on the line, and we have Naveed joining remotely also. So, just a reminder to everybody to please state your name before speaking for the record. I know it's hard to remember, but please try as much as you can to do that. Obviously, the meeting is being recorded. And with that, I will hand over to Russ. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I just wanted to spend a minute at the front here to share what I hope will be the flow of things through the three days. Today, I want to focus on the ICANN SSR. Before the pause, a huge amount of work was done, but I want to walk through that material, figure out what additional information we need, and who can provide the information that we need and who from the review team is going to go get the information we need.

If we have all the information we need, then I want to figure out who's going to pick up the pen for that piece and write that part of the report, and then [inaudible]. Okay.

Tomorrow, I want to focus on the DNS SSR. We're not as far along on that work, but Eric provided a document that had basically some big buckets in terms of topics in it. So the idea tomorrow morning is we'll sit down and see if we can [come to] consensus on those being the right big buckets, and if they are, we'll break up into groups, one for each bucket, figure out essentially the same things for those topics, what information we'd need, who's going to get it. If we already have everything for that particular topic – which would surprise me for that one – then we can figure out who's going to hold the pen.

And then for the third day, I want to spend some brainstorming time on what we want to do with the futures work stream and do some consensus work on the report for the SSR1 recommendations. So, that's an overview of the three days. We talked about it a little bit a week ago now on our call, so none of that should be a surprise to anyone.

Anyway, that's what I hope to get done in these three days. So, I'm going to turn it over to Boban to lead us through the work. What do you want projected from the Wiki?

BOBAN KRISC: Thank you, Russ. Before I start, I would like to welcome Denise. [Thank you.]

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you. Apologies, everyone, for being late. Traffic. And welcome to California. It's great to see all of you.

BOBAN KRISC: Thank you. So, Work Stream number two, and we talk about it in [our last] conference calls how we should or how we organize it. And I would propose let's start with the Wiki page and go through the material that we have here. So, I hope [you've done] your homework, and identify the relevant topics and documents and take a look in the output from October 2017.

Let's start with this one. After that, we should focus on the sub-subgroups' topics – let's call them so – because we mainly focus on six or seven topics in the Work Stream ICANN SSR. [What that means] we talk about the security framework, about the risk management process itself, business continuity strategies, operational planning and controls, incident response at ICANN, root server operation related to the DNS, and the [tasks related to] Global Domain Division.

And the idea is that we structure it and split it, and maybe two or three members of the review team take one work package and draft the report. So, that's how I propose to work on it, because I think it's the most efficient way, and [not] put all together the stuff and all work on them, because I think it's more efficient to structure it.

So, let's start with it, take out the summary, use the meeting summary of October 2017, and then we can go to – I think it's on the right side on the Wiki page in the front, to the draft report, and take a look in it.

So we started to draft it –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

BOBAN KRISC: Yeah, talking about this Google doc. So, as you can see, we start [inaudible] something who was – and who participates in interview from the ICANN side, who was which subject – metrics [inaudible] so here's the first topic, let's talk about the BCM. Xavier was there, the CFO of ICANN, and James, and we talked about the risk management framework, test methodology. They showed us the outcome of their assessments, we talked about risk treatment and how they identify the relevant processes in a business impact analysis that are relevant for ICANN. So we talk around about 1.5 hours about the topic, and that was the outcome. And there are some open questions. Maybe we should go to the open questions. Maybe someone can assist here. Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: [Oh, well, I'm talking?] Okay, great. Will do. Thank you, Boban. Your leadership on this has been so great, really useful. So it's been 15 months since we had this meeting. I think just at a base level, it would be good if those of us on the subgroup just did a quick check in with key staff about the key information to ensure that we've got the latest. So, have they updated their risk framework, their operating plan? And make sure that we check in on that, on the first couple of items.

I've reviewed the recordings and the notes from that meeting, and my recollection is that, broadly, the subgroup that was there at that meeting had a good degree of confidence and was very pleased with what we heard regarding risk management and their business continuity objectives. Their approach seemed to be really comprehensive, they seemed to have all the big items addressed.

So at the time, we didn't flag any particular issues with the reports and plans that they provided broadly, but as we got into some of the specifics, I think there were issues that were raised upon which we wanted more information, and I'll revisit that as we dig into it. Thanks.

KC CLAFFY: You were at that thing. You too? That's it. Three. That's good. Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sorry. Could we walk through it and see whether [we have] everything we need, or just need a check-in, or whether there's real questions that need answered and figure out who needs to be asked and who will do the asking?

DENISE MICHEL: I started just a very short table on the key elements, so reports and plans underpinning the key areas, and I'm happy to share that with the team, and I've indicated some notes on where we want to just do a quick check-in with staff and where we want to elaborate a little bit more on some of the questions that we asked, and answers that we got. Thanks.

KC CLAFFY: There's a big spreadsheet that we sent. Is that the same table you're talking about? Yeah, because that's not a small table. And how does that table relate to this? Should we be reviewing this one too? Wiki table 19 January 2019 that Jennifer sent out, I think.

JENNIFER BRYCE: So, those are the questions that were asked at the time and the answers on there. So it's a separate table from what Denise is talking about.

KC CLAFFY: But definitely in this table there seem to be some dangling things, so just I wonder, are we supposed to get closure on those, or is that part of what this conversation is?

DENISE MICHEL: I can use that table if people would find it to be useful. I think there were some issues raised that we don't have closure on. I can flag those on the table and flag items where I'm proposing we just need a check-in to make sure we have the most up to date information. Would it be more useful just to use that? Yeah. [inaudible] do that.

KC CLAFFY: Unless it's way too much.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, it's fine.

KC CLAFFY: Okay.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Right. These are questions that were asked at the meeting, and then obviously, the answer has been provided there.

MATOGORO JABHERA: Maybe we need to consider that, because we have a lot of documents and we might be on different pages, because we are struggling to get which document we are currently using. So we need to syntonizer so that we're on the same page. Thank you.

BOBAN KRISC: I'll to clarify it. So we have, I think, three main documents. We have this one here, it's the Google document named ICANN SSR day two. I think there is also one which is called day ono – I'm not sure – where we have drafted the outcome of the meeting. So this –

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible].

BOBAN KRISC: Yes. So, that's the outcome, and it's not really a report, it's only, let's say, a summary of issues that we identify. And we have also another

Google document. We should have another Google document. Can we – yeah, that.

DENISE MICHEL: If staff has a chance, it would be great to both drop in Adobe Connect and send to the e-mail list the ICANN SSR day one, ICANN SSR day two, and the table of questions, I think, are the three key things we want to discuss right now. Thanks.

BOBAN KRISC: [inaudible].

LAURIN WEISSINGER Can we just copy the text and put it in the shared one?

ALAIN AINA: Russ, I don't know [what looking forward we're expecting,] but could I suggest that from the preamble draft describe the methodology what we've been looking for? So for example, can we take it from there and see from the LA meeting what information we already have, some of these kind of things? Then we can consolidate the document later or whatever [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: That seems like a reasonable way forward. The preamble draft explains the process we were following, and so now we need to capture the results of that meeting and figure out what else we need. Does it make

sense to take this document and copy it to the end of that one as a mechanism?

We seem to be struggling with the Google doc, struggling with what we need to do.

ALAIN AINA: Then we have the key focus area from the preamble document, ICANN security framework, etc. So, I think I would suggest that we look at it and see if the meeting in LA, if we have done all we're supposed to do, or as we said, what do we need to do? And I think the document consolidation or whatever it is will – because we may also need to discuss and agree on – because when you see all of these things, [you look, there's a] lot of work to do, but we may not be able to cover all of this in detail. So we may brief us on the scope of what it is we want to do. Denise, can we try to take it from the preamble document? Okay.

BOBAN KRISC: I would propose not to add the draft [the three parts,] and we should add maybe – there is another document that is called [SR subtopic] ICANN SSR, and there you can find all key items, the seven topics, and the idea was to talk about different domains in each of the topics.

So maybe it's better because we have our topics there, and then we can maybe put the results from this document here, ICANN SSR, to the other one, because I think it fits better in the methodology approach, this one here. That's not really a draft report, it's only there are some questions here and there are some no answers to it. And the other one

is not so detailed. I think it's better to take a look at this one and then put those together and then try to identify here the relevant outcome and write it down in the first one. Okay.

MATOGORO JABHERA: Yeah, I think that would be the good option. We start with the preamble document, we match the draft report that Boban is sharing with answers on the same document, and that way, we might be in a position [where to find the same] so that we reach a point where we can have at least a final draft.

But there is something to consider, is that we as a team to review the ICANN SSR on the methodology from the standing point is that we will be having ICANN staff that has been contacted to give some response on the questions that are there, and the technical people, we review what has been given out, but also, we rely on the standard frameworks. We say, "Is there any division?" We can come up with a recommendation.

So, and then later on, we can also think of if some of these [items] affect a certain group within ICANN ecosystem, they could also be consulted to give an input on what we see is really happening on the ground. So I think this was – I'm thinking from my own perspective. Thank you.

ALAIN AINA: And Boban, I think you said we should go back to the original subgroup document, right? But if you remember, this was some brainstorming document, and we agreed that there's some item there we don't even

know if we need to cover. So that's why I'm saying that – so for me, what I see is because you had this meeting in LA, you'll be able to identify [the real] focus area, which seem to be in that preamble document.

So [otherwise,] if we go here, people can get lost. Those who were not here at the beginning can get lost.

BOBAN KRISC: Yeah, not this document, another one, Alain. We have different documents. So there is another one which is [inaudible] high-level description. Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: [Could you put a pointer to it?]

BOBAN KRISC: Yeah. I'm just dialing in the Adobe Connect. Just give me a second.

ALAIN AINA: And again, Boban, I think from all this document, the preamble seems to be the latest.

BOBAN KRISC: [Yeah.]

ALAIN AINA: So at least the latest one seems to have [inaudible] summary of [inaudible]

BOBAN KRISC: So that's the document that I mentioned. Yeah, it is. Jennifer, can you put it somewhere? It's linked on the Wiki page. And what we tried here is so when we scroll through the document, and let's say – okay, so maybe [this one here.]

So it's a high-level description, and we are talking here about internal security, stability and resiliency operation processes, and different topics like]GDD] operations, deployment operations of network infrastructure, EBEROs and so on. And maybe we can split it, these work items into, I don't know, maybe two review team members, and then they can try to consolidate these topics with the spreadsheets that we have with questions and answers, and the outcome of the October 2017 meeting in LA. So, that could work, because we are talking about operational stuff, the next chapter is about information security management, then we're talking about risk management, business continuity management, so these are the whole topics, and I think we can put it together with the preamble and say, "Okay, here's the structure, here are the seven work items, the key action steps," and then we try to link the whole outcome that we have to this one here."

ALAIN AINA: Boban, again, question to you is, the focus area we have in the preamble document, how different [is it] from this?

BOBAN KRISC: [They should be the same.]

ALAIN AINA: So if they're the same, I think maybe we should look at this, take this preamble document which is the latest one, and see if there are things missing, work item or anything missing, because [inaudible] document was original brainstorming on what we have to cover for this Work Stream. Right?

BOBAN KRISC: It's not the first version of the brainstorming document, so it's another version.

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible] years' worth of work.

BOBAN KRISC: Yeah.

ALAIN AINA: Okay. [I shouldn't be using] the brainstorming document. This is the adopted workplan for the sub-subteam back in 2017.

BOBAN KRISC: Yeah. We focused on these areas, on these topics in the factfinding meeting in LA.

ALAIN AINA: And this is what you used to prepare for the LA meeting?

BOBAN KRISC: Yeah.

ALAIN AINA: Okay. And then at the LA meeting, then you had the report. We have that document, [there in the] report, at least an idea of the data you collected and what is missing, what needs to be done.

BOBAN KRISC: Yeah.

ALAIN AINA: Okay. And then you started, I think you drafted the preamble document, right?

BOBAN KRISC: Yeah. You're right.

ALAIN AINA: Okay, so in this case, can then we go – okay, maybe to that preamble document? And look at [the focus areas] you've put there, which seem to cover what I expect this ICANN SSR to do, and from there, yeah, we'll see. For example, ICANN security framework and [inaudible]. Okay. Have you covered this fully in the LA meeting? Do we have all the detail? Etc. Then we [could go over these] kinds of things. Because if we don't have this kind of approach and methodology, we can spend a day and we will not be able to learn something. Yeah, because we knew at the beginning that even when you mention ICANN SSR, it's too broad. So for me, I think we already succeeded in narrowing it down to something.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, if I may, so we have a very – this Work Stream that's been going on for a couple of years has a discrete list of what falls with – that we want to focus on within SSR, ICANN. That dictated the topics that were covered at the face-to-face meeting. Boban wrote up a report that details who addressed those topics, how they were addressed, and now he's suggesting that we walk through those key areas, identify places where – it's been 15 months – whether any report or information that was provided by staff and that was discussed by this group needs to be refreshed.

There are certainly areas that we requested additional information, the questions were partially answered, or as often is the case, the responses raised additional questions, so there's a little bit more question due diligence, and then the team also should, I think, discuss who's holding the pen on what and how we are bringing this to closure. Right?

So, I volunteered to take the existing table, add a notes column, highlight a current link to any documents that have been updated in the last 15 months and make sure that we've got the latest information, highlight where additional questions or information is needed, and use that as a primary tracking document, [the] closure on material that supports our decision making in these areas. Boban, is that an accurate –

BOBAN KRISC: [Yes.]

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

ALAIN AINA: Yes, I think we seem to agree, but I think maybe we are now close to action. Jennifer, can you scroll down? Okay. I'm referring to [the] preamble document. You said this is what this subgroup looked at, so [this is what I'm saying, that] let's take it from here. First, do we think all of these things cover exactly or mostly what we need to do for the ICANN SSR? First, and then two, then we look at from here what we have done so far, and then this will probably take us to the other document, the information we have, the missing data matrix, etc., then we'll know for example where do we need – for example, are we all okay with ICANN risk management framework? Do we need some extra work? Etc. So, this is what I'm suggesting.

DENISE MICHEL: So, Alain, I think you're restating what I think Boban and I have just said. Right, so we're going to check to make sure that people around the table remain comfortable with this list and the decisions that we've made and revisited to create this list over the last two years. I guess one last chance to add something additional, then we'll review [where we're at] with each of these areas, and determine more information gathering and volunteers of who's holding the pen to write up a proposed findings and recommendations in this area. Have I framed that properly, Boban?

BOBAN KRISC: Yes.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah? Are you comfortable with that, Alain? I think we're on the same page, yeah.

ALAIN AINA: [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: Okay, good. I should say, add notes to the notes column that indicates we have the current information here.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay.

DENISE MICHEL: "Here's an updated version of the operating plan, we still need information on XYZ."

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. I volunteered to gather that up.

ALAIN AINA: I'm fine with this, so I just want us to discuss the scope and where can we go, [where we are going,] because one of the issues we had was also we have to decide the level of assessment we want to get, because some of them may require some confidential information. Then the question is, do you want to go in there, or just stay high-level with the public informations? Because yeah, we had this issue of NDA, [inaudible] sign an NDA to get some informations, etc. Do we need that?

KC CLAFFY: I thought we got past that issue before I showed up. Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

ALAIN AINA: But if you want to go and ask certain questions and gather some informations, then if you –

KC CLAFFY: I think in that case, we just say we're not doing that, therefore this is the limit of what we can say here. Is that fine?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Yeah.]

KC CLAFFY: Okay. So let's – so, are there other dimensions of the scope of this you want to talk about before we go into the final level of granularity, which I think is what the spreadsheet is?

BOBAN KRISC: So, I talked to Denise before we go to the spreadsheet, I would like to add here some information, a strawman version of the document here, because there is another Google doc, and that's what was the outcome of our brainstorming session where we on a more detailed level described this topic [series.] So we have five to six points to every main topic, and maybe we can use that then to say, "Okay, this is the bridge between this strawman version, between this document here that describes the subtopics in every topic," and then we have the outcome and then we can consolidate it and take a look in it, "Okay, what we need more to fulfill it?"

so I posted the link in the Adobe, [and I'll take a look] into it, and then we can only put [inaudible]. So when you click on the URL in Adobe chat, when you go to that first – that was the initial idea. Before we go

to LA, here are the seven key areas. The first one is ICANN security management, which is the same with the security framework of ICANN, and then we said, "Okay, here are different domains, and let's talk about these domains. So what about leadership roles, responsibilities and so on?" And can you scroll down, please, Jennifer?

So then we have – we tried to identify two volunteers which are responsible for the subgroup, and that was in this case me and James. Then there is a second key item [inaudible] business continuity, and when you now go back to the strawman version of the preamble, then you will also find this topic here, and [as a next detailed] level.

So we talked in LA about business continuity objectives and plans, operational planning and controls, business continuity strategies and so on. So that's the next step, and we have this description for every one of the seven topics, so we can go to the strawman version of the preamble, maybe structure it like this, and then say, "Okay, we talked about that one in LA, here's the outcome, and now we have the table with maybe missing information." And yeah, so we can try to close the loop between all these documents here. And I would say this one is pretty good for a bridge to what does it mean, what you can find when you talk about risk management at ICANN or about security framework for ICANN or business continuity at ICANN. So, [what do you think about it?]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Aren't these the same seven topics that are already called out in the preamble?

BOBAN KRISC: They should be the seven, yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

BOBAN KRISC: So, it's the next level. It's only more detail, this information here, but they are the same. They should be the same, because we are talking –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Good, I was just making sure I hadn't lost track. And so it seems to me that these then become the topics to walk through to say, "Do we have everything we need to write about, say, documented risk assessment process?" And if so, we can assign someone. If not, figure out what we need to do.

BOBAN KRISC: That's the idea.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Great.

BOBAN KRISC: Yes? Perfect.

MATOGORO JABHERA: Maybe, Boban, do we have an outcome from the LA meeting? Do you have the document of such kind of the outcome of the [meeting in order to] to try to address some of these topics so that we also – because we have already seen the preamble, we've seen the prior document before the meeting, do you have a document that [outlines] the outcome of the LA meeting? Because I remember before going to the meeting, there was some issues that were raised that some of the issues that we were addressing are out of the scope and [inaudible] so maybe we need to see so that we reach a point where we can now start with – somewhere to start. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. And you're referring to, [I think,] a misunderstanding of the use of a broad term of auditing, which some people interpreted as some detailed professional financial audit. It was being used as a very loose term to indicate that we're going to broadly review ICANN's responsibilities and activities in this area because we're charged to do that as part of our remit.

So after we worked through that misunderstanding, there wasn't really any disagreement about – all of this clearly is within our remit. Most of it actually also [follows up on] the requirements of recommendations in the original SSR1 review report. And Boban did a write-up of what you've seen here, of what we addressed and how these points were addressed. And then there are links to the material on the Wiki and slides that are referenced in the meeting in LA.

I think it would be helpful if staff could spend some time pulling things together in one document for ICANN SSR and sort of working with Boban to make sure that everyone is looking at the right thing under [ICANN's] context for it, because as Boban said, he's got the preamble of this Work Stream, he's got the initial key categories we agreed to look at, he's got the outline of the results of the two-day meeting where that due diligence was done, and then you've got a bunch of documents, materials related to that that I think are parked under background materials that relate directly into, "This is the version of the operating plan we walked through in this meeting," so there's layers of detail and specificity here that I think is a little bit challenging for people to follow, but that's the course that was taken.

BOBAN KRISC: And Matogoro, just one clarification. There is no report beside this one [inaudible]. Yeah, that's the only outcome from the meeting in LA. That was the drafted audit report. That was the first document here. So, we have this drafted report, and we have the table with question and answers and a reference to documents that Denise mentioned. But there is nothing else, so everything that we have is linked here from the Wiki page.

MATOGORO JABHERA: Okay. So, after – of course, we went through a number of [history,] so after the meeting, there was no actual drafted report that addresses specific response from the questions that were raised from the team, right? That's what you're speaking?

BOBAN KRISC: That's a table, [the] document with question and answers.

MATOGORO JABHERA: Okay.

BOBAN KRISC: Yeah, so I think two weeks after the meeting in October, they paused us, and that's a problem, because James had [– some noticed, yeah,] James isn't anymore here. So [we can try also] to reach him to say, "Okay, just send me the stuff that you have" to consolidate it, but that was a problem. So we started initially with the reporting, and then they paused the whole process, and that's it. So what we have is here, and we should start with these documents that we have and try to structure it. And I think now everybody in this room has an idea of what we have and how we can structure it. And now it's a question, okay, how to go through it?

So we have this one here. It's the next detail level to the strawman preamble version, and we have the outcome, the drafted report, [and any questions, answers with] related document. So they are the main documents that we have, and now it's up to us to say, okay, let's try to consolidate it and then go through it.

MATOGORO JABHERA: Okay, so does the table for question and answers contains all the questions that were asked by the team?

BOBAN KRISC: Not all of them, but I think most of them. Maybe 80%, yes. And then we have still some outcome in the drafted report document. There is also something. [But this document] [inaudible] [we should address all these] [inaudible] related here. And then if we find something where we say, “Okay, there's still more information needed,” then we can write it down and then ask ICANN staff to provide more information on this.

MATOGORO JABHERA: Yeah, I think it’s okay, because [it’s us being the wrong way, and] we are lucky that we still have Boban and Denise, they could also be part of the team when we could be missing someone to ask all this.

KC CLAFFY: And Eric.

MATOGORO JABHERA: Yeah, thank you.

KC CLAFFY: Norm was [inaudible] for that meeting.

ALAIN AINA: Boban and Denise, once again, I think we almost agree. This document, I think, I understood that this is what you used to prepare for the LA meeting.

BOBAN KRISC: Yes.

ALAIN AINA: [Okay.] And at the meeting, you had them – before the meeting, if I recall well, you had a questionnaire, right? And then after the meeting, you produced this document. So, I think it may be difficult for people to catch up [on these things,] so we need to adopt a methodology for everybody to understand. That's why I think, let's not focus on consolidating the document now. [Let's say that you have to lead us, the way that we all] understand what this subgroup is about to do and what you have done so far, etc. Then we can now talk about document. We talk about document later. So we seem to be spending time [on which] document, but for me, I think it's not yet clear for people around this table.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, I'm confused on what we're trying to achieve right now. So we had the subteam that did this work, and it was paused shortly afterwards, so there is not a good record of what was accomplished. But at this moment in time, are we trying to identify for the whole team on what was done and what the results were, or are we trying to find a path for the subteam? Or is it something else? I'm actually confused.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. What I was hoping to do is go through each of these items, find out whether we have everything we need. If so, assign someone to go

write that down. If there's something we need, then figure out who's going to get it and from where.

NORM RITCHIE: Okay, so because this is now 15 months old, there's kind of two conditions to that. Did we have the information we need at that point in time, and has anything changed since that's of importance?

RUSS HOUSLEY: There's two reasons that we might need more information. One is 15 months have passed. The information we have is stale, we need to refresh it. Or we never had everything we needed, and we need to identify the gap and then fill it.

NORM RITCHIE: Okay, so should we just then not just start going through the list of seven items here and discussing them? I'm trying to be helpful in finding a path forward, because we're spinning.

RUSS HOUSLEY: We are spinning, I completely agree with that. So, if we start with number one, it has seven subpoints. Has the leadership roles and responsibilities been captured? Has it changed? And then we can go to the next one. I think that we need to just be very methodical about this in order to get through this and identify who's going to do what next. Boban, I don't know what that look means.

KC CLAFFY: I guess the issue is we're looking to the subteam because we weren't there. So, is there literally not another word of text about any of these than what's in the spreadsheet, or did somebody star to write up the impressions of that meeting? Which I thought [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: There would be a transcript as well, right?

DENISE MICHEL: My recollection is that, again, the team was suspended by the board soon after this happened, and so Boban did an outline of here are the key things that we dove into, and gave a sense of all the things that were covered at that meeting. Staff put down in a table questions that were raised. Some of the questions [were not in the] table, they need to be added. And that's where things were left.

KC CLAFFY: Nothing's been done since then?

DENISE MICHEL: Nothing's been done since then, right?

BOBAN KRISC: [No, nothing.]

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. And so the path before us is to review the elements in the outline, and the questions in the table, flag additional things we need to check on, information we need to gather, questions we need to get answered, and divide up perhaps the issues so different people are volunteering to do a writeup on risk management framework, operating plan, however we want to divide it up so we can then come back to the team with draft language that says, here's the issue we addressed, here's our findings, here's our proposed recommendations so you actually have text you can start marking up and agreeing or disagreeing with, I think, is the path forward Boban was outlining.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah. Again, given the time lag here and that some of the people are no longer with us, it's going to be fuzzy. This is 15 months ago, the notes are not detailed, so we're actually, I think, up against the first question, do we have to redo this?

DENISE MICHEL: Those meetings were recorded, and I believe a transcript is available as well. I think some substantive staff work on these issues, on the LA meeting can help pull together all of this so we have a clear sense of what is our starting point here and what do we need to revisit as a group and what do we feel comfortable we've got enough information on. But as Norm said, we definitely need to hear from the rest of the group about – assuming all of you have had a chance to review the material from this workstream, do you find it to be fulsome enough, or

are you at the point where you want to reopen some of these issues, I think, is also a question on the table.

KC CLAFFY: I heard you say with some confidence that you sort of got a lot out of that meeting. There was a lot of substance that occurred that meeting. And now I'm hearing you saying with some substantive staff support we could kind of get what we needed in terms of content to do this assessment.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Laurin?

KC CLAFFY: Hold on. I'm trying to figure out what's the method forward. Are you saying among the subset of us, somebody has to go listen to all those meetings again, read through the transcript, try to map it to the bullets that are on this thing, and then maybe staff is going to help with some of that? Or hire a consultant to do all of that.

LAURIN WEISSINGER So, I'm wondering, can we do something that's in the middle? I'm not sure we have to redo. I hope not. But if we break up people in the room, can we do this more efficiently? Kind of look at only one issue and see if we can reach some level of some idea of what we need to do or what is being done, preferably [obviously from] one person who has been

present on each group. Would that work, or would this take too much time?

Sorry for looking at you, but you were the two there.

ALAIN AINA: I think at some point, we have to [– then I'll call for the chair,] so we have to move on. And I think first thing we need to do is that when we did this subteam agree on item for example, we didn't have KC, we didn't have Ross, etc. So, I say let's look at the thing and see if we as a group now agree, and what do we think should be done for this ICANN SSR first? I think if we do that, it will help us to determine the way forward.

KC CLAFFY: I've looked at it, because it was sent out and I thought that was part of what I was supposed to do. So, I did it. And I'm fine with it. I'm not saying it's what I would have come up with. I wasn't on the review team then. And I don't think we have the resources – and I'm not going to question the judgment of that review team, I think that's a perfectly reasonable job that they did.

I don't know how to get from there to the final product, and I think Denise has probably nailed it, and I guess I heard other people saying this. At the beginning – I heard other people had said it before I got here – this is an enormous amount of work to put this into something that is coherent and usable by the community. It does not look to me, based on my experience with this review team, short as it may have been, that

that is going to happen by a volunteer effort. At least not by this set of volunteers. No offense, but we're all super busy.

And I think that's why Laurin is going to, "Well, can we do something in the middle?" But what does it look like? What do we think the output looks like, besides, "Okay, we did this, we had the conversation, the transcript is public, people can go look at this if they care." I'm still trying to figure out what is the methodology for going forward, and to the consulting point, that seems to be a big point, because we're talking about where are we going to get the resources to do this when the participation of the review team thus far – and from the short time I've been here, I observe it to be low.

ALAIN AINA: I think this is a good discussion I want us to have, because you just raised other things I think we should discuss, resources, and are we able to do this as volunteer? Etc. So I think this is what I'm saying, that let's have this general discussion on the SSR [meetings and – okay?]

KC CLAFFY: I hear you, but I think that that's a recipe for spinning our wheels. So, we may be coming to the conclusion – and I'm sort of getting there on my own here, is, this level of work cannot be done by a volunteer review team. And maybe that is an output in our report, "This is what we think needs to be done, it cannot be done in the current context." And I think there's also a lot of baggage because of this shutdown that we had, that it doesn't look to me like we've recovered from.

ALAIN AINA: So, you're drawing this conclusion based on the work item, so if we change the work item, [will it] be acceptable for you to put the work item such that it can be done by volunteer?

KC CLAFFY: [It's not] clear to me, because like I said, I look at this outline and I think, "Solid outline, reasonable things to look at." You're saying, "Let's just cut 80% of it out so we can do the job?" Is that what we're going to put in the report? That we just cut it down to a few things we all could do?

ALAIN AINA: One way of doing this is the scope and the scale you want to attribute to this. [I can just] review these things by asking questions, and based on the answer I do, I don't need to go in depth. It depends on the level, scope we want to –

KC CLAFFY: It sounds to me like that's exactly what happened, is it not?

RUSS HOUSLEY: We need to get the other people who are waiting in the discussion. Norm, then Denise.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, KC, I think you hit exactly the crux of this whole problem. When you look at SSR, [the organization] part of that is akin to a security audit, and it goes towards the maturity of the organization as far as security goes. So they don't have security certification now, and without that, the ask then becomes basically to cover all those areas that would be covered, at least as far as security goes, under those areas.

So if we're stuck in that mode, do we go deep, which is a lot of work, or do we not do the job properly? And that's really what we're debating. And I think we debate it for a long time and it's got mixed up with what is scope and what is everything else. It really is, the job is this, but it is a huge task. So, where do we cut down? Or we just say, "We did this," and say "That's where we are, that's what we did, our recommendations going forward is whatever, you should do security audits or go for a security certification?"

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, I agree with Norm, and I wanted to clarify, for any board members listening, Norm used the word "audit" with a lower case A, and as the replacement for a broad assessment of this area. Right, Norm?

NORM RITCHIE: [Yes.]

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. Okay. So, I e-mailed a draft proposed sort of Work Stream template, and it's just a draft. And apologies, I haven't had a chance to discuss it with the rest of the leadership team or the committee, but I

throw it out as a first draft so people can comment on what form the output might take for our Work Streams. So it's on the e-mail list when you have a chance to look at that.

I think that there is a middle ground here where we acknowledge the level of due diligence that was done, the findings based on that level of due diligence, because it's not going to be really deep due to our resources and time, and then our recommendations drawn from that would be stated if we felt like this is an area where we think more work needs to be done, we recommend the following actions, and I think that that to me speaks to a middle ground that Laurin raised which is we do what we can, what we feel is appropriate given our time and resources, and if we feel that it' an area that deserves more attention, that would be part of our recommendation. That's the way I'm thinking about this. I just wanted to share that.

KC CLAFFY: I want to propose a way forward. Can the subteam go do that exact thing, what they think would be a good example of that exact thing, for one of these areas? And then we can try to mimic it. Can they do it today?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I would like to not do that, because that basically says, "Let's stop while the subteam goes and does that." What I'd like to consider is picking one of these bullets and understanding where the answers are so we can pull them together, and then we can divide this list and get some parallelism.

KC CLAFFY: I'd be fine with that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right. So, let's just pick one, sub-bullet one, leadership roles and responsibilities, have where's the answer to that, is there additional information needed, is the information we have stale, and has it changed? And see if we can do one little nugget like that to the point that we're all happy? Then we can divide and conquer. Can you walk us through that, Boban? Yes or no.

BOBAN KRISC: Okay, yes. Thank you. Let's start not with the [information security measures.] Let's start with risk management, because risk management, there are only three bullets. The first one is the process, then the risk treatment, and then criteria for risk assessment and risk [assessment.]

So, when we take this one and go to the Google doc, and to the spreadsheet, and look for risk management, maybe we'll get some answers. Not this one, the outcome Google doc. The day two doc, yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: So we have the material that's parked in the ICANN background part of the Wiki that includes the presentation on risk management. The elements are how they're addressing risk management. So all that material, I think, is in background. So, I think questions that were – I think [inaudible] questions that we may want to make sure that we

understand include – let me see – around – sorry, I've got a lot of documents open.

So, for example, in risk management, they talk about the DNS risk assessment document. They indicated there was a draft document on DNS risk assessment. [I think] an obvious question there is what's the status of that. Does that remain in draft form? Is there a plan [defined?] Hm?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

DENISE MICHEL: No, is there a plan for finalizing it? I think it would be useful just to make sure that we have a clear understanding of the DNS risk assessment document, what it contains and how the organization is using it. I think that's an example of one area where it would be useful to check in.

BOBAN KRISC: So, that's a good point, because when we go to the spreadsheet and the table with question and answers, then we will find these questions, and also the answer to this [inaudible]. And the question was, is there a final DNS risk assessment document? And the answer was there is no final document. Yes, this one here.

And there are still more. I don't know, two or three questions regarding risk management. And I think with these documents, we can get an idea of what we can recommend about this topic, because the process itself,

the methodical approach and so on is described here, so we have a lot of documents that are [referenced] to it.

Xavier shows us also a spreadsheet how they do their risk assessment at ICANN and how they treat the risks that they identify and how they mitigate with controls these risks. So I would say from a methodical approach, [they are fine.]

And the related questions that were open, there are answers now, and they're linked here in the document. And I think with this information, we can go and recommend something.

DENISE MICHEL: I think another issue – I believe it was originally raised and questions were asked by James Gannon, who's no longer on the committee, but I think a relevant area that the team may want to consider, and that was around the PTI-related exercises. The staff indicated that there aren't PTI-specific continuity exercises and that they're seeking to develop a plan to conduct those exercises. I think that's another good thing that would be fruitful for the team to check in on to make sure we understand what the status is of these exercises, whether they've been completed, the outcome, and what the general approach is to ongoing PTI exercises. Thanks.

BOBAN KRISC: So, [do these two] examples help understand it, or do you need more information about [inaudible] the level of [we talked with the people?] Because [inaudible]

LAURIN WEISSINGER: It makes sense to do what Russ said, like we break up, we check what is in there, what is not in there, what are the answers we need, what is missing, and based on that, we work through it. Because we did exactly that for SSR1, but we also said, "Look, the answers that were given or the answers that are available are insufficient to give an answer," which then leads to exactly what we did with SSR1, which is like, "Okay, this is apparently not fully implemented," which then leads to our recommendation. I think while this is not a proper audit and we again have to underline that this is not within our capabilities, we can make these high-level recommendations which will probably go from reviewing the document, having done my homework, will be essentially very similar. Right? We will be saying, "Well, you're doing stuff, but there is often no clear information, there is not enough data, there are not enough reports to really do that." I would propose we just try to go ahead, try to get some clarity and see what is missing.

And I would say, as I said, let's try to break up, because in this large group, it's really difficult. It would be much easier if it's like a group of two, three people, to really focus on something.

KC CLAFFY: I agree with that, but I want to kind of get closure on this risk management. So I'm looking at the top three rows of the spreadsheet, this Wiki spreadsheet, and this did help a lot, because now I'm rereading those answers to this, and it still boggles my mind a little bit that the

entirety of this conversation about this topic seems to be what's in these two columns of this spreadsheet.

So, it does seem that there's ore that could be added, there's more clarification and there's more substance ion the final document. So, I guess we have to turn this into some Google doc online so we can all edit it at the same time. But certainly, it seems to me like the notes column here, back to Denise's proposal, would include follow-up questions based on the answers in this column. Like it's pretty skeletal, the answers they're providing, so, can you please expand on – rather than saying board risk committee, what is the process? [Is there anything around that?]

And then obviously, in the third row, the final document, is there a final document? What does it say? Can we read it?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, that's, I think, really helpful, KC. As part of the meeting and the due diligence for the meeting, we looked at the risk management report and the process they used to create that report, and the CFO then gave a presentation on the report, and the steady state how that's all handled. What we don't have was written reactions from the team. Boban was providing anecdotal responses that, yeah, everything looked in order. Applying a reasonable business standard to this report and methodology and what they're doing, and the resources they had, they apply towards it. Anecdotally, the teams who were there came away with the sense that, yeah, they've got this handled.

We've got a few questions about some supporting documentation, but we, after delving into this and talking to staff, there was an anecdotal response that this isn't an area of concern for this subcommittee group that delved into it. Does that help?

KC CLAFFY: It'd be great if the review team had the set of tabs in our browsers of all the documents that we might –really, this is where you just want a Google doc and search all the documents that might have the word "risk management" in it and look at the transcript and look at any other documents that were provided, look at the spreadsheets, and then we just take what we can get and we put something into this column. And we divide it up in two people, each take some ten of the recommendations or however many, and we come back together at lunch, and see how far we get. And when we exchange, "Here's where I struggled. Give us some advice because you guys were there."

So that means we need [– are all those] URLs on some Wiki page and we can just click them all and they'll all open in our browser and we'll go off and do this – Negar's looking at me like I'm on some –

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, KC, I think that's part of what we're struggling with, is that we're sort of missing a layer of substantive support that pulls everything together and says, "This is where you need to focus your attention. One, two, three was done, here's the supporting links where you can find the work that went into this. Here are the three things left to do." And we're left – I think members particularly, it's very – I mean, members

who have been here the whole time have a hard time finding everything, but the new members that weren't here when all this occurred, I don't know how you're managing to follow all this and read all this. It is really challenging.

KC CLAFFY: I did go back and read part of this October meeting transcript in June because I was a sucker for punishment, and I don't remember it now. And it's not been 18 months for me. So, yeah, we need to go – but I can't imagine staff can know how to find all this stuff either, because there's a lot of stuff there. Okay, so besides the transcript, what are the other URLs that we need open in my browser for me to do this? And I'm trying to figure out what's the right datamining approach so that I can search everything out at once, maybe put it on my laptop and then use.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think Jennifer just posted several of the URLs. The only one that's not there, I think, is the transcript. Is that right?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Well, let me know which documents you want.

RUSS HOUSLEY: [Only the transcript.]

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay.

DENISE MICHEL: I think he's unilaterally called for a biobreak.

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible] nine minutes ago. I don't know if the memo got out, but Laurin and I have a conference call with somebody at 11:00, so we were hoping to push that break to 11:00. But biology has priority. Norm and Denise, do you remember any other besides the transcript that we should be [grabbing] as we do this exercise?

DENISE MICHEL: Staff, correct me if I'm wrong, but all of the relevant foundational materials and presentations are found in the background material part of the Wiki. Is that correct?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Correct.

DENISE MICHEL: And so I think if staff has a chance to pull those links together, then it would be easier for the team members to say, risk management, here is the relevant background material links if you actually want to look at all the background, the presentations, the risk management report, links to the board committees that are dealing with risk management, that stuff.

KC CLAFFY: At the granularity of those seven categories, you mean?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

KC CLAFFY: Oh, that would be extraordinarily helpful.

DENISE MICHEL: If that's what you want to do.

KC CLAFFY: Well, yes, I guess I was thinking in terms of a spreadsheet which is broken up into those seven already and the rows each have a tag that is associated with –

DENISE MICHEL: You mean the spreadsheet that reflects the questions that were raised? Yeah, those are questions, that doesn't include the foundational material that was reviewed.

KC CLAFFY: You had another spreadsheet that was more.

DENISE MICHEL: No, I was just working through this question spreadsheet, adding questions that were asked but didn't appear on this spreadsheet, questions for which there's outstanding material needed. That's all.

KC CLAFFY: But I assume that set of questions did come from – open questions with respect to those seven categories.

DENISE MICHEL: Absolutely. And were literally raised in – the meeting was structured around those seven categories, and this Excel spreadsheet, my understanding is staff created it based on the questions that they captured from the two-day meeting that addressed those seven categories.

KC CLAFFY: So let me just ask you guys. Do you think going from this granularity that we already have where there's questions and answers is a reasonable place to start, or should we be starting back up at the seven and trying to make up new questions based on these bullets?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm worried that we won't figure out what we already know or have in the documents if we don’t just walk through these and work with what we've got.

KC CLAFFY: Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: And then find out what we're missing. But if we don't do one, we're just talking about what we're going to talk about instead of talking about it.

KC CLAFFY: And I would also make the case that in the context of time and resources, I think what we're missing, we have to say, "We're missing this. That's for some other person to do with resources." But we'll decide when we get there how serious are the things we think we're missing.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Norm, then Laurin.

LAURIN WEISSINGER So then in terms – if we have seven things, I would say let's do this one, kind of together, and as soon as Eric's here, we have got three people who have been present –

RUSS HOUSLEY: [Four.]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Four.

LAURIN WEISSINGER Four? Oh, wait.

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible].

LAURIN WEISSINGER Perfect. Exactly. So not present present together, and we go through it and we try to get it done, and then we kind of come back together.

KC CLAFFY: Yes.

LAURIN WEISSINGER Done.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's exactly what was suggested an hour ago. Let's do it. Let's do the one, please.

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible]. What is the type of diction we want in this notes column? So let's do it for row one, two, three.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, Boban suggested we do this for the risk management. Let's just do it.

BOBAN KRISC: I would say it's the easiest [inaudible] yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Alright. Could you walk us through this table then? For the risk management part, do we have the information we need? If not, what do we need to go fetch? Or is it stale? Same questions we had at the beginning.

BOBAN KRISC: Two minutes, yeah?

KC CLAFFY: I'll do it. Look, I'll do it, guys. We don't have details here. The question was, "Please provide in writing details on how the risk management [inaudible] staff." So, we have three words here and there. Risk management committee, that's the board thing, that's the internal thing, made up of ICANN Org exec team which provides oversight [inaudible] risk management function risk liaison [for] staff members who represent each function for implementing the risk framework and all Org personnel who own the risks inherent in their activities.

That seems to me to be like a title or caption of a diagram, but not actually the details of how it actually occurs. So, what we want is the details. We want the paper that goes with this caption. I assume it exists, I think some parts of it exist. So, I don't think we're asking ICANN to make up all new text here.

So I think that that's maybe our notes, is, could we have an expansion of this brief description with some brief details? Is that ...

NORM RITCHIE: Do we want to go to that level of detail? I need that for my own guidance? Knowing that a risk committee exists and the board risk committee exists, do we have to actually say like who are the members of it or stuff?

KC CLAFFY: Fine question. And okay, so now I'm a little bit trusting that the question was the right question, do we think we need the details?

DENISE MICHEL: I think, again, staying at a high level, I think it's reasonable to document at a high level the structure and process that's used on an ongoing basis to maintain and update the risk management structure at ICANN. So, I think a little more details, still staying at a high level, would be appropriate.

KC CLAFFY: Why don't we just say, "Where is the URL where this is documented on ICANN's website?" The public version, we're not asking for any private details. So I know [OCTO because] I did for my recommendation homework, OCTO, the architecture of OCTO inside of ICANN is actually documented on the website. There's an org chart, there's names, there's roles and responsibilities. So, I bet there must be something like that. Maybe it doesn't have as much detail, but let's let ICANN tell us, what do they have that documents this on the website? I think [inaudible] column, and then let's do row two.

DENISE MICHEL: I think that's a great suggestion, KC, and I think for general guidance to staff when they reply to questions that the review team asks – yeah, URLs and links are a pretty important, just a general statement I don't think is enough for us to draw our conclusions and also include in the final report as findings to give the broader public confidence that we indeed did our due diligence.

KC CLAFFY: And I guess we want to walk this line of we're hoping we're not asking ICANN to create a whole bunch of new content. We're hoping that it's already on the website. And so we have to walk that carefully, and maybe Jennifer and Negar can give us some real-time feedback on, "We can get you that but it might take a month." Then maybe we'll reevaluate what we ask for, because we don't want to wait a month. And decide whether it's really important to wait or something.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Sorry, can you repeat what you want to add in the notes?

KC CLAFFY: So in this case, I guess the notes column would be at the very minimum, “Is there a public URL that documents this in a little bit more detail? Is there a risk management framework description on the website?”

BOBAN KRISC: I found the risk committee of the board, and Kaveh is also part of the risk committee. And I'm [now] looking for the risk management processes.

KC CLAFFY: Okay, let’s see row two. Again, it feels to me like these exercises, if they occur, are probably documented somewhere. And we’re not interested in a secret version of this, we just want to know what happened, how are they designed. Whatever ICANN is comfortable saying publicly, I think, is what we should be evaluating. And then as we seek to develop a plan to conduct future exercises, they talk about personnel changes, so now we have this and we can have the advantage of having 15 months later, what's the current status of that? Anyone else?

DENISE MICHEL: I agree with that. I'm also writing notes in the notes column and I'll then circulate it, make sure that everything people think needs to be done is captured here. So I think that'll help with our follow-through.

KC CLAFFY: Great., Any other comments? Or from the cyberspace?

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, just doing a quick Google search, I see documents going back to 2012, 2013, 2011, but it doesn't look like they've been updated since.

DENISE MICHEL: I haven't found anything post '13 in the public realm, but again, it's often difficult to find things on the website.

KC CLAFFY: '13? I didn't think – was PTI existing in '13?

DENISE MICHEL: This is general ICANN risk management. So we're jumping back to the first question.

KC CLAFFY: Can we move to row three? Alright, row three, we need the document. And again, to the extent that DNS risk is included in risk management, where is that documented?

BOBAN KRISC: I found a URL, but it doesn't exist anymore. Maybe Jennifer [can try] to find this document. The name is summary risk management process

from January 23rd 2015, and it should describe the whole process itself. And I can send you – well, [you also documented where these documented references.] It's in the chat, in Adobe chat.

DENISE MICHEL: Could staff put in Adobe chat the key risk management links that are on the ICANN website? It's just hard to find doing a Google search.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm hoping we can get these three done before your call at 11:00, and then take the break, we can maybe get all the links organized during the break, and then when we come back from the break, we can hopefully take the other six into little groups and get there.

KC CLAFFY: Since it's been in every answer so far, I guess I take Denise's point that it would have been good if before this meeting, we could have asked, somebody could have asked ICANN staff to put a link inside each of these answer columns. Maybe we try that.

And again, it's not about trying to create a bunch of new content. If it's not there, that informs our conversation, we move on. I don't want to [see a mire.] Or if it's not public, that also informs our conversation, and we can move on. But in all cases, step two is let's move on.

Are we waiting? What are we waiting for, Russ?

RUSS HOUSLEY: We're ready to take the break, unless somebody has something to add to one of these three rows.

NORM RITCHIE: I just want – do you guys understand what is required? Because I'm not 100% clear. I can go off and do things, but I'm not sure that's what people are going to want.

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible].

BOBAN KRISC: [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: For example, there's an Org chart of ICANN that's been posted in May of last year and actually shows, identifies [VP] of risk management, his name is public. Is that what you're after, KC?

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, so what I'm struggling with – because I was there, and I've got a level of confidence for each of these areas through those discussions and presentations, [and what] you're asking for is [inaudible] show us the evidence. So, I'm trying to bridge that in my own head.

KC CLAFFY: That's helpful, because I totally will trust your confidence. If you guys have confidence that these questions were answered satisfactorily at the meeting, then maybe we don't need any follow-up.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, so still, in order to document our findings, we need to have the key source documents and links in one place, and I think we need staff assistance. Perhaps, staff, you could contact the [VP] of risk management and ask him to provide us with the key documents, underpinnings for his job and ICANN's work in this area. And I think that's just a basic element that we need to include in our findings and in our work. And then we have these additional questions that I think we've just sort of gone back and agreed, yes, we need to make sure we've got the links and documents to this.

KC CLAFFY: So, Norm – so thank you, Denise, but Norm, there's this thing in column E, board risk committee, risk management committee. Are you saying that whatever you heard in October '17 plus this column sort of addresses your questions in this area, and link to the public org chart you're finding would kind of mean we could close this row?

NORM RITCHIE: Okay, this one in particular, we were given the presentation by the [VP] of risk management, so the fact they had someone there full-time – and he described his process and what he did, and did a presentation on it.

And there's something, “do you do this?” And they said, “No, we do it this way.” Doesn’t make it wrong.

KC CLAFFY: Is that presentation public? I mean the slides.

NORM RITCHIE: No. That’s the problem, right?

KC CLAFFY: Okay.

DENISE MICHEL: So we've got the recordings and the transcript. There's a number of occasions when the recording was stopped, but yeah, I’d have to go back and listen to it again, see what was on transcript and off-transcript.

If I were to answer your question, I think in addition to just making sure that we document appropriately what we heard and how they're approaching what they're doing in risk management broadly, personally, I think we should make sure that how they're approaching DNS risk inside their overall risk management process is appropriate.

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: DNS risk as it applies to ICANN's remit. So, it's not clear in my mind – and I kind of tried to go back and look at documents – how ICANN is addressing this, and I personally think that's an area that deserves a second look by some of the experts on this committee to...

KC CLAFFY: That feels challenging. I wonder if that could be a part of the SSR, because that sort of convolves, it seems to me, ICANN's mission and ICANN's internal operations, which I see why, because they're convolved in real life, but that looks like a very daunting challenge to try to integrate that in an evaluation of their internal – and I think this thing is hard enough as it is. But I'm interested in what other people think. I would be okay with punting that to the SSR – whatever, the other category of just this is part of ICANN's mission to manage this risk for the global DNS, and not try to integrate that into their own internal risk management.

NORM RITCHIE: Generally, I think one of the difficulties of the SSR review, whether it's one, two or three, is all the information that you get [and collect] as evidence cannot be made public. And that is something that I think needs to be addressed for the next review, but I don't think we'll be able to solve that one.

The other thing is that even in discussions – because everything, there's a transcript and everything is public, the words are guarded. So it's not a really good conversation you're having with people when everything's being recorded on some of these, because they're sensitive.

So that has to be addressed somehow in the future. I don't see how we can address that given how deep we are already.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. So, at a high level, there is, or has been in the past, an ICANN DNS risk management framework that was sent out for public comment, and then presumably updated and then used. There's a DNS risk management framework working group that is well-documented, so yes, there are certainly things that are going to be not in the public sphere, but I think there's ample material to look at in the public sphere, and if we find things that we don't have public information about and we have questions about or feel that more attention is needed in this area, I think we can make that decision and fold that into a recommendation if we feel that it rises to that level. That's how I'm thinking about it.

BOBAN KRISC: And what we have is also a list of risks that ICANN identified. We don't have the risk treatment plan, but we have a list of, I don't know, 35, 40 risks, and they are in the document that I posted in the chat. So there are all these enterprise-wide risks, that's the name of the list, [and they are updated] from time to time. And there are also domain name system-related risks.

So, with the documentation that we have, we should take only a look inside and say, "Okay, that's what we have," and [inaudible] Denise [inaudible]. So, let's take a look in that what we have and let's [write

here and] identify it, “Okay, is this enough? And if not, then let’s address it if we need something else to answer the open question.

That’s the document, Jennifer, you had it open. ICANN’s response to CCWG Accountability. That was – second. Maybe somewhere. There was only –

KC CLAFFY: [Didn't you ask for it?]

BOBAN KRISC: Yeah, asked for, and they showed us the risk treatment plan, so how they categorize it, how they rank it, what is a high or a medium risk for ICANN, and how they mitigate it. So that’s what we saw in the face-to-face meeting. But that’s not public. So the only part that’s public is this one. That’s the correct document, and then when you scroll down, you'll find –

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible]

BOBAN KRISC: No. That’s a specific one, the DNS risk.

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible].

BOBAN KRISC: Yeah, so these are global. Next page, please, Jennifer. So here's the risk definition, and here are the risks that ICANN identified and that they evaluated from time to time. And there is also a page where the process is described, and you will find there's lots of stuff regarding risk management.

KC CLAFFY: In the 2014 [inaudible]?

BOBAN KRISC: In the 2014 and ’17, yeah, and there is also a Wiki page from the board, and they describe with the risk committee, their charter, so what it proposes, the scope of responsibility. This is also linked in the chat of Adobe, so that’s what I find in global, how they mange risk. But not specific in the DNS part. So that’s outstanding.

And when you ask me, “Okay, what's the methodical approach?” I would say, okay, here are responsibilities, we have a board of directors, we have an approved risk committee charter by the ICANN board of directors, there are responsibilities, here's the list of enterprise-wide risks, they showed us how they treat them, and the only part that is outstanding is the DNS-related risk stuff.

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think we got in trouble there and we need to make sure it's within ICANN's remit. Remember, that was one of the issues. But I know you need to be on the phone.

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so let's take our break now, and see if we can be organized to do the other six [when we get there.] Half an hour, please.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay, we're going to pause the recording. Everybody's going to take a break, and we'll be back at 11:30.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Laurin, you have a question already?

LAURIN WEISSINGER [inaudible]

JENNIFER BRYCE: Alright, everyone, welcome back to the second morning session of the SSR2 face-to-face meeting in LA. The recording is unpaused. Please remember to state your name for the record when you're speaking. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. During the break, I got together with Jennifer and Negar, and we went through the seven topics and identified which rows in that table go to which topic, which pages in the day two report map to those, and have links for the transcripts. So, what I'm hoping we can do then is divide up into groups and walk through what we just did with the three risk management rows, and each group can tackle that. So, Jennifer, if you could share the Google doc we made, and we can figure out who's going to work in what group.

JENNIFER BRYCE: I posted the link into the chat as well.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, can everyone see the Google doc? Okay, so the first category, I'd like to form, I think, three teams and each of us tackle two of these since we did the risk management one together. That leaves two of these topics for each of the teams.

So, there are three of you there who were at these meeting, so Norm, Denise and Boban, you're the team leaders. Okay, so at the meeting, did you have – of these topics, were the three of you on all of them, or were there subteams?

At the meeting in LA 15 months ago. I'm just trying to figure out, of the seven, we've done number three, right?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, we need a team to do one and two, a team to do four and five, and a team to do six and seven. Does that make sense?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so Norm, you're doing one and two, four and five, or six and seven? [Check, please.]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: It is, it's in the chat. The last link in the chat.

LAURIN WEISSINGER As an idea, we could also do it according to what the people who were there prefer to do or are more happy with discussing, if that's a better –

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think that's where I started, and they said they were all in all of the meetings.

LAURIN WEISSINGER Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, norm, pick two is what we're saying. Okay, so Norm's going to lead the group on six and seven. Denise, which two do you prefer? So, Boban, you have one and two. Alright, so we have two people will join each of you to do this. We'll pick a corner of the room and we'll get to work.

So, we'll just take three chairs to each corner, and see what we can get done. Hopefully before lunch, we'll have made a good dent in it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: So just like we did for the risk management, we're going to figure out what it is so that we already know what, if anything, we need to learn and from who, and who's going to take the action to find it. Okay?

DENISE MICHEL: And do we have any additional guidance on where all the relevant documents, the links on the relevant documents?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think you will find that the links are referenced from one of these places, but if not, you may have to do some searching in the Wiki. But we've tried to pull this together in the break time. We already were a little long. And so you know what rows tie to each of these, there are no leftover rows, we made sure of that, and which pages in that day two document cover it. So I think we've divided the work in such a way that we shouldn't be stepping on each other.

Okay, Laurin, which team do you want to join?

LAURIN WEISSINGER I'm just reading through which one I would be most suitable for.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Read faster.

MATOGORO JABHERA: [inaudible] join one and two.

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible]

MATOGORO JABHERA: Yeah, group [inaudible] item one and two.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Alain or Ram, do you know which one you want?

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: There's only seven and we already did three. So, Alain, which group do you want to join? Alright, Boban, your group's full. Why don't you go stare at a corner? Pick a corner and get to work. Ram, which group do you want?

LAURIN WEISSINGER So while he's looking, I think I will go with Denise then.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so Ram and I are going to join Norm then.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: All here. Yeah. It's here or the beach, that's your choices. Jennifer, would you pause the recording, please?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Will do. Thanks.

Good afternoon, everybody. Welcome back to the SSR2 face-to-face meeting on the 25th of January. This is the afternoon session. Please note that the meeting is being recorded, and if you please would state your name into the microphone before you speak for the record. We also have Zarko joining us online as well. Alright? And over to you, Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. We're now going to go through and do the report outs from each of the groups. Items one and two were done in Boban's group, and so Boban, over to you.

BOBAN KRISC: So, thanks, Russ. Let's start with number one, ICANN's information security management system. And we take a deep dive into the documentation that is linked here in this chapter, and for a follow-up, one question that we raised up is we need more information about the roles and responsibilities in the organization. And what is the difference between COO and the CIO reporting line? Because there are both reports [inaudible] people who are responsible for security.

So, we have in the CIO part someone who is a senior director of security and network engineering. On the COO part, we have someone who is the vice president in security operations, and then we have the CTO and the office of the CTO, and that's well-defined and described on the webpage.

So, we need more information about it, how they interact between them, and the second question was, are there any changes in the

organization regarding security management since October 2016? So that's the first point.

Then we go through the Q&A section and the spreadsheet, and find there the question why ICANN doesn't use more industry standard [certifiable] and auditable processes. So, that was also recommendation number nine from the SSR1 report, and the answer was ICANN Org use a suite of continuous improvement frameworks to drive improvement across the organization. This also includes the use of audit and certification frameworks for engineering and IT and IANA function and [inaudible].

And our conclusion was we also need more information on these frameworks. In particular, the topics, and the topics are here. Resources, competence, awareness and communication, access control and cryptography, physical environmental security, operations security and system [inaudible] development and maintenance, and supplier relationships, are these also part of the frameworks or standards?

And yeah, then the recommendation, okay, ICANN should follow an organization [formation] of security management standards like ISO [27000-1] or NIST [inaudible] to be sure to cover all the relevant topics related to an information security management system.

So unfortunately, we don't have any [inaudible] facts in the draft report after the October 2017 meeting, so that's why we need more information on that to decide, okay, do we need here some recommendation or not?

Another question was regarding critical operation staff, what means, okay, there's a GDD portal and supporting infrastructure, and then the question was, is that managed just as a general ICANN service, or attention given to supporting infrastructure that's [inaudible] around rootzone maintenance, and is that just handled as a general ICANN IT service?

And the answer was rootzone administration is handled by the same care of all ICANN critical infrastructure. Redundant system, site failover, quick restore, as well as enforcement of information security best practices, and that the people who [answered] this can't speak to the rootzone management or maintainer as this function is handled by Verisign. And also for the [GDD] portal itself, that is a service hosted by [inaudible].

And what we would like to see is more information on these best practices that are implemented, and that ICANN is still responsible for the rootzone management or other relevant supporting infrastructures. So if they say, "Okay, we have some supplier here," then it's a question how ICANN assure that information security requirements are communicated to the contractors, and are there any obligations like [reporting,] controlling, auditing of contractors, etc.?

So, only that someone said, "Okay, we have someone and we sourced it out or we have some supplier there," you are still responsible for this service. So, we need to hear a little bit more clarification. And that was the second answer or the second requirement [that we have in this one.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, let's pause there – I should probably not use that word – and see if the group has any questions for the follow-ups you suggested here in group one. Anyone think there's some omissions, or is this going to be enough for us, once we know the answer to this, to get writing and deciding whether there's anything to recommend.

Okay. Jennifer, can you take what's written here and turn it into questions that staff can get answers to, or do you need other than just the document which has got XX instead of a number – I suspect that's [in the] cybersecurity framework, but is there anything else you need in order to deal with that?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, Russ. I think we can take these away and get them answered, and then we can always come back for clarification if we need.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, great. Alright, onto group two. Boban, back to you.

BOBAN KRISC: Alain, or Matogoro, would you like to? Yeah, two, business continuity. Okay, I will do it. So, the second topic was business continuity at ICANN, and the question was perform assessment of ICANN's business continuity management system. This includes –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

BOBAN KRISC: Yeah. This includes but is not limited to the following domains. So we talked about business continuity objectives and plans, operational planning control, business continuity strategies, prioritization, resource recovery strategy, business continuity strategies and plans, and the [evaluation] process itself.

So, [and we] found here also, unfortunately, nothing [inaudible] document, but in the drafted report. And came also up with some follow-up questions. The first one is we need the information who's responsible also in the organization for business continuity in general. That's what we missed also in the fact-finding meeting in LA.

Then we have seven or eight questions also from the drafted report that are related to business continuity. So, we need additional information. Discussion is needed. The focus on how business continuity affects operational compliance and the rootzone security.

We heard about significant work within ICANN, but not much reporting on these [inaudible] preparedness and operational recovery of funding, so we need also here more information.

Then also the question, why don't ICANN follow a formal framework? Because we talk a lot of also in the factfinding meeting in October 2017 in LA with the staff about the theoretical approach, and we don't see much documentation on this. Also, the question that they raised up, what the frequency of disaster recovery testing is, because I have also

referenced one document from 2010 as an example called IANA full scale business continuity exercise, and it was conducted in January 2010, so eight years ago or nine years ago.

And there are also a lot of recommendations there, I think seven or eight, and the question is have the recommendations [inaudible] been implemented? And if so, how? It's always the same direction, the depth of testing of the disaster recovery needs to be elaborated, because we have talked only about tabletop exercises and no active [power trip] exercises.

Then the question that James raised, do we have an impact analysis after the PTI separation, and do we need an update on the business continuity plans? Because we heard of a lot of shared infrastructure and we just want to be sure that we address it here in the context of business continuity appropriately.

And the last one is document [inaudible] processes that have interorganizational [dependencies] and [it relates] back to business continuity plan. So we need updated business continuity plans, and I would really appreciate it if we can take a look in it. And that's it from this part.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Any follow-ups or comments on the section two? Okay, Boban, can I request that you capture this morning's discussion under three? Because I think you were taking notes in that table. Just so that it's all in one place.

BOBAN KRISC: Yeah. We'll fill it here.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Thank you very much. Okay, Denise, your group had four and five. So, can you walk us through that?

DENISE MICHEL: Is there someone on the phone? Do I need to use the mic?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. So four is perform – I'm just reading it – how effectively ICANN has implemented its security incident management and response processes to reduce both proactively and reactively the probability of DNS-related incidents. This includes but is not limited to the following processes. And then the three listed here are security incident management process, two, security incident response process [inaudible] to a global IANA incident, DNS-related, and then the third is ICANN operational responsibilities such as L-root.

And I invite my other teammates, I don't see Laurin here, and KC, but [Eric,] please jump in on this as I go through it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: They're on the phone with Lyman right now.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. So, do you know when they're going to be back? We could switch the order here.

RUSS HOUSLEY: We could do that. We could swap the order.

DENISE MICHEL: And they contributed a lot to what we've added here.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

DENISE MICHEL: It could be a richer discussion when they're here if they're going to be back soon and Norm doesn't mind doing his.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, they should be back in like 20 minutes.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, Norm, why don't we jump to you then? Take us through six and seven.

NORM RITCHIE: Okay. Let me see if I can scroll and finger on this at the same time.

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: I know.

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: Oh, cool. Wow, thank you.

KC CLAFFY: [There you go. Don't say I never did anything for you.]

NORM RITCHIE: [I could make a comment, but we won't.] We took a different approach to how we went about this. We focused more on the Excel spreadsheet and the outstanding questions there rather than talking more about

this, but I'll try to embellish it as best as I can. And of course, please step in if I mess anything up.

So, as far as the registry agreements, the backend BERO agreements and the registry agreements [inaudible] TLD, I think that the general consensus was that they were actually quite detailed and quite good, and the processes [you went through] to become a new gTLD applicant were pretty rigid.

So, the outstanding questions really focused more on going forward what is the status or EBERO and data escrow. Let me switch over to another document here. Looking at the information we had, there is a – it's called the SLAM, the service level agreement monitoring system. There was a presentation provided by Francisco Arias at one of the ICANN meetings, and there is an additional system as well, an update to that with another acronym which I can't recall what it is.

RUSS HOUSLEY: [OSAPI.]

NORM RITCHIE: [OSAPI,] yes, which allows the registry to access the metrics that ICANN has on them as far as SLA goes. The questions we're really asking before is, what public data is available on SLA monitoring? And as near as we can garner from [those developments,] it would be none. But I don't know that for sure. There may be some public, but it kind of makes sense that there would not be, at least to me. But there [are] definitely systems in place for the monitoring and the list of all the metrics. I'll

update the doc later on with the links to those presentations, and within those, you can actually see the details on what is being covered. So, I think they've done well in that regard.

The other outstanding item here is on BERO, was there anything done as far as root cause analysis from EBERO's documentation? We don't know if there's been any root cause analysis done.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

DENISE MICHEL: [I'll need to go check my notes. For those of you who were on the review team, Eric, I believe we were in – was it Barcelona? We met in conjunction with –]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, in the DNS symposium [inaudible] EBERO [inaudible] a few questions that we raised about that. There were problems initially with testing and I think failures. I'd have to go back and look at my notes. I just want to let you know, I want to go back through my notes and make sure that we [got] the information that we had previously asked for about failure rates, any issues and improvements they're planning on for EBERO.

I think also, we should probably ask as we're talking about security incidences, the crossover with BERO and EBERO is what protocols they have in place to secure that data, and if there's been any breaches. I think probably something we're looking at in a number of areas, and it should be discussed in this area as well. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, yeah, [obviously,] what Denise just said, and just a couple sort of backstopping points. I think we had heard in Madrid that there were a number of instances where registries had failed and that EBERO was not activated but that the indication was that it should have been. And I think we did ask some specific questions about this one when we were in the SSR meeting in the LA office in October, and I think what we heard was that there was – I'm paraphrasing and I might have gotten it wrong, but my recollection is that it wound up being a very manual, human-oriented problem and that there was no codified process to follow that would have caused somebody to pull the trigger. And as a result, or maybe just incidentally, EBERO had never been activated even though it had crossed the red line a couple of times in the past.

So, I think we had some questions about what would it take to trigger an actual EBERO [event] and why it didn't happen, and will it happen next time? And I think we got the indication there's be some codified process that we'd be able to see at some point.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [I think we're checking that.]

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, I remember that same conversation, and that was the EBERO was not invoked, but it was handled. So the question is, is that a satisfactory way of handling this or not? But I like the way you say, so, what is the level and what is the trigger? I'll put that in as a question.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: Okay.

BOBAN KRISC: Hi. I've added a URL here in the document. this is a PDF of the EBERO exercise that was presented by, I think it was Francisco in Abu Dhabi. And when we go into the document, there is description and [how they're provided,] and what we can see is maybe at the end of – could you please open it, Negar or Jennifer? Click on the URL and open the document. Thank you.

And, okay, here's the EBERO program itself and what is an EBERO event, and we talked about it in October 2017. There are critical functions that are provided by an EBERO, currently contracted EBEROs, and there are only three. So, as we can see, CNNIC, CORE and Nominet, and when you scroll down to the end, there is summary of the exercise.

And what you can see is I would say the last slide in this presentation deck, it's an EBERO testing case here in the summary. Go to the summary, please. So, this one here. So you can see there were three tests of TLDs with different scenarios, and the test – I think it's yours – took in the last case around about eight days. The whole process. And the whole process ends with data escrow function is restored, and that was the end of the exercise.

So when you go to the timeline on the next slide, then we see that the whole process itself – and I think the contracted parties commit 24 hours for the process – took in a test run about eight days. And that was only a test, so it was well-prepared, the people are informed. So, it was nothing what was really operational.

So when we have to start, when we have an incident and we have to say, "Okay, we have an EBERO case and let's start the whole process itself." And I would say we have to recommend that we should provide such exercises on a frequent manner. [And now we're ahead of] an escrow agents, so [inaudible] escrow agents.

I also talked to the ICANN staff. So, what do we think about that all parties relaying such an EBERO case come together and talk about the process? There is no room or something else where we can discuss such relevant cases. So, they don't talk to each other. That's my opinion. So, the process itself is unclear, because we heard only ICANN initiate it when you have to release [a deposit] and send it to ICANN, but I think we can perform it and make it more efficient if escrow agents talk with emergency backend operators directly and say, "Okay, we can provide you the information, we have a communication here established"

because we have also only a few escrow agents. There are [three of EBEROS and three] of escrow agents, and put them together and let's improve the process itself. And yeah, that's what we can see, and maybe what we can recommend on this one.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, when we went through the slide deck, we noticed there was nearly 100 observations for improvement, right? And so basically, what our question is, what's been done with those? And so that was the question we captured, is, okay, you did this experiment, you learned 100 ways you could improve, but we haven't heard anything since.

NORM RITCHIE: Okay. Thank you. Yes, if I recall correctly too, I was at that presentation done by Francisco. Only two of the three EBERO providers were exercised. Three TLDs, but two of them went to one provider. So, that's [inaudible].

BOBAN KRISC: And I think one TLD with one domain per TLD. So it was nothing sophisticated. It was only so –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: One?

BOBAN KRISC: Yes, one.

NORM RITCHIE: So it wasn’t [inaudible]. Okay, so I'll put together some questions that we have then for ICANN around that and put it back into that document. And I'm going to do that within the next two days. Sorry, I'm fumbling with scrolling again.

So, onto seven. Seven really gets around contractual compliance for registrar agreements and registries. There's a number of areas that fall under here, a lot of which is currently in flux. So, when we discussed this, we found it difficult to actually discuss a lot of areas of compliance, especially around WHOIS, because WHOIS has changed so much since spring of last year. And there's also the CCT report that came out, which I believe got he attention of some people involving contractual compliance, as well as the abuse report also got some attention.

So a lot of work we did and the questions we did, I think, are outdated. So we thought probably one of the better things to do would be to almost restart this section with current information rather than going back and using old information that people are just going to say this no longer applies.

As far as the compliance function goes, it’s still not clear to a lot of people what the compliance function is. Denise, I think, knows quite a bit about it. I know a bit about it as well, so we kind of volunteered us to sketch that out for this group so we can actually have discussions around it and get everybody on the same page of what we’re dealing with. And basically, it’s a cheat sheet for this group to have further discussions on the topic. Does that make sense?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, I agree with everything Norm said, and I would suggest that Norm and I kind of take WHOIS out and compliance out and work on it separately and update all of this, and then come back to the full team and kind of walk you through it and start from there. Since the board passed the board passed the temporary specification that pulls most of the WHOIS data out of the public sphere, that has as sort of ripple effect through a number of issues, including security and stability. I know SSAC issued a statement on this as well. there's been a lot of activity in ICANN, and there's currently an expedited policy development process that's trying to address it.

When it comes to security and compliance obligations, restricted access to WHOIS limits Contractual Compliance's ability to perform a number of its functions in ensuring compliance with registrar/registry contracts and a variety of other things that feed into DNS abuse and security. So I think this is a very rich area, a very timely one for this review to look at and consider. Thanks.

NORM RITCHIE: Okay. So that was kind of easy from this point of view. [It kind of says] we need to restart it.

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: Okay. Thank you for your finger.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Any further follow-ups for section six and seven? Okay, so Norm, I'm going to ask you to do what I asked Boban. Can you put it in the Google doc?

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Just so that we have it all in one place. And, okay, Denise, we're going to do yours, four and five now.

DENISE MICHEL: So, four, Laurin, Eric and KC are going to jump in on this as well, but to tee it up, as I said, four is how effectively ICANN has implemented security incident management and response processes on a both proactive and reactive basis, reduce the probability of DNS-related incidences.

Three key things were called out: security incident management process, security incident response process relating to global IANA incident, and ICANN operational responsibilities such as L-root.

In reviewing the transcript of the LA meeting, documents that we could find and answers that were initially provided, we found a number of areas where additional documentation should be requested and

clarifications requested as well. I think Laurin did a great job of documenting them here in the [inaudible], and so the yellow highlights are additional questions we had after reviewing the available documentation on the ICANN website.

I'm happy to run through all these questions, but I'll stop there to see if Laurin and Eric and KC have any additional color to add to this and to see if there are questions.

KC CLAFFY: I guess a lot of this is just that some of the questions in the spreadsheet, there were no responses to, and some of the responses that were there were brief, so we were expanding on follow-up questions, and then there's some new stuff based on the bullets. I don't have anything else to add though.

DENISE MICHEL: So, a series of questions that we'll drop into the table to make sure that it's captured there as well as here, I guess if we're using that, and then sort of an area was called out where I think the four of us certainly wanted to consult with others who were expert in this field and talk about a potential recommendation around management-level audits [inaudible] audit we feel are needed along the lines of ISO compliance by a big four audit professional compliance party. So that's something we flagged and want to talk to people who've had experience in complying with ISOs like Boban and others, but just wanted to tee that up and note that that'll be something we'll want to discuss again in more detail. Any questions about that?

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, the IANA department – PTI now – has SLAs with at least three different communities, and I know that updates to the registries do get audited, and they make sure that no audits were applied that don't follow procedures. Somehow, I think we need to be careful to exempt that, say we recognize it's done over there. Why isn't it done over here as well?

DENISE MICHEL: Referring to that element that's already being audited?

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: I'll put it down.

LAURIN WEISSINGER [Not there.]

DENISE MICHEL: I got it.

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, I'll go before you because you might correct me on this one, but I think one of the things we were talking about was compliance as well, so not just auditing and someone checking something, but actually following compliance and having an audit done of that by one of the big four or something like that. So, yeah, Russ, that's a point very well taken. I think we want to include that, which is not what we were talking about, with what we were talking about, because I think they both work together.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I just would not want the question to go, and them go, "See? We can do it." And the compliance using one of those frameworks, ISO, NIST, whatever, is a very different thing than the, "Did you follow your own documented procedures?"

DENISE MICHEL: [Go for it.] Anything else on this?

BOBAN KRISC: Only one informal thing. [inaudible] talk in October 2017 about the implementation of controls, and in this case, segmentation of network. Then we agreed on this that we don't want to, I don't know, show up in the vulnerabilities in the organization itself.

And when I take a look into this one here, then I see something like here is not really good segmentation, I'm not sure if this is too deep in the

control level and not on a high-level approach, because it's concrete. So yeah, we are talking about one fault that we had, yeah, and that we found.

And I don't know if you say, "Okay, it's okay, and we can write it down so let's stay," but when we should come together, it is too detailed. And maybe someone can take – I don't know what with this information, then we should put it out [of] the report.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think that's a really good point to call out. I'm sort of tempted to ask if we could pause the recording or not. But before – I think we do. Someone stop me if you think we should pause the recording before I go much farther.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Pause the recording, please.

DENISE MICHEL: I think we'll need to think a little bit more about how to phrase these questions, and yeah, what nuance we want to use.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yes, the recording is on. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, I think for the recording, I just want to say we had a discussion that we want to make sure that the way we word these does not highlight any vulnerabilities in anyone's networks, and that was the summary of the off-recording discussion.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Russ. Alright, continuing on then, again, a number of questions listed around security incident management processes. The transcript highlighted that there's work in a number of areas. At the time of the discussion, ICANN was, I think, at a point of documenting and hardening processes in many of these areas, so it's a good time to revisit incident response of processes and protocols and documentation. A couple additional questions around the L-root was added there. And I think that is an overview of the work that we did on four. If there are no questions about that, we can move on to five.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. Alright. Assessment of internal security, stability and resiliency of ICANN's operation processes and services. This includes but is not limited to GDD operations, the centralized zone data service, SLA monitoring system, statistical analysis – well, and then abuse data was flagged as well.

In part, five was a follow-up to some recommendations that were in SSR1. So, again, we spent time going through the transcript, looking through documents on the ICANN website and considering the questions and how they were answered in the table, and highlighted additional questions that are needed here, particularly around clarifying what the current processes, responsibilities, documentation in these areas.

For the CZDS, there's been a lot of issues in that area. Norm's been involved in a beta, in a new release that's coming out, so perhaps similar to WHOIS, there's been a number of issues and some changes coming up, so we flagged this as an area we want to take a fresh look at, likely have additional questions, particularly after the, I guess, beta is released.

And then we spent a fair amount of time talking about abuse data and how there are recommendations in the CCT, the Competition, Consumer Trust review report around providing abuse data, and there's been discussion for years about ICANN's own programs they're developing under the open data initiative to provide data about particularly the gTLD environment and abuse.

ICANN spends a significant amount of staff and community and board resources on items touching on abuse in the gTLD space, and there's quite a bit of well-documented requests and recommendations that, because of that and other reasons, ICANN should provide verified public data about abuse in the gTLD space to ensure that ICANN's staff and community activities are carried out on a foundation of accurate data and understanding of the abuse landscape.

So, we have additional questions in that area, and they're highlighted in yellow. I'll pause there for questions and invite my colleagues to add any additional information, notes you want to highlight for the group.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I just had a question about the word “verified.” Not quite sure what you mean by a verified abuse.

DENISE MICHEL: So, I think the part of the [I guess] discussion is, as we know, there's long-standing business practices and operations that use a whole variety of private sector services around gTLD abuse to provide security and consumer protection.

ICANN spent several years trying to bring the DAAR report to the public space so it could provide well-researched, well-documented source of high-level data in this area. There's been criticism stated in the past that some in particular private sector data sources are open to interpretation or there's disagreement about whether they're accurate enough or whatever. So I was using loosely the term “verified” to mean that it’s gone through a rigorous process of checking. Does that answer your question?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes, that did. Thank you. And Laurin?

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible]

LAURIN WEISSINGER Just as a comment, this doesn't have to be that there's issues with this, right? But that the methodologies are different, right?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah [inaudible].

LAURIN WEISSINGER So, different groupings of factors and all that kind of stuff, and you need to somehow reorganize that appropriately.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks. That's a great clarification. Yes. I think we're done on that for now. We'll be doing some more work online, but are there any other questions?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so we have a little bit of homework we've assigned for Norm to put stuff all in here for his group, for Boban to capture the risk management discussion from this morning, and that gets us to a place where we have the questions captured, and then Jennifer's going to turn that into a thing for staff to answer, and so hopefully, we can then get an estimate from staff as to how long it will take to get us those answers. Does that all make sense?

I don’t think there's anything else to do today on ICANN SSR. Does anyone know of something? So, Laurin has a question.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go ahead.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Just, do we want to start thinking about aiming deadlines at ourselves?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think I would really like to do that, but it would be – I think we have to know what the delta is for staff to get us at least the bulk of the answers. There are fewer sections than I anticipated where there are no questions. Almost everything had something we need more information on. So, it’s like had half of them not had follow-up questions, we could have started the assignments and writing for the other half. Norm?

NORM RITCHIE: Given that particularly the one area around the WHOIS and contractual compliance are going to take some time to complete now because it’s kind of a restart, we might want to think about getting the other areas done so we leave room for that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Your point is it'll probably take them longer to answer that question, or it'll take us longer to digest it? Or both?

NORM RITCHIE: Both.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so what I would like to do then with the little bit of time we have left before 5:00 today is talk about tomorrow where we're going to first brainstorm the big topics [but that] has to do with and we'll break up into groups and do the decomposition of each of those.

So, Eric sent out a document last week. Eric, maybe you could walk us through that so that by morning, people will have had time to digest it and think about it so that maybe we'll be more fruitful tomorrow morning than we were this morning.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Sure. Let me just pull that up real quick, and maybe someone can put it up on the screen for everyone else. So, while we get there – it may not even bear pulling up. So the document I sent out was called SSR2 RT DNS SSR Work Stream, and it had the preamble in it that we had discussed and circulated some time ago. So most of the document is that preamble, and then the sort of latter portion of it is just a bulleted list with essentially nothing under each category, but it was designed to be starting point buckets, as in that it doesn't have to be the canonical list. We can add and take things away from it. But just to get people

going as a flavor for the kinds of subtopics of the Work Stream that I imagine we'd get into.

I think it's about to come up now. Yes. Thank you. Scroll down to that page. Thank you. The second page. So there's a whole bunch under general area of issues, and these are things that I thought we would at least use as starting points to think about what the broad areas would be. I don't presume that it's comprehensive.

So, just as a set of strawmen, root KSK rollover is a general area, and I'll just take the top three real quick in no particular order. Alternate root deployment, coexistence, and rootzone SSR measurement reports. I thought if we took this as a starting point and then we came up with what we as a team think the right list of general overarching categories for the DNS SSR should be, we could then take those, and let's just say for argument's sake that this is the set we wind up with, we'd then break into a set of subteams, and probably not do them all at once because there's not enough of us to spread this thin, but then we go a few at a time, people would break out.

And I recall when we met in Madrid, oh so long ago, that one of the ways we got going Work Stream everybody started thinking about what sorts of issues – and they cared about pudding them on stickies, and then we went to put the stickies into paste-it boards, and that was how we kind of organized things into sub-streams, workstreams, whatever. We called them subteams back then.

And we could do something similar to that here, I was imagining, where if we came up with the list of issues that we cared about for DNS SSR,

we could then talk about the things underneath them that we think are important. So, root KSK rollover is an example where there's a lot of things we might decide we care about underneath the root KSK rollover.

So, possibly, breaking out into subteams, going over each of these issues, enumerating the things in them that we think are important, we could do that in little groups and we iterate a couple or a few times so that people could cross-pollinate between groups and not get pigeonholed. And then we could come back and see what we actually had, and maybe some things fall together, maybe some things drop out. Maybe we add some things at that point.

But then once we have a list of things we care about – another great example is namespace abuse, which I would expect if we keep it, will blow out into a lot of sub-examples or sub-issues that we would look in. Then we can start looking at whether we can normalize the set of things down to a relatively fewer list of things we care about that we could ask for clarification on, provide our recommendations for, etc., but getting the list of issues locked in and the sub-issues below those issues, I think, is what I would propose we do tomorrow. Norm.

NORM RITCHIE: Just a really quick clarification. Is namespace abuse domain name abuse? Is that what you mean, or is it something else?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I left it very broad on purpose. I think some people consider the IP space a form of namespace, and I think you could even consider the IANA

registries in some ways that way. So I left it very broad so that we as a – I didn't want to do all the thinking on my own, because I figured we'd do better together, but I though this would get people thinking. Russ, how does that seem to you?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Hopefully, that will plant some seeds for you to think about tonight in the bar, whatever, so that we could be productive tomorrow. Denise, you were about to say something.

DENISE MICHEL: I was just going to say I think it's a really good start and a nice framework to have the discussion within. If there are any relevant documents in background materials or previous meetings that people also should look at to prepare for this, it would be great if staff could pull those together and send them around. And then finally, just an observation that we have a really ambitious workplan overall, and I think we're going to need to do some really ruthless prioritization on what we can actually accomplish. So I look forward to tackling this tomorrow.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I agree with the ruthless and the prioritization.

KC CLAFFY: Remind me, we have SSR1 review, this, and what we did today. Is that it, those are the three big chunks?

RUSS HOUSLEY: There are four big chunks: SSR1 –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes. Tomorrow is the DNS SSR, Sunday –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: – which is this – and Sunday is the brainstorming for futures and wrapping up of SSR1.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think Russ's idea of getting a set of pointers if there aren't any sort of canonical pointers is a good idea for people who want to dig into things. My two cents is I think the beginning of tomorrow will be very brainstormy, and I think whoever just asked me, Norm, what do I mean by namespace, I'm hoping there's a lot of, "What did you mean by this?" At which point, I'll reflect back and say, "What do you think I meant by that?"

But I think that's probably a good way for us to all kind of get on the same page, like looking at – where is it? The only one I see is the IANA

registry SSR measurement report. I think there are some other measurement – oh, top-level domain SSR measurement reports. The extent to which we kept something like that in there, it would probably have a lot less decomposition below it of things that are under it than something like namespace abuse. So these things, I don't think, are all created equal. So as far as ruthless prioritization goes, I think this list looks longer than it probably is. Or maybe not.

KC CLAFFY: I want to add that one thing I sent to the mailing list today, so it might get longer, [like community outreach on that.] [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, she sent it earlier today. And I realize that when this brainstorming part was done on the ICANN SSR, post-it notes were used a lot, and I know that Jennifer brought way more than we could possibly use.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, I'm not. Ruthless prioritization.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, okay, go ahead, Norm.

NORM RITCHIE: I'm just going to bring up the ccTLDs because I like them.

DENISE MICHEL: And who doesn't?

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, exactly.

DENISE MICHEL: ccTLDs are great.

NORM RITCHIE: But throughout everything we're covering, the ccTLDs are rarely touched, so we have the ICANN SSR, we have a lot of stuff on the root, a lot of stuff on the gTLD.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

NORM RITCHIE: And we rarely ever get down to anything involving the ccTLDs, which are equally important.

DENISE MICHEL: Good point.

NORM RITCHIE: Is this our opportunity to put something in here for them?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

NORM RITCHIE: It's not?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I put top-level domains on purpose. I left the G off. I left the CCs off.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

BOBAN KRISC: Just for the record, no, it is, yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: I think that's a good suggestion, if only to acknowledge the great work that the ccTLDs have done and the paths they blazed in a number of areas. Of course, there are a few that we may want to look at.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: They're a full supporting organization within ICANN, there's detailed processes for developing global policies in this ccTLD space. They are a part of the whole DNS infrastructure, they're mentioned multiple times in the bylaws, and understanding that ICANN has a limited authority in the ccTLD space, but the ccTLD operators have agency and we can suggest to them some things to consider doing if we feel that that's a direction to go. And not to say that we're going to go there, but that's how I'm thinking about this space.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I noticed no one over there is pushing the button. Okay, we are clearly done. So, I think we should wrap up for today, a couple minutes early, and clearly, Jennifer wants to go over the action items.

JENNIFER BRYCE: My favorite thing. I do. And then I just have a couple of administrative bits and pieces, so if you can just bear with me for a couple of minutes. So, the action items that I captured for today mostly all pertain to that SSR seven topics document that we just looked at, so team members are going to take a look at the document and just add any additional questions that they may have to that. staff will extract the questions from the document into a sheet where we check the delivery dates and expected delivery dates as we do with the other questions. Boban's

going to capture the risk management discussion items from the morning and provide a written update in the document.

Team members who worked on item five, I don't know [if that was you,] Laurin, to update the document with follow-up questions that came out of the discussions. Norm, you took an action to add some links to the document for your items and add some additional questions. And then Denise and Norm together will draft an update and list of questions for item number seven.

And that's all I have for the moment, so if you think of anything additional, let me know. Just to let you know, dinner tonight is at 7:00 PM, it's at Café Delray. It's about a 15-minute walk, I believe, just around this street here. And of course, if you'd rather take an Uber, that's fine too, but it's a nice day.

So it's at 7:00, and tomorrow morning, again, the meeting starts at 9:00. Breakfast will be served in this room here. You're all welcome to eat the breakfast, obviously, from 8:00. So with that, I hope you all have a nice couple hours, and see you at dinner. Thanks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]