EN

MONTREAL – Joint Meeting: ICANN Board and SSAC
Wednesday, November 6, 2019 – 09:00 to 10:00 EDT
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

MERIKE KAEO:	All right. This is the one-minute warning.
	All right. Could everybody sit down, please. We're ready to get started.
	So welcome to the SSAC-board session.
	And I think, to first get started, I'd like to make sure that everybody knows who's around the table.
	So why don't we go around and introduce ourselves.
WARREN KUMARI:	Hi. Warren Kumari, an SSAC member.
BARRY LEIBA:	Barry Leiba, on SSAC.
PATRIK FALTSTROM:	Patrik Faltstrom, SSAC.
HARALD ALVESTRAND:	Harald Alvestrand, ICANN board.

RON DA SILVA: Ron Da Silva, ICANN board.

TRIPTI SINHA: Tripti Sinha, ICANN board.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Akinori Maemura, ICANN board, BTC chair.

MERIKE KAEO: Merike Kaeo, SSAC liaison to the board.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Rod Rasmussen, SSAC chair.

JULIE HAMMER: Julie Hammer, SSAC vice-chair.

CHERINE CHALABY: Cherine Chalaby, ICANN board.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Maarten Botterman, ICANN board.

GORAN MARBY: Goran Marby, ICANN org.

LYMAN CHAPIN: Lyman Chapin, SSAC.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Jaap Akkerhuis, SSAC.

CRISTIAN HESSELMAN: Cristian Hesselman, SSAC.

MERIKE KAEO: Great. Welcome, everyone.

                         Next slide, please.

                         So on our agenda, we have two primary topics.

                         One is an SSAC topic that we wanted to raise. The SSAC has taken on an environmental scan of threats to the DNS ecosystem. So we would like to brief the ICANN board on the initial environmental scan of what we have found.

                         Then the second half of what we have will be the board topics to primarily get the SSAC's input on the community, board, and ICANN readiness for the three critical plans that will shape the ICANN future.

                         So I will hand it over to Rod to talk about the environmental scan.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Great. Thank you, Merike.

If we could have that slide deck. While that deck is being brought up, I wanted to take a few minutes off the start here to do a couple things. First of all, I'd like to thank Goran and Cherine for including a wonderful, brief tribute to Don Blumenthal, our friend and colleague in SSAC who we lost just a month ago, at the opening ceremony. It was quite touching. And we had the first-ever Blumenthal Dinner the other night. Goran came, and we spent an hour or so remembering our good friend. And that was very special for us. So thank you for that.

I would also like to recognize that this is our last board meeting with Cherine, who has been -- who, when he came to the board chairman role, he had very large shoes to fill with our beloved Dr. Steve Crocker having to step down. And, of course, for those of you who don't know, Steve was the first SSAC chair, helped with the creation of the SSAC, and ran it for many, many years.

So we had a particularly keen interest in seeing how this new guy was going to deal with things.

And, Cherine, you more than filled his shoes. You overfilled them in many ways. You've made security and stability a primary goal of ICANN and overall. The work towards the strategic plan, obviously, shows that first and foremost. And the Board Technical Committee has been -- has evolved into a very effective, we think, mechanism. You have been behind the scenes constantly, working with me, to make sure that the work we're doing, whether it's the NCAP or other things that involved ICANN org and working together with the organization, whether it's the policy team or OCTO, has been going well.

And the one thing that I will always take from our interactions is that you always start and end our conversations by talking about trust. And that is -- and trust, from a security perspective, means certain things, trusted networks and things like that. But in this environment, trust and being able to work together, and you have been a very trustworthy partner in working with us.

And thank you very much for your service to us.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you.

[Applause]

Rod, I have to say, it's been a real pleasure to work with you, because you, too, engender trust, and you're a straight-shooter. And I think this is very important.

In terms of Steve Crocker, I have to say something. He gave me one task when I succeeded him. He said, "Cherine, you have to learn to count in binary. Otherwise, the technical community will not be able to talk to you." Right?

I have failed him, by the way.

[Laughter]

And I had dinner with him last night. He said, okay, well, if you can't count in binary, I'll help you to do it with your hands, and he started,

one, two, one -- have you ever seen Steve doing that? He can count endlessly in a very good way.

So, anyway, it's been such a pleasure. And I really enjoyed our interaction. I really enjoyed the strong relationship that the SSAC has with the board.

And now I think the relationship with the technical community -- the technical committee is also maturing. 'Cause, you know, we set up this technical committee after Steve left because we felt that he was the technical committee. And then when he's gone, we wanted to make sure that we institutionalize and have a real committee that is the point of entrance into the board for all technical matters. And it took a while for that committee to develop and find its own rhythm. And now they've found it, I think, and it's functioning extremely well. And we're very, very happy that we have -- and that you guys, at least, say that it's working for you as well. And that's a big reward for us, and we really appreciate that.

So thank you very much for your kind words. And I'll miss you guys. Thank you.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay. Well -- and, you know, we are -- we had a very good meeting with the Board Technical Committee Sunday or Monday, I don't even -- Monday. It's hard to -- it's, what, Wednesday? Right? Okay. All right. ICANN. Yeah.

Anyway, we discussed this, what we're going to discuss here today. And we went into a lot more detail in that meeting where we're not going to quite get to that level of depth for this meeting, because we got some things that the BGC is looking at as well and had some really constructive conversation around that.

But let me talk about what this is.

May I have the next slide, please.

The next slide, if I could.

And so what are we -- the name here is what it -- what it might imply, is we took a very large holistic look at the naming and addressing systems in order to take a kind of a step back to fundamentals.

Are we still having problems with the slides here?

I've got them in front of me in a different one, so I will continue through this while you guys are working that out.

But we wanted to do a few things with this. Besides taking a step back to first principles, we wanted to develop -- use this to develop a prioritized list of things to -- for our work product.

There we go. Excellent. Thank you.

And also to use that to inform the community about various issues that we see as being important. And that will help us with our own planning for work products, et cetera, beyond the things that we do in the normal course of business, which is oftentimes responding to board or

community requests, try and keep up with the issues that are topical within ICANN community and also what our own members bring from their experience. We wanted to also have this more broad and kind of top-down look at things so we make sure we're not missing things.

Another important thing we want to do with this is to figure out where we may have gaps in our own membership, whether it's skills that we either don't have or may have not enough members to be able to form a work party. If we wanted to dive into a particular topic space, you need to have a critical mass of people in order to get that sort of work done. So those are some of the factors.

Next slide, please.

Why now? Why the timing?

First off, it's actually in our charter, or our -- the way we were formed.

One of the things that we, as SSAC, is to from time to time, is do an ongoing assessment of the threats to the naming and numbering system. So that is something that we've done on, I would say, a more informal basis. But I think one of the things we had seen is the ICANN overall moving towards a -- more of a strategic planning process and thinking about things from the bottom -- you know, from going back to first principles again.

And so that was a bit of an inspiration for us to take a look at ourselves and do the same thing.

So this really got kicked off at the beginning of the year. But we really got going on this in the late spring and over the summer.

The -- this also coincides with our own organizational review. And those were some of the recommendations that were contained within that review.

And we are also -- we also had looked and had decided to change up our own membership process so that instead of a kind of a process where, as people would apply, it would be an ad hoc thing, an application would come in, we'd evaluate that person in a vacuum, so to speak, where we want to move to a plan where we can actually bring in a whole bunch of different candidates and be able to fill out those gaps, wherever they may be, in technical diversity and other diversity areas that ICANN has set as priorities, and we have as well.

And, by the way, we are -- we are -- we will be looking for new members, and we could certainly use some input. We are having several members leave at the end of this year, so we'll be down a little bit. We'll be looking to refill that. So if you know some folks who might be good candidates, we would encourage you to encourage them, or you yourself, to consider joining.

Next slide, please.

So in order to do this process, we broke this down into several steps. First, we wanted to do this comprehensive scan, looking at the threats from a holistic area, trying to categorize things into broad buckets and put that together into a document where we could see everything at

once and then have a methodology around taking a look at those threats and, you know, looking at the likelihood, how likely they're going to happen and what kind of impact that we're going to have in scoring those, at least on a rough basis. And then from that, create a prioritized list of those different -- the different issues. And those issues, then turn those into particular study areas that we would consider as work products.

So we're partway through this. So we're not done yet. So there's no magic answers here at the end of this. We're still working on this.

But I do want to point out that -- excuse me -- in order to do this, we were -- we received some assistance from OCTO and also from the -- we had the ability to use a research fellow that the policy folks were able to have work for us for six months. And our own really hard-working staff did a fantastic job of being able to put together in a short period of time, just a few months, this really comprehensive work product we have right now internally. It's got over 170 items in its bibliography. So there was a lot of research that was pulled together. So there was a heck of a lot of work. And we really appreciate that we were able to tap into that to put this together.

Next slide, please.

So the scan itself is, as I said, a wide-ranging look at the threats. And we tried to group them into four major areas, with, you know -- together with those areas, we have a high level, in a paragraph -- a few sentences or a paragraph or two, depending on the nature of it, about each of these types of issues we identified.

And then we have, as I mentioned, a very extensive bibliography. So this should be very useful for us going forward as we keep it up to date for references for being able to then take an issue, understand it at the top level, and then be able to dig into it if you want to know more.

Next slide -- next scan -- or next slide, please.

Next slide, please.

So while the next slide is coming up, I will talk about the threat classifications we came up with.

Here we go.

And it -- I'm sure you can't see it from out there, 'cause I'm -- it's in front of me, and it's difficult to see, but this is -- the classifications on the left side there are the most important things to take away from that. These are the areas that we bucketed our items into.

And then underneath each of those, you can see some examples. These are kind of the headings of what various types of threats are. And this is not -- as I've mentioned, this is not a final product yet. We have some refinement to do here. One of those refinements is making sure the terminology we're using and the terminology the BTC has looked at in their own work are harmonized in some way and that we have some further refinement about some of these items, which some of them are very particular and some of them encompass several other subtopics on them. But this gives you a rough idea of where we're at on this classification effort.

From this, we are planning on, as I said, doing some refinement on those risks, also taking a look at where there are existing mitigations, because a lot of these things have been dealt with. And also looking at where there are, as I said, this classification around priorities as far as where we might want to spend our time and energy. And that may mean advice to the ICANN board, the ICANN community, part -- constituencies or contracted parties, other players in the ecosystem. That may be advice to outside entities. And we've done that in the past as SSAC, while we have a particular remit towards the ICANN board and the ICANN community, we are also providing advice on issues that have a broader impact across the Internet.

Typically, they have some sort of at least tangential impact on what we're doing here with the DNS. So that's the goal there.

One more slide. Next steps. Thank you. Next slide.

There we go. I knew there had to be one more slide.

The -- so as I said, we want to articulate these threats more clearly.

One of the things that's not on here because we have our meeting with the BTC, we want to do this harmonization exercise with some of the work the BTC has been doing. And then, you know, as I mentioned, we're going to use this for mapping our people skills, needs, to the priorities and also add to our work plan.

We have plenty of work we've got going right now, and we've found that some -- the work parties we have operating right now touch on some of the things we preliminarily found were high-priority areas

through our top-down process. So we're in alignment there. This isn't a gating item, but we want to be able to use this going forward.

The other thing that we are hoping to do is publish this in some form for the community to be able to use. It's not ready for that -- doing that yet, because we need to -- what we have is a very large list of threats and potential, you know, areas of concern. What we don't have with that list of threats is, you know, where those stand as far as mitigations and things like that. And we don't want to scare you too much on this. That's really important that we -- when you talk about these things, you also talk about what their status is.

So we're looking to do that and trying to get that out in hopefully fairly short order. But we'll see how the schedules go. But definitely before the next time we all sit down together at one of these ICANN meetings.

I believe that's the last slide. But could you just double -- yes, that's the last slide.

So I'll open that up to discussion with the board.

MERIKE KAEO: Yes. So I just want to give one additional statement.

So as we've presented this and also to the BTC, I want to just add to what Rod was saying, that be very careful when you're just looking at what the categories of the threats are, because there is no context behind it yet. And so just the words and that we've identified certain topics as being threats doesn't mean that their impact or the likelihood

is to be something to be worried about; right? You need context behind it.

And so one of the things that this scan has done, it's an excellent, excellent document to articulate what could the threat be and why. But the addition that hasn't yet been put in is the -- the mitigation techniques that exist. So I just want to caution people. I saw some people take pictures of the slide also, that these are not threats. Some of them may be negligible because there are already existing mitigation techniques.

I just wanted to point that out.

Cherine, did you have a question?

CHERINE CHALABY: Yes. I mean, this is going to tie in very nicely when I talk a little bit about getting ready for implementing our strategic plan, because one of the biggest concerns we have is how to keep the plan alive. And so we have to create a mechanism where we all, as a community, on a regular basis, engage to assess any new threats, any changes to the direction possibly based on these external threats.

And then when we were giving this presentation to other constituencies, how are you going to keep current with what's going on? Because if you want to be involved as a community in updating the strategic plan, reviewing it, you've got to be current with knowing what are all the external forces that are affecting us. So this is really spot on in terms of work.

And I see also -- What I don't understand is this work plan. What is this work -- is this an SSAC work plan or -- to do what exactly?

Yeah. But the general thing is amazing.

The other question at the end was just for understanding.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thanks, Cherine. Let me address that.

So we have -- That is SSAC's internal work plan for what kind of work parties we would start up.

So just for background for the people in the room that may not be familiar with how SSAC works, we have 38 members right now. But they all have different backgrounds and different availability and timing and things like that. So one of the things we try to do is manage the work we do when we're coming out with a paper or working on a study or public comment or any of those things, is match up the skills with -- of people that we have with background in that area with actual ongoing work. Because we're limited by their capability for volunteer hours; right? So if we have a whole bunch of things on, say, DNSSEC that's an issue, we have so many people who can work on that. So if you have ten things on DNSSEC, you kind of plan that out; right? That's an extreme example, but trying to illustrate the point.

We also have a limitation on staff resources, meeting times. Literally, there's so many hours of the day you can line up people from around the world to be able to get together on a call. What we typically do is

we'll form a work party and have a topic area, and we'll have weekly or biweekly calls, depending on the availability, where they'll iterate on a document and bring in -- or maybe some research or what have you, to bring together a document, then, that that work party hashes out, edits, et cetera, adds, substracts. And then when they feel that's ready, then they present that to the entire SSAC for a review and we have a conversation around that, update that.

 If all goes well, we then present that -- or we publish that for the community. And if there's particular recommendations, that kicks off process that, you know, we track with the board. If there are board recommendations, et cetera, it has a whole other bit.

 But that whole ability -- again, this is my own prioritization, the word of the week, the word of the year, as it were -- around how to get the work done. And, yeah, this is one of the reasons we wanted to do this, is we want to make sure that we weren't leaving any really high-priority items off the table just because we were focused in on what we had in front of us already.

 Julie.

JULIE HAMMER: Just one minor point to add. One of the things that helped us significantly in this work was the fact that in our budget, we had some money for a research fellow. And we are also working on ways in which having that budget for a research fellow in the future can help us progress this work more quickly.

MERIKE KAEO: Okay. Harald, you had a comment.

HARALD ALVESTRAND: So I would just say that this is -- what has been presented so far looks like an excellent start, and I am looking very much forward to reading the background material as it rolls out.

 And, naturally, we -- this is something that will have to be the basis of a living body of knowledge, whether it's maintained as a document or whatever, because what we do about it will change over time.

 And not only SSAC will have to -- will be able to use this information, but other bodies can also take it up and say, "Okay, here's a problem. This problem is more important than that problem." That's -- and we actually can do something about that. Let's do something.

 So it's a very good start for having the ability to have a conversation about who does what and how do we mitigate the threats or embrace the opportunities that occur in this landscape.

 Thank you.

MERIKE KAEO: I'll make a comment to that, too.

One of the challenges, always, when you're discussing risks and mitigation techniques is really how public do you make that. Because anything that can be used for good can be used for bad. So you have to

really be careful about how you make the information available so that it's useful but also can't be used for any nefarious activity.

Akinori, you had a question?

AKINORI MAEMURA: Yes. Not a question, but a comment.

Thank you very much, the SSAC people, to do this quite holistic approach scanning the threats. And that's a really good job. And I really expect the future development of this.

And then in the board, at the Board Technical Committee, we are doing a little bit similar project under the shepherdship of Harald, after -- we called that as the DNS evolution and security. And it's another kind of a scanning, listing of threat, and then identify that and recognize that as our own risk, and then do something to address that.

So this SSAC product is quite much more widespread to take everything around the Internet infrastructure technology into its own view. So in that sense, it's really holistic.

And then what we are doing at the board level is some sort of -- it can be combined, or it can be -- you know, get along with.

So this week, yes, as Rod said, BTC and SSAC had some in-depth discussion on this. And this is a very good beginning of the -- to cooperate with each other.

And then I'm -- we at the BTC need to have a deeper look on that and how to -- how to co-work with this product, with this (indiscernible).

And, again, thank you very much for this effort. Thanks.

MERIKE KAEO: Yeah. Thank you for this, Akinori. Definitely the BTC work and what the SSAC has done is very complementary.

Anybody else have any questions on this particular topic?

Okay. I will then hand it over to Cherine to discuss the board-related topics.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you. Can we put that questions up? Right.

So basically, over the past year and a half, the Board, the community and ICANN org worked together in developing the next five-year strategic plan for ICANN, and we've done that and the Board adopted it in Marrakech. Now, you can't implement the strategy document on its own. We need to develop an implementation plan for that. And Goran and ICANN org led the work on that.

This document, which we call, in ICANN terminology, operating and financial plan, will be available for the community for comment in December this year. So the strategy and the implementation plan will both be available for you in December.

In addition to that, there's a third plan which is really a subset of the second one about the evolution of the multistakeholder model. And that exercise is being facilitated by Brian Cute, a member of the community. And in that plan, all we need at this stage is to identify the issues that are of concerns to the community in terms of improving the effectiveness of our model, and also find some suggested approaches that will lead eventually to some solution over the life of the strategic plan. It is scheduled that this plan will also be available in December for comment.

So, in December, we as a community, all of us, we will have three plans in our hand, and they're really far-reaching plan that, in a way, map out the road for ICANN over the next five years.

So the question to us is what do we do? Do we just say, okay, we're happy with those, leave it to ICANN org to implement, or do we engage collectively as a community, each one according to their ability to engage, and make it a successful collective endeavor?

So we posed that question to you guys in -- to all the community in Kobe and said -- the question said, "What do you want to do?"

And we were very, very happy with the response. Pretty much every constituency said, "No, we need to be engaged." And I think that was a very good sign.

And then we said, okay, if that's the case, what do you suggest as a community? What do you suggest the Board should do, what do you suggest ICANN org should do, and what do you suggest the community

should do to get ready to implement those plans successfully which the bylaws mandate have to be effective 1st of July next year; all right?

So what we're going to present to you now is three slides, no more than three. Each one of them summarizes or synthesizes what you, the community, are telling Board, org and yourself what should be done to get ready.

So here's the first one. And there are no more than five suggestions or maximum six per group. So only three slides. I'll go through them very quickly, and then we'll open up for discussion.

So the first one you're saying to the Board, one, the strategic plan has a new vision. It's called being the champion of the single open, interoperable Internet and the steward of its unique identifiers. So you are saying what are you going to do, the Board, to demonstrably show you are championing this new vision or are you going to leave it to us as a community? What are you going to do?

Second thing, you said the strategic plan has five key objectives. Sorry for that. Can we just go back a couple of slides to remind everybody of those five objectives? Here they are. We don't have to go through the details of them but one on security, one on governance, one on unique identifiers, one on geopolitics, and one on financials. Five; right?

So let's back to the -- Go forward again.

So you are telling us, great, we all agree on those five strategic objectives. How are you, the Board, going to align your work with that? We don't want you, as a Board, going on a tangent doing other things

other than what's in the strategic plan and obviously our bylaws and mission.

Thirdly, you said we want you to engage everybody in getting ready for the successful implementation. Hence, this meeting and the meeting we're having with everybody just to raise the awareness and saying what do we do.

The next one is interesting. You said your job as the Board doesn't stop with us kicking off this plan and starting it in 1st of July. You have a job to do, provide an ongoing oversight of its implementation.

And then finally you said we want the Board to ensure that the strategic plan is a living document. We're not going to forget this in a drawer. We want you to find the mechanism to engage us as a community, to review it at regular interval and adjust it if necessary.

So those are the five suggested actions or responsibility that you expect from the Board.

Move on to the next one.

As for ICANN org, you said, okay, so we have three plans. They have to be implemented, we need to have an implementation manager for us, working for us, all of us. And your suggestion is ICANN org should be the implementation manager. They have to develop detailed plans. And if you look -- drop down to number 6 at the bottom, and you demand as a community that ICANN org, as the implementation manager, provide a regular progress report to us as a community about the status of the implementation of those three plans.

The second point here, you said, okay, one of the strategic objectives is to ensure the long-term financial sustainability of ICANN. Well, if that's the case, we expect ICANN org to have tightly -- a tight control over ICANN's operating expenses; okay?

The next thing which relates to you guys a bit, it says -- you talk about two very big goals which are very important, like the security is a big issue, like evolving the unique identifiers. We know that ICANN, on their own, you can't do it. You need to go out and engage with the technical community, with our other partners like the RIRs, and work together to achieve this goal.

And, in fact, we have put into Goran's annual goals, this is one of the goals, to be out and engage with the technical community.

Number 4 is you said ICANN org has to provide resources to anticipate, understand, and respond to any changes in the regulatory and legislative environment worldwide. A lot of you said we're doing catch-up with GDPR. We don't want to do this again. So we have to anticipate ahead of time and engage. It's not just a passive engagement. It's also to engage proactively with governments, with the regulatory authority in order to understand the landscape and what's coming. In a way, like your scan on technical threat, this has to be another scan, and a proactive one, on this side.

And then number 5, which is, okay, which is something we have done in the years past, make sure your yearly operating plan and budget are consistent with the five-year strategy.

And then the last slide is, again -- and when I say "your," it doesn't mean this is the SSAC's suggestion. It means that it's SSAC, GNSO, all constituencies together. We just put the synthesis here.

Here's what you said about suggestions for yourselves as a community. First one is let's walk the talk. If we really believe in this vision and strategic plan, then we have to make sure that there's a community-wide buy-in. If I ask anyone in this room today, do you remember what the five or six strategic objectives in the current plans are, anyone remembers, raise your hand? No. Because what we did really, we wrote it, we put it in a drawer and we forgot about it. Okay. But at that time we were going through the transition. The issue was we wanted to be global, independent, multistakeholder, all of that.

Today we are saying we are going to face more external forces, more than we've ever done as an organization, particularly on security threats, particularly on fragmentation of the Internet. We cannot just allow ourselves to put this in a drawer and forget about it. We have to be proactive. So by being proactive means, remember those five goals I mentioned to you? You know? And live and walk the talk and live the vision.

Number two you said, okay, we're asking the Board, we're asking ICANN org to align their work with the strategic plan. Wouldn't it be a good idea, to the extent possible, that every SO and AC do the same thing and align their work with the strategic plan.

Number three, for years we've been crying as a community that we need to make our multistakeholder model more effective. Well, we

have an opportunity to do it now. What are we going to do? Are we going to just do a paper exercise or are we going to commit and make it happen? That's number three.

And number four, it's exactly the discussion you guys had. We want you, ICANN org, to -- the Board to create a mechanism for us to review the strategic plan on a periodic basis, want to assess external threats, and we make sure that the direction is still the right direction. So every community has to get ready so that when the time comes to review the strategic plan, it is an informed decision, an informed input.

So thank you very much for the scanning of the threats and what you mentioned. It's exactly that.

And then finally, okay, we believe that, you know, we ought to ensure ICANN's financial sustainability because that's in all of our interests, so we need to do our bit. We need to be more productive, and we also need to find an increased pool of volunteers. And I know you just mentioned earlier that we have some people leaving, people coming. That is not an easy thing to do. We recognize that. And we need to deliver, as a community, to the Board timely, effective recommendations, policy and advice, and also foster an awareness among the efficient use of the ICANN's limited resources.

So those are your suggestions as a community to yourself, to ICANN org, to the Board. Now I'm going to open up to discussion.

What do you think, guys? Does it make sense? Have we missed anything? We got something wrong? And how are we going to take

these on, each one of us, and make sure we actually do what we said we need to do.

Back to you.

MERIKE KAEO: All right. Rod, do you have a comment?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Why, yes, I do.

Thank you, Cherine. As you pointed out as you went through the presentation, it seems as though our work here was timely. So I guess we anticipated these slides to some extent.

But, no, seriously, though, it is -- as I mentioned earlier, the work we were doing around the threat scan, the prioritization of issues and the like was in part inspired by the overall strategic plan exercise that we participated in along with all the other parts of the ICANN community. So it was quite apparent that we're maturing the processes and the organization and the like.

SSAC as a whole hasn't gotten together and looked at this and done our normal magic around that kind of consensus stuff, but I will talk to a few points that -- that we have opined upon in the past and just make some personal observations as well.

So the number one area for the strategic plan is around security, and that is kind of our charter and our purpose, so when that one came out

of the process with the strategic planning, we knew we were right in the middle of that and considered that part of what we do and what we bring to ICANN, the community, and all the other entities that, you know, are called out in this. So that makes perfect sense to us, that we're doing that. And the things that are mentioned for both -- from the organization's perspective and the Board's perspective are already in place in many ways in that we have a process, working with the Board through the BTC, we have the issues tracking system already up and running. Obviously there's always room for improvement on these things, but we actually have mechanisms to -- in play that I think meet that July target; right? For, especially, as I said, working with the Board and org in particular.

We also have -- less formally, we do have a very tight working relationship with the RSSAC. We have a liaison between the two organizations that -- and we have a regular meeting at every ICANN meeting between the two organizations where we take a look at issues that both are -- well, actually each individual organization is looking at and looking for overlaps. The root key rollover that was just proposed was an area yesterday in our meeting we determined we would coordinate our response on to make sure that anything that we come up with that might be different between each other is actually rationalized between us so that we can fully understand that and give you good advice on that. So we actually have -- that's a formal process -- a little bit more formal process. And we have informal processes with other SOs and ACs. We typically try to have a regular meeting with

ALAC, and we have a pretty good relationship with the PSWG, which is part of GAC.

So there are a lot of things that we're doing on an informal basis to try and do these things to move forward and be able to have a combined view, moving forward, on just issues we deal with. But tying it into an overall strategic plan makes a ton of sense because you want to be pulling in a direction that -- that, in the long run, is best for the entire community.

So in general, these are pretty good.

One area, and this is my personal observation, although I imagine the rest of the SSAC members will probably support me on this, is the thing I see missing here is kind of the metrics in process. What are the things we're going to measure in order to see that we're actually accomplishing the goals?

And I think this is a great place for discussion. I think our discussion with the BTC on tracking threats and the thing that we got kicked off here is, you know, a way of getting that started. But one of the things we do need to think about is how do we track and where we're going to achieve our goals and how we're doing along that.

And, you know, we want to be able to say, great, we got this done, but we also want to say where are we lagging behind and where do we need to put more effort into achieving those goals.

So those are a couple of things I see there. And I'll stop pontificating and see if there are others who want to weigh in here.

CHERINE CHALABY: I just want to respond to that metrics and goals, because I think that's quite important, because if you have a strategy without metrics, goals, deliverables, everything, it will be a total waste of time, in my view.

So this is what you should look for.

Can we scroll back a couple slides, please. Keep going back. One more. That's it. No -- that's it.

So what I've showed you here is just snippets from the strategic plan, which is a high-level direction.

The next document down, which is the operating and financial plan, this is the one I've been referring to as the implementation plan, is the one that will have all the metrics, the deliverables, and all of that. And that is the one that is going to be put out for public comment in December. And I think you should scrutinize this extremely hard to make sure you're satisfied, because it is against that second plan that you have asked for ICANN org to provide you with regular reporting as this is being implemented. And the reporting has to be against not just high-level stuff. It's got to be against all the deliverables, against metrics, against all of these things. So that is a real exercise that we all have to put our -- a lot of effort into it to get it right so that, as we move forward, we'll be able to track our progress extremely well.

So thank you for raising that point.

ROD RASMUSSEN: And in response to that, too, I will point out that we have the issues tracker that we have. I believe ALAC and SSAC have their issues in the same system, if I remember correctly. That is a way of making sure that particular projects and things are going, which is a tool that's already in place that can be looked at. That one, we are still going through how we are going to fully do that through an implementation light, but it's a base to build with it.

My point on the metrics is how do we make sure that that, which is set up for kind of tracking ongoing day-to-day, so to speak, projects, has turned into a how are we executing against our strategic plan. So we'll look for that and other things in that plan. I'm looking forward to seeing that.

CHERINE CHALABY: While I'm still having the floor and still around, just give you one more thing.

So we, clearly, on the Board -- can we go back to those five strategies? The five? Yeah.

So we have now gone to every one of our committees -- the Board has seven, eight, or nine committees, one on governance, one on financials, one on the BTC, and so on -- said how are you, each committee, going to align your work against each one of those as well. So make sure that our committees stay within that -- that very clear five tracks that are identified by the strategic plan.

So -- So I think it will work. It just needs a lot of hard work to put those metrics, to put those proper reporting, and a commitment to make it work. And then it will be successful.

MERIKE KAEO: Thank you for that.

Patrik.

PATRIK FALTSROM: Thank you very much.

First of all, I would like to -- as being the chair when you stepped in, Cherine, I would like to personally thank you very much for everything that you've done, and wish Maarten good luck on your endeavors. I'm sure that SSAC and Rod will take care of you. Cherine can tell you a little bit what that involves.

And Cherine, you can, of course, apply for membership in SSAC.

Anyways, can we go to slide 7, please.

CHERINE CHALABY: I can count in digits only. Sorry.

PATRIK FALTSROM: So back to the topic. Being an engineer and operation person, for me it's really important when having actions to tie a little bit to these things

with metrics to know who owns each one of these actions. Who is making sure we're moving forward.

We are a community with very different roles and very different number of sort of suborganizations within ICANN as a whole.

If I exaggerate a little bit, I look at these actions, I see one, number 2 on this slide, which is just like you mentioned, that is directly targeted at, for example, SSAC and the other organizations to ensure that we are aligning our work with those five strategic objectives.

The rest of the actions, I don't see there would directly be anything that we at SSAC, for example, can pick up. I think the actions are probably owned by ICANN's CEO, ICANN corporation, or maybe the Board until it is a little bit -- it's sort of expanded a little bit what actually should be done there. Is that something of you that you might share or how do we move forward? I would like to move forward with more tangible items here for, for example, us in SSAC so we don't have anything that is dropping between the chairs.

MERIKE KAEO: I see that Harald had his hand up.

HARALD ALVESTRAND: Just I hope you said -- I certainly hope that SSAC will also help with number 4, which when stuff -- shit happens in the external world, please warn us; otherwise, we might miss it.

PATRIK FALTSROM: Oh, yes. Missed. Understand me correctly. There are several of those actions which are things that will be done, and the community, including SSAC, is expected to help with the review and make sure there the action. But I think that is like normal operations here in ICANN. But it's not really the community that owns that action. That is what I wanted to try to try to --

MERIKE KAEO: Cherine, next.

CHERINE CHALABY: So I would say number 3 is critical. I think we all have to. And in number 3, there are six issues that the community identified ought to be addressed.   And the number one issue I think is going to be prioritization. And, frankly, it is going to be a very, very difficult problem to solve because we have been putting it on the back burner for years. And I can see George sitting here. I remember a discussion with George a few years ago when this issue came up and said, "Cherine, this is an issue of supply and demand." We have a central pool of very limited resources, whether it's volunteers, ICANN org staff, money, and time. Those are the -- right? And we have a real heavy demand coming from either PDPs or CCWGs or reviews or advice, or this, every one of those requesting help for this very small pool of resources. Who makes the priority? Who makes the decision? How do we go about -- right? -- deciding whether the need for NCAP resources is better, more important, or less important than the need for an EPDP on sort of GDPR resources? How do you make that decision?

If there's an endless pool, then it's not an issue. And prior to the transition -- excuse me -- we had our funding increasing not exponentially but steadily increasing over the years. A few years ago our size was smaller, our problems were smaller, and we could do it. We never thought about it, even though we had these problems. But now it's been three, four years that we're feeling the pinch very much. And everything comes -- becomes a priority over that single priority. Prioritizing our work is a top priority, but there was always another priority above that.

And I think the moment has come that we need to fix it. Because at the moment, the Board is sitting on 3-, 400 recommendations that are coming our way, and you know you can't implement all of those in one go. And there's request for funding for resources everywhere. You know you can't provide those, so how do we prioritize?

So with your engineering and brains, frankly, this requires -- requires some sort of a solution that works for everybody. So that's going to be a tough one, and your input and contribution to that would be greatly appreciated, I think.

George, do you remember that discussion we had about, you know, supply and demand and a central pool? You do. Do you want to share your -- the benefit of your thoughts with the group? There's time?

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Okay. Thank you. Covered one half of it.

The other half was the following. That I felt ICANN is acting very much as a cost center, and that is it has a fixed supply of resources, and it's overcome by this flow of demands.

I would argue that ICANN should operate more like a profit center and say here's what we have to do. Let's go out and get the resources to do it. That means increases in budget, which are not popular with anyone, but if you're really going to meet all the demands that you think you should -- you should meet, then the current budget is inadequate.

Thank you.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you, George. That's not exactly what I thought you would say, but....

[Laughter]

MERIKE KAEO: I'm just going to make a comment, also. As I sit on the Board side as the liaison, I'm just going to say I'm very, very happy that the SSAC undertook its environmental scan, because part of that was also to actually get the SSAC to look at what do we prioritize from an overall security and stability perspective, which ties in really nicely as we all try to figure out what does the community overall prioritize, and everything that's coming down the pipe.

So I think it really ties in very nicely to the overall strategic plan and implementation.

I C A N N
ANNUAL GENERAL
66
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

So does anybody else have any other comment?

Rod -- I mean Ram.

RAM MOHAN: Thanks. This is Ram.

So one of the pieces of -- at least comments or perhaps advice for the Board, is to make sure that the expectation is not to arrive at convergence and/or consensus on what these priorities are and how the implementation of these priorities ought to be, because it's a diverse community, and if you want to get to an effective multistakeholder model, then I would argue that an effective multistakeholder model ought to be one that both provides a good platform for diversity of views, but I think from the Board and from ICANN org, the real task is to synthesize, and then make choices, and then explain the choices even if those choices are not in convergence with everything that comes from the community.

One of the concerns that has happened in the past is one part of the community is upset about something, and there is a great deal of sound and fury, and that results in skewing the priorities, even though they may not be appropriate for the institution of ICANN.

MERIKE KAEO: Thank you for those comments, Ram.

Anybody else have a question or comment before we close the session?

I C A N N
ANNUAL GENERAL
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019
66

There is one question from the audience.

AUSTIN BOLLINGER: Hi, my name is Austin Bollinger. I'm from Grand Rapids, Michigan, here on behalf of the next-gen program.

I know back in 2013 there was talk on DNS security in regards to rate limiting, for example. And then I know shortly after, in 2015, there was a strong push for DNSSEC along with 2018. And the larger results when, for example, being malicious there, that can be more damaging.

I'm just slightly curious if there's any talk on hardening DNS security along with the push for DNSSEC, or how that could look.

MERIKE KAEO: Yeah, I'm just -- yeah, I'll give it to Patrik.

PATRIK FALTSROM: Okay. I'll try.

There is still very, very large push for DNSSEC as -- given the LAN security and threat landscape that we see out there. In that landscape, we need all the (indiscernible) security mechanism as we can, and a single one of them will not solve all the problems we have. Exactly how to prioritize and where the energy should be spent depends very much on what kind of threats and what kind of risks analysis you do of the situation within which you operate. This is one of the reasons why, for example, we in SSAC and the Board, we're trying to coordinate and help

by doing this investigation of the threat landscape related to the identifiers.

But if we go back to DNSSEC, as you had mentioned, it is really, really, really important to separate zone signing, which creates a digital signature on the data in DNS, and validation that is needed to validate whether those signatures are correct.

In the push for DNSSEC, there's too much marketing which only look at the signing when the in reality, for example, what we see in Sweden, you must start by looking at the validation. Exactly how to get more DNSSEC signing and validation deployed out there is something that absolutely is still discussed. For example, as the activist Don Blumenthal dinner that we had Monday which created quite a lot of discussion.

So it is needed to dig a little bit deeper than using buzzwords when looking at the various different kind of things. But we do hope that, for example, this threat landscape (indiscernible) that we are looking into will help each organization to evaluate where they are and what risk they are operating in.

MERIKE KAEO: I'm also going to take this. So when you deal with security items, there isn't just one silver bullet. And so when you hear about limiting, like using reverse policy zones, right, RPZ, they help when you have large-scale denial of service attacks. When you have DNSSEC, it helps to know that you're getting the right answers. And so there's many

different techniques that you use because you have to look at holistic security issues.

There's a lot of SSAC documents, some of them dated from ten years ago, that are basic and fundamental in terms of how do you secure DNS.

And it's not just that one particular strategy is going to help solve all the issues. Again, you have to look at it holistically, and it's security by design, and there's many layers.

And so I hope that also helps answer part of the question.

And we are over time, so thank you very much to everybody for attending. And let's have a great rest of the day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]