

# At-Large DNS Risk Management Framework Report Workspace

Comment Close Date	Statement Name	Status	Assignee (s) and RALO(s)	Call for Comments	Call for Comments Close	Vote Announcement	Vote Open	Vote Reminder	Vote Close	Date of Submission	Staff Contact and Email	Statement Number
13.09.2013	<a href="#">DNS Risk Management Framework Report</a>	Adopted 12Y, 1N, 0A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <a href="#">Julie Hammer</a> (APRALO)</li><li>• <a href="#">Alejandro Pisanty</a> (LACRALO)</li><li>• <a href="#">Olivier Crépin-Leblond</a> (EURALO)</li></ul>	09.09.2013	15.09.2013	19.09.2013	19.09.2013	25.09.2013	26.09.2013	27.09.2013	Patrick Jones <a href="mailto:patrick.jones@icann.org">patrick.jones@icann.org</a>	AL-ALAC-ST-0913-05-00-EN

## Comment / Reply Periods (\*)

Comment Open Date:

23 August 2013

Comment Close Date:

13 September 2013 - 23:59 UTC

Reply Open Date:

14 September 2013

Reply Close Date:

5 October 2013 - 23:59 UTC

## Important Information Links

[Public Comment Announcement](#)

[To Submit Your Comments \(Forum\)](#)

[View Comments Submitted](#)

## Brief Overview

Originating Organization:

DNS Risk Management Framework Working Group

Categories/Tags:

- DNS
- Security/Stability

## Purpose (Brief):

The Board-level DNS Risk Management Framework Working Group (DNS RMF WG) has received a final report from Westlake Governance following the ICANN Durban meeting. The Working Group is initiating a public comment cycle on the DNS Risk Management Framework report prior to sending the Framework to the ICANN Board and staff for implementation. Public comments are welcomed on the document and proposed approach to risk management for the areas described in the report.

## Current Status:

The draft Framework was presented at the ICANN Beijing meeting. A draft report was delivered for the ICANN Durban meeting, and the DNS RMF WG has opened the document to a public comment cycle.

## Next Steps:

Following public comment, the Framework report will be delivered to the ICANN Board and staff for implementation.

Staff Contact:

Patrick Jones

[Email Staff Contact](#)

## Detailed Information

Section I: Description, Explanation, and Purpose:

The DNS Risk Management Framework Working Group (DNS RMF WG) has received the following report prepared by Westlake Governance on a DNS Risk Management Framework for ICANN. A draft of the report was presented to the community at the ICANN Durban meeting. The Framework report has been revised, and the Working Group is now initiating a public comment cycle on the DNS Risk Management Framework Report.

At the conclusion of the public comment cycle, the Working Group will recommend to the ICANN Board that the DNS Risk Management Framework be transitioned to ICANN staff for implementation. Ongoing oversight of the DNS Risk Management Framework will be handled by the Board Risk Committee.

[Draft ICANN DNS Risk Management Framework](#) [PDF, 2.88 MB]

Section II: Background:

Background on the DNS RMF WG can be found at <http://www.icann.org/en/groups/other/dns-risk-mgmt>.

Section III: Document and Resource Links:

None


Section IV: Additional Information:

None

(\*) Comments submitted after the posted Close Date/Time are not guaranteed to be considered in any final summary, analysis, reporting, or decision-making that takes place once this period lapses.

## FINAL VERSION TO BE SUBMITTED IF RATIFIED

[Please click here to download a copy of the PDF below.](#)



## FINAL DRAFT VERSION TO BE VOTED UPON BY THE ALAC

The ALAC has considered the Final Report submitted by Westlake Governance on an ICANN DNS Risk Management Framework and offers the following comments. The report provides a framework at a relatively high level, that draws on and combines several other frameworks (Mikes and Kaplan, Capability Maturity Model, ISO31000) and tailors them to some degree to the ICANN context of DNS risk. While it may be highly open to debate whether the proposed framework is optimal for ICANN, and individuals will have very different views based on their own experience of risk management and their place within the ICANN Community, to some extent the fact that a risk management framework exists and is utilised to force rigour into the consideration of risk would be an important outcome.

However, the ALAC deplores that the framework that is proposed is the proprietary and business-oriented Risk Management methodology ISO31000 framework whilst the DNS Security and Stability Analysis (DSSA) Working Group had proposed the use of the Open Standard NIST 800-30 methodology. The use of a proprietary methodology effectively locks ICANN into a methodology from a vendor requiring licensing, which is likely to preclude the use of the methodology for other purposes by the community. The DSSA had specifically chosen the NIST 800-30 methodology to allow the freedom of use associated with an Open methodology.

The ALAC also questions the use of a business methodology applied to the DNS. The Westlake Report appears to mix the Risk Framework for ICANN (the organisation) with the Risk Framework for the DNS which is not a single organisation, entails a wide variety of actors, both controllable and uncontrollable, and is therefore a much more complex ecosystem than a typical top-down corporate environment. In fact, the Framework appears to be for the most an inward-looking Enterprise Risk Framework for ICANN. It is unknown whether the ISO31000 methodology has ever been successfully applied to an outward facing technical risk management function.

The notion of external risk associated with unknown unknowns is minimised to reflect technical risks only. In fact, the proposed DNS Expert Panel appears to be focussed almost entirely on technical risks thus lacking a component of political risk such as that caused by action in Internet Governance. Whilst technical threats to the DNS cannot be understated, recent examples of unilateral actions by Nation States has shown that political threats are to be equally taken into account, yet the use of a classical business-oriented Risk Management framework does not appear to give the ability to take those into account. The report definitely falls short of fully identifying all threats to the DNS.

In fact, the Westlake report is high level. The ALAC deplores that at this point in time, the proposed Framework is far from being detailed at a more granular level. It appears that the detail of the proposed Framework contained within the report would need to be further developed by ICANN Staff, with some input from the ICANN Community, before implementation would be feasible. In particular, the establishment of the proposed Expert Panel (previously called the Risk Advisory Group in the 24 June 13 draft), as detailed in the Appendix 4 Terms of Reference, constitutes a significant new permanent volunteer resource within ICANN. The Risk Register Template (Appendix 6) and Risk Mitigation Schedule (Appendix 7) are highly simplistic, without any metrics, and require a great deal of expansion and adaptation for the assessment and mitigation of DNS risk. It is unknown whether "treatment" and "monitoring" could all be done in-house or would need external resources or collaboration. Furthermore, the estimation of resourcing required (i.e. the information on the 'what, who and when' part of the process) seems to be pitched at what is required for the maintenance of an ongoing Risk Management system, but the ALAC considers that the initial implementation would need a much more concerted effort with considerable resourcing, both staff (ICANN the Organisation), volunteer (ICANN the Community) and outward facing (the wider Internet community).

Is this recommendation feasible, bearing in mind this Risk Management Framework is long overdue?

Indeed, the ALAC is concerned that it has been over a year since the publication of the Security, Stability & Resiliency of the DNS Review Team SSR-RT's Final Report, yet many of its recommendations are still far from being implemented. The ALAC therefore recommends that in the face of urgency, a two-pronged approach should be followed:

- ICANN Staff should examine in greater detail the resource implications of initial implementation and ongoing maintenance of this specific Risk Management Framework before recommending to the ICANN Board whether it, or some variation of it, should be adopted. It should evaluate whether this proposed Framework is indeed suited to the technical and political risks to the DNS.
- ICANN should select quick wins to implement part of a risk mitigation framework, drawing on already available resources such as SSAC, RSSAC, the DNS Community and the wider ICANN community. The urgency in addressing purely technical risks to its own DNS operations is possible today thanks to the resources that ICANN already has at its disposal.

Those two parallel processes should be started while closely adhering to the the recommendations of the SSR-RT.

On a more general note, the ALAC is disappointed that the Framework as proposed in the Final Report has not built in any substantial way on the work undertaken by the DSSA Working Group apart from mentioning its work. Most disturbingly, the instigation of this study led to a suspension of the important work of the DSSA, and effectively caused that bottom-up cross-community working group to lose all momentum for the continuation of the security risk assessment tasks which it had been chartered to undertake by ICANN's SOs and ACs.

## FIRST DRAFT SUBMITTED

The ALAC has considered the Final Report submitted by Westlake Governance on an ICANN DNS Risk Management Framework and offers the following comments. The report provides a framework at a relatively high level, that draws on and combines several other frameworks (Mikes and Kaplan, Capability Maturity Model, ISO31000) and tailors them to some degree to the ICANN context of DNS risk. While it may be highly open to debate whether the proposed framework is optimal for ICANN, and individuals will have very different views based on their own experience of risk management and their place within the ICANN Community, to some extent the fact that a risk management framework exists and is utilised to force rigour into the consideration of risk is an important outcome.

The detail of the proposed Framework contained within the report would need to be further developed by ICANN Staff, with some input from the ICANN Community, before implementation would be feasible. In particular, the establishment of the proposed Expert Panel (previously called the Risk Advisory Group in the 24 June 13 draft), as detailed in the Appendix 4 Terms of Reference, constitutes a significant new permanent volunteer resource within ICANN. The Risk Register Template (Appendix 6) and Risk Mitigation Schedule (Appendix 7) are highly simplistic, without any metrics, and require a great deal of expansion and adaptation for the assessment and mitigation of DNS risk. Furthermore, the estimation of resourcing required (ie the information on the 'what, who and when' part of the process) seems to be pitched at what is required for the maintenance of an ongoing Risk Management system, but the ALAC considers that the initial implementation would need a much more concerted effort with considerable resourcing, both staff (ICANN the Organisation) and volunteer (ICANN the Community). The ALAC recommends that ICANN Staff examine in greater detail the resource implications of initial implementation and ongoing maintenance of this specific Risk Management Framework before recommending to the ICANN Board whether it, or some variation of it, should be adopted.

On a more general note, the ALAC is extremely disappointed that the Framework as proposed in the Final Report has not built in any substantial way on the work undertaken by the DSSA Working Group. Most disturbingly, the instigation of this study led to a suspension of the important work of the DSSA, and effectively caused that group to lose all momentum for the continuation of the security risk assessment tasks.