LAURIN WEISSINGER:	"ICANN should formulate clear key goals and strategies for SSR activities, updates, regularly attain community feedback and publish the resulting documents. And these agreed principles should guide SSR activities throughout the community."
	Any changes requested? We have "regularly." We don't give a timeframe for that. Probably [objectives] would be better.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	I think we add that.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	Thank you. I just wanted to go back to the point you made about saying updating them "regularly." That term could mean any number of things to anyone. ICANN could say regular is five years; you guys could say regular is once a month, once a year. So I think it would be beneficial to define that in a reasonable way, thinking about the amount of time it would take if they have to go back for public comment and planning and all that. So the frequency is best to be determined.
LAURIN WEISSINGER:	What timeframe are people considering to be appropriate for this?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	It's not incumbent upon us to have to tell them how to do SSR1 recommendations. That's [inaudible]. With this one, I don't think we [know what to say].
RUSS HOUSLEY:	So just delete the recommendation is your suggestion?
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	[off mic].
LAURIN WEISSINGER:	I just did the strikethrough for now. So we still have the text but if we can't find anything on it, then chuck it.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Eric, does that apply to the earlier one we moved on from as well?
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	Well, [inaudible].
LAURIN WEISSINGER:	Which earlier one, Eric? Two. So this is [inaudible] process that is aligned with the community review, Eric? That's the one you're thinking of?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	[inaudible] regular basis.
LAURIN WEISSINGER:	So this is page five.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	Okay.
NORM RITCHIE:	Yeah, I agree with that. We're just to review the recommendations, like what would happen to them, not to add more.
LAURIN WEISSINGER:	Okay. So text remains but is officially cut. Okay, what page is that? So this is the one on the public glossary, bottom of page six. Do we want to kill that as well?
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	[off mic].
LAURIN WEISSINGER:	Okay, so the public glossary thing, we strike it?
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	Yeah, [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, that's what I'm saying. The text still works, but it says what further work is needed. And that is addressing that. It's just not a recommendation.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: So you would want to just put it back into the what further work is needed and we just don't make the recommendation.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, I think it is good words, it's good advice, but I wouldn't highlight it as a recommendation. It's just this is a further work that's needed that would have satisfied.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So [inaudible] example.

NORM RITCHIE: Yes.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Just as an idea, we could also essentially write a recommendation for ICANN org to revisit this report and essentially look at those. So we say this is not fully implemented and we give them some pointers how to do it. Just as an idea.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That helps.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: We're at number six now, I think.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: You're going to [inaudible].

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I just did. Number 6, "ICANN should publish a document clearly outlining the roles and responsibilities" – oh, wait. Didn't we do this? Yes, we did.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Sorry. Here in 6 we do have very specific recommendations.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think [inaudible] can add that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: We don't have a place in the things we talked about today and yesterday for this piece.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We could add [inaudible].

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay, proposal from Laurin is do we want to create an additional Google doc that we call "Recommendations"?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That's what we need, another Google doc.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: No, because one of them is a proper recommendation that has nothing to do with this specific text.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah, I [inaudible].

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay, so what I'm doing is I'll make this one green which indicates we move it to some form of recommendation document, which we don't have yet. Any more comments on 6? Okay, I assume that's [enough].

Number 7, "ICANN should build current SSR framework by establishing a clear set of objectives and prioritizing its initiative and activities in accordance with these objectives."

We say this is still relevant – wait. Why did we strike this? Oh, I am so sorry. Yes, I'm getting lost. Yes, I'm sorry.

Okay, so Recommendation 8, "ICANN should continue to refine its strategic plan objectives, particularly the goal of maintaining and driving DNS availability, clear alignment of framework and strategic plan."

We say that, as with Recommendation 7, there's routine opportunity to comment, discuss priorities, but the chief concern is the level of detail related to SSR activities. In the interest of transparency and accountability, the recommendation remains relevant. However, the mechanisms envisioned by SSR1 for achieving this have been replaced by other organizational and process tools at ICANN. It would be useful to undertake some of this public objective setting with [prioritization] done by public community input processes. Furthermore, these objectives would have to be written in a way that allows them to feed into applicable and measurable SSR activities.

We have a recommendation here which is, "It is recommended that the processes used to develop the SOPs should include more community involvement in SSR matters and should provide procedures in setting the objectives and prioritization at a more detailed level than is done today." Strike?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

EN

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I think we have identified this kind of issue space as something where we want to give a recommendation. So I'm wondering, do we just strike it?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: And then revisit? Okay. Let me make the edit.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think this one is a really good example of why we don't necessarily have to provide a counter recommendation to SSR1 recommendations because this recommendation is like, "You need to do a better job of outlining some stuff," and we're like, "Yeah, that's a great idea, but it's not measurable." We don't then come back and say, "How about another idea? We can just say, 'We can do great justice.'"

LAURIN WEISSINGER: No, this is stuff that would go into the final document.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [off mic].

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Or to consider to be moved to a recommendation document. So it is only the case for this one where this is actually a comment and the one

on public comment changing the procedure as to make it searchable and accessible. These are the two green ones right now.

Okay, for now we are leaving it, I guess, and we can discuss it in the end. Is there anything else on Number 8? No?

Okay, Recommendation 9, "ICANN should assess certification options with commonly accepted international standards, (e.g. ITIL, ISO and SAS-70) for its operational responsibilities. ICANN should publish a clear roadmap toward certification."

Here we have two recommendations. "While ICANN [runs] specific infrastructure that [inaudible] struggle to capture appropriately. There is value in pursuing individual and [organizational] certification, particularly if these [goals] are organized and planned appropriately. Therefore, this recommendation is still relevant and further work is needed."

Then recommendations follow. "ICANN should fully implement initial SSR1 Recommendation 9. Roadmap should be established toward what certification activities are being undertaken and what ICANN is aiming to achieve. ICANN should provide reasoning for their choices, demonstrating how they fit into security and risk management strategies. And in order to reap the benefits of certification and audit regimes, ICANN should set and communicate expectations for organizational and individual audits and certifications, explain their expectations and [plans where appropriate]. For example, ICANN Org should explain which certifications or [trainings] are relevant to which roles in the organization and track completion rates."

RUSS HOUSLEY: So you're going to make this green, right?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Well, that depends on what people say.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, I agree. Green. But also, I think something that kind of jumps out as potentially missing here – and I know Boban and Laurin and others have talked about it in this context – is that, if I can just really simplify what I've heard quite a bit, is that we hear that ICANN is too unique to use an established ISO standard. So why don't we say that in here? Because I think….

LAURIN WEISSINGER: That ICANN is [not unique].

DENISE MICHEL: Well, say – yes, we have found that these can be used.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So you're saying further work is needed. The team observes that ICANN is able to use – and then list these standards at the bottom. Because this green text is going to move elsewhere, but you want to say something here in the part that's remaining.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:	Okay. Wait a second then. So we have this kind of double so the wording is kind of repeating. So we can use some here and some there. Okay. I added the uniqueness bit here in the text as well. Yeah, Boban? This is coming from the old recommendations, so now – yeah, we'll just cut it. It says commonly accepted international standards. So that would be okay. ICANN can be audited and certified along the lines of various standards. Okay, can I move to 10, or anything else on this one?

Okay, 10, "ICANN should continue its efforts to step up contract compliance enforcement, provide adequate resources for this function. ICANN should also develop and implement a more structured process for monitoring compliance issues and investigations."

We say, was the recommendation fully implemented? No, it was partially implemented. Did it have the intended effect, and how did we conduct an assessment? Since 2011, Compliance has professionalized and greater transparencies available because of monthly reports. However, it is not clear the extent to which SSR issues are handled within this compliance process. Despite other requirements for compliance improvements such as those arising from [inaudible] and the ATRT first and second report advocating a [inaudible] for ICANN's compliance function much [improvement] work needs to be done.

Okay. We have no recommendation for this one, but we say, yes, this continues to be relevant. Further work would be to drill down into greater detail on specific security, stability, and resilience issues such as those outlined in ICANN's SLA monitoring system along with details and follow up and any enforcement action. Do we want to write – I think, Denise, this was you. Sorry.

EN

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, thank you, Laurin. Yeah, I did have this one in my group. And given the extensive discussion about abuse issues and the role of Compliance and registrars and registries, I suspect there's going to be a lot about this in the other section of the report. So I would suggest that we handle that, then come back and make sure we're consistent.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. I'm just writing recommendation on compliance, coloring it green as a link for later inclusion.

Recommendation 11, "ICANN should finalize and implement measures of success for new gTLDs and IDN fast track that expressly relate to its SSR-related program objectives, including measurements for the effectiveness of mechanisms to mitigate domain name abuse."

We say actions have been taken to mitigate domain name abuse. Implementation did not have its intended effect. SSR1 Recommendation 11 was aimed imbedding SSR1 considerations into the expansion of the DNS space, but there are no measure for success. And the recommendation we have here is coordinated vulnerability disclosure reporting would be an excellent project for ICANN to progress. It is difficult to assess the status of this initiative [inaudible] form 2013. Essentially, we discussed this on the ICANN internal, so I would say this is a green one to be included.

DENISE MICHEL: This might be locked. I was going to try and change it myself. I think we should say the DAAR system has been proposed but not implemented at this point instead of stating it was simply created. I think Spec 11 relating to SSR obligations for new gTLD registries is an area we'll want to be addressing in our ICANN SSR section under [registries].

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah, this is why it's green. Would you add that to the text, Denise? You would know better to put it because you wrote this. You did not? Oh, I'm sorry.

DENISE MICHEL: [Not me].

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay, can I move to Number 12? I assume yes. "ICANN should work with the Community to identify SSR-related best practices and support the implementation of such practices through contracts, agreements and MOUs and other mechanisms."

We say the recommendation was not fully implemented. We have a very, very long text on that. And the recommendation that's already in green, "ICANN should work with the community to identify SSR-related best practices and then implement the practices through contracts, agreements and MOUs and other mechanisms." Are we happy with that?

Okay, Recommendation 13, "ICANN should encourage all Supporting Organizations to develop and publish SSR-related best practices for their members."

We have a recommendation here which is that ICANN should adopt a general SSR policy and strategy which requires SOs to discuss and implement relevant aspects and make available relevant information to their constituents.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I'm sorry. Can we back up to 12 for a second?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Well, okay, it's not measurable.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I realize that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Well, then, this is one of the things that we were quite vocal about and we have all assured ourselves we won't do. So it's not that the recommendation should get scuttled or has to get scuttled. But we should strive to try and – if it's going to be a recommendation, it should be measurable.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I mean, these are not final, Eric, right? These are the ones we will move into a document and then edit them accordingly.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So looking ahead to 14, if people are ready.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Is that okay if I [inaudible]?

RUSS HOUSLEY: 14 seems – or I mean 13.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible] ahead, though.

RUSS HOUSLEY: What? We just marked it make it measurable so that when we actually do get to that part of the document and import that, we will.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay, so essentially we were at ICANN should adopt a general SSR policy and strategy which requires SOs to discuss and implement relevant aspects and make available relevant information to their constituents. Do we want to strike this, or do we want to integrate this into our own recommendations?

RUSS HOUSLEY: It seems to overlap with things we talked about, so I think we can safely strike it.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. Not getting anything, so probably not.

Okay, Number 14, "ICANN should ensure that its SSR-related outreach activities continuously evolve to remain relevant, timely, and appropriate."

We have no recommendation. And we say this recommendation remains relevant. SSR [communities] are not stationary, always evolving. Staying in step and [inaudible] of them is critical.

Are we happy with that? No recommendation needed?

Okay, continuing, Number 15, "ICANN should act as a facilitator in the responsible disclosure and dissemination of DNS security threats and mitigation techniques."

We have a recommendation which is ICANN should provide anonymized metrics of the vulnerability [disclosure] process on a regular and timely basis. We had talked about that process yesterday, so it makes sense to also green it up and see how it will be included in the end. Any comments? None?

Good, 16, "ICANN should continue its outreach efforts to expand Community participation and input into the SSR Framework

development process. ICANN also should establish a process for obtaining more systematic input from other ecosystem participants."

Our recommendation here is the following: ICANN needs to develop an overarching SSR strategy that includes measurable or trackable objectives pertaining to the acquisition of external feedback and outreach to relevant [non-community] as well as community stakeholders. This should incorporate some of the observations made under the review of previous recommendations.

RUSS HOUSLEY: There's an extra word, right?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: There was [an extra word].

RUSS HOUSLEY: I was trying to figure out for what?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: What shall we do with this one?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think we talked about this today in terms of the way different things need to integrate, and we talked about parts of it yesterday. So I think we make it green [and move on].

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay, green. Any more comments? No?

Okay, 17, "ICANN should establish a more structured internal process" – hmm? Shall I skip everything without recommendations? Okay.

The next recommendation refers to 20, "ICANN should increase the transparency of information about organization and budget…"

ERIC OSTERWEIL: There is a recommendation there.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Where?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: It's not flagged as a recommendation. SSR recommendation [inaudible] should be reconsidered and reissued in a form that can be effectively assessed in the future.

I'm fine with that. I just want to make sure we all – we just kind of skimmed over it. I don't know if it's anything anybody has any consternation over. It's [kind of] like a recommendation that we're essentially reissuing that recommendation.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay, so that's a green.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [off mic].

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Sorry about that. So 20, "ICANN should increase the transparency of information about organization and budget related to implementing the SSR Framework and performing SSR-related functions."

As a recommendation, we have ICANN should increase the transparency of information about organization and budget related to implementing the SSR framework and performing SSR-related functions.

So there's definitely at least the lack of trackability.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, this recommendation at the very end [inaudible] the recommendation continues to have relevance today and I would recommendation as part of our wrap up work we come back to this. I think of it as sort of a foundational tool to support many other recommendations and focus that we're providing for ICANN.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes, I think this reappears all the time. By the way, I did add a kind of a list at the bottom if people want to scroll down with the reappearing issues as well. Any other comments on 20? No? Okay, let me see where the next one.

DENISE MICHEL: Just for context, 20, 21, and 22 are all very similar and should [be] treated the same way.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay, so 22 has a recommendation, but it's essentially the same topic, "ICANN should publish, monitor, and update documentation on the organization and budget resources…." So this is also a green one to be included.

So then there is Recommendation 23 and 24 where we are still doing some [interviews]. So these will be the ones that we will have to discuss on call at some point.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So 23 ends with a [pointer to] later in the report.

DENISE MICHEL: I know I read a [inaudible] this comes to the heart of the SSR problem with the ICANN model. So I expanded on it and maybe I should [inaudible]. I think that it's a symptom of denial to say that ICANN could ensure that decisions are reached in an objective manner free from external or internal pressure. The whole multi-stakeholder model is designed to include these pressures. They're supposed to balance each other out, and they don't. And I don't know how we could not make a comment on that. But we could [punt] this to the future. I mean, I wrote a bunch of stuff [inaudible].

LAURIN WEISSINGER: So my proposal is we put a note under 23 which is to be addressed in final recommendations. Would this be okay?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It already says that. [It's] what the last sentence [says].

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay, it's not green yet.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I thought green was for texts you were going to move.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah, but this is the thing. This will also lead to some form of recommendation.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It will, but there are plenty of other things we talked about the last two days that are going to cause us to write that.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay, so 24 is the same where there's still….

RUSS HOUSLEY: I don't understand this line of stars in the middle.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay, so 25 is about identifying near and longer-term risks. I don't think we need to discuss this here because this is coming from ICANN SSR2. Yeah, we have a whole section, so that's fine.

"ICANN should prioritize the timely completion of a risk management framework."

I'm sorry. I'm also getting tired.

I think this I would also say belongs to risk management; 27 is still risk management. So that is covered by ICANN SSR. We have a recommendation there, however, which is if one were to rephrase this recommendation to [inaudible] believes what was meant was ICANN's risk management framework should be clearly articulated, aligned strategically against the requirements and objectives of the organization, describe relevant measures of success and how they are to be assessed.

The review team also took note of the conclusion of the DNS risk framework report [inaudible] 2016, identify security, stability, and resiliency framework, recommendation these be taken into account as resource documents for the development of any risk management framework.

What shall we do with this? Oh, yes. Yeah, yeah, yeah. I think she's still looking for that. No, this is 27. No, no. Yes, I'm just saying, what do we do this one? Do we strike it? Do we move it to…?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [off mic].

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Make it green?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay, green. So the upper part. I mean, the lower part is more of an implementation that would probably better be served to be put up to the further work needed.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [off mic].

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Uh-oh.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [off mic].

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay, Recommendation 28 has no recommendation attached. We say it is still relevant and that's it. And that is on threat detection mitigation, threat and incident information dissemination. So I would say we make a green comment that we have to say something about that.

NORM RITCHIE: Yes, that's why we're waiting to hear if Scott was [inaudible].

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Oh, yeah, Scott, we're waiting on you [inaudible]. If this was added very recently … If not, as in less than two weeks ago, then it should be here. Then [we solved] problem. If you could check, Scott, that would be great.

So just asking if it would be possible for us to have a chat at some point about this, Scott, off the record so we can see what we're going to do with this. Is this doable? Okay. Okay.

Okay, so I just want to have people's attention on the last point. If you could scroll down [inaudible] screen two, which is essentially a summary comment of the reappearing issues that we identified throughout the text. So I kind of did this in the end.

We have a lack of indicators, measurements, and goalposts, number one. Number two, there's a lack of publicly available evidence and procedures. Number three, there's a lack of community review and accountability in some cases. We see a lack of overarching strategy,

EN

goals, and comprehensive policy. There is a lack of clear definitions in some cases. There's a lack of clarity in terms of what is being done, and there's a lack of integrated security management. For example, the whole thing of policies, procedures, standards, baselines, guidelines, as we see in standard security management.

Are there any comments on this? Otherwise, I would propose to also have this green as it already is to be included in our final recommendations. Denise, go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL: I guess I was thinking of this as it probably would be a really useful background preamble before we get into the details of our assessment. In addition, we may want to turn this into a specific recommendation in the recommendations section. But I think because these comments were woven throughout the observations on the SSR1 implementation, I think it would be good to at the beginning of the SSR1 implementation stuff say that we have observations that apply broadly across many recommendations and we found the following. So give that background and context before they read through.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I think it makes sense to do that, but I think it also makes sense to leave it in green. This doesn't [they become] that, right?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, both.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: They're just [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. It will be both a recommendation and a preamble.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. I will put – sorry? Say again. Oh, last page.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, I'm on it.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay, so thank you very much, everybody. I know this was a bit special, but as you know this was a very long process and in the end we lacked quite a bit of information writing this. So we're done with that. I'm giving back to Russ for probably wrap up because we're ten minutes behind time.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you, Laurin. I know that was difficult. And thank you for picking up the pen when we were in a log-jam situation. Thank you very, very much. We all owe you many beers. So if we each buy you one tonight, you'll feel really good tomorrow.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: [Oh, I'm sure].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, turn it over to Jennifer to go over the actions.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you, Russ. So despite the long day, I have very few action items. The first being for staff to circulate the table of the DNS SSR topics [and] volunteers for each one. And then and action for team members to review the table and add their names against any items they would like to work on. I think that is all we have for the moment.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So you have the table, right? Okay. Okay, any other business? We're done. We'll see you in the morning. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]