Review and Analysis of the Implementation of the First Security, Stability, and Resiliency Review Team Recommendations

# Overall Observations

## Summary of assessment of implementation

| Rec | Status | Comment |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Completed |  |
| 2 | Implemented | Has a recurrent component so will never be completed |
| 3 | In process | Will require application to all future materials |
| 4 | In process |  |
| 5 | In process |  |
| 6a | In process |  |
| 6b | In process |  |
| 6c | Completed | Whether resources provided is “appropriate” is subjective |
| 7a | In process |  |
| 7b | Not yet started | Depends on 7a |
| 8 | In process |  |
| 9a | In process | Deferred until the CIO/CTO role has been filled |
| 9b | Not yet started | Depends on 9a |
| 10a | In process | Efforts to step up compliance enforcement continue |
| 10b | Implemented | Whether resources provided is “adequate” is subjective |
| 10c | Completed |  |
| 11 | In process |  |
| 12a | In process |  |
| 12b | In process |  |
| 13 | In process |  |
| 14 | In process | Continuous evolution implies it will never complete |
| 15 | Completed |  |
| 16a | Implemented | As outreach efforts will continue, this will never complete |
| 16b | In process |  |
| 17a | In process |  |
| 17b | In process |  |
| 18 | Completed |  |
| 19 | In process |  |
| 20 | In process |  |
| 21 | In process |  |
| 22 | In process |  |
| 23a | Implemented | Whether the resources provided is “appropriate” is subjective |
| 23b | In process | Unclear whether this is implementable |
| 24a | Completed | Some question whether the approach taken is most effective |
| 24b | Completed |  |
| 24c | Completed |  |
| 25a | In process |  |
| 25b | Completed |  |
| 26 | In process |  |
| 27 | In process |  |
| 28 | Implemented | As engagement will continue, this will never complete |

### Actions taken

A majority (27 of 41) of the recommendations (and their sub-tasks) are as yet incomplete, however implementation has at least begun on all recommendations.

## Implementability

In nearly all cases, recommendations appear to be or, in the cases where implementation has completed, have been implementable. In the vast majority of recommendations, staff has indicated they did not anticipate or experience any issues when implementing the recommendations.

It should, however, be kept in mind that the implementation of a large number of recommendations has not been completed and, in some cases, have not even started. It may be that implementation difficulties will be encountered at some future point.

One notable exception to this general Implementability is related to recommendation 23 in which ICANN it is recommended that ICANN “must ensure decisions reached by Working Groups and Advisory Committees are reached in an objective manner that is free from external or internal pressure.” While objectivity in reaching decisions is a worthwhile goal, it is difficult to imagine a decision that is “free from external or internal pressure.”

## Effectiveness

For those recommendations that have been implemented, the overall impression has been that they have been reasonably effective in addressing at least the letter of the recommendation. Unfortunately, many of the recommendations used subjective qualifiers and few specified concrete metrics by which effectiveness could be measured. As such, objective measurement of the recommendations effectiveness is challenging.

## Summary of community input on implementation

A total of 3 public comments were received on the final report of the SSR Review team. A summary of those comments can be found at:

[http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/summary-comments-ssr-rt-final- report-30aug12-en.pdf](http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/summary-comments-ssr-rt-final-%20report-30aug12-en.pdf)

# Recommendation 1

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

## Analysis of Previous Review Team Recommendation

This recommendation aimed to publicly document ICANN’s role in relation to related to security, stability, and resiliency in a clear and concise way and to obtain consensus within the community regarding that role.

## Summary of ICANN’s assessment of implementation

Completed.

### Actions taken

#### Staff (specifically, the ICANN Security Team) published a draft statement for public comment in May 2012 and conducted extensive outreach with the community to facilitate feedback. A report of the public comments received was published, and a revised draft statement was published for the ICANN meeting in Toronto (<http://toronto45.icann.org/meetings/toronto2012/presentation-draft-ssr-role-remit-04oct12-en.pdf>). Following an open session in Toronto and additional community engagement, a new version of the statement was incorporated into the FY 14 SSR Framework, published for public comment on 6 March 2013. This document was open for public comment through 20 May 2013.

### Implementability

Implemented.

### Effectiveness

Input received on the statement has been very positive. Internal to ICANN the statement has given the new Senior Management Team language for ICANN's role and remit in SSR. Externally, the community participants who have contributed to the review of the text have noticed the improvement in language over time and have been supportive of the text.

## Summary of community input on implementation

ICANN received 20 comments on the draft statement during the public comment period between 17 May and 31 August 2012 (see <http://forum.icann.org/lists/draft-ssr-role-remit/>). A summary of these comments prepared by ICANN is available at <http://forum.icann.org/lists/draft-ssr-role-remit/pdfIijnRXQ1v1.pdf>.

## Summary of other relevant information

None.

## ATRT2 analysis of recommendation implementation

This recommendation can be partitioned into two sub-tasks:

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

ICANN did publish a statement regarding its SSR remit and limited technical mission. Whether that statement was singular, clear, and consistent is, of course, a matter of opinion, however based on public input, it would seem the statement is viewed by the commenters to be “clear and concise”. As such, this component of the recommendation would appear to have been followed.

With regards to the second component of this recommendation, while staff undertook significant efforts at outreach that appear to have been effective within the Community, it is unclear whether ICANN’s role in the context of SSR is well understood outside of the ICANN community, particularly in the non-security related communities.

## ATRT2 assessment of recommendation effectiveness

Providing a clear statement of ICANN’s SSR role and gaining consensus within at least some portion of the community regarding that role has been effective in helping people within the community understand ICANN’s role and limitations. Continued efforts at outreach and education on ICANN’s role relating to SSR would likely improve the effectiveness of the implementation of this recommendation.

# Recommendation 2

“ICANN’s definition and implementation of its SSR remit and limited technical mission should be reviewed in order to maintain consensus and elicit feedback from the Community. The process should be repeated on a regular basis, perhaps in conjunction with the cycle of future SSR reviews.”

## Analysis of Previous Review Team Recommendation

The SSR-RT thought it important to ensure ICANN's definitions of its SSR remit and limited technical mission and the implementation of that remit and mission were reviewed with input from the Community in a repeatable, regular basis.

## Summary of ICANN’s Assessment of Implementation

Implemented, albeit this recommendation has a recurrent component and thus will never be completed.

### Actions Taken

Staff (specifically, the Security Team) incorporated a tracking page in the Annual SSR Framework showing how the previous year’s activities were implemented.

ICANN published a draft of the FY14 SSR Framework that includes ICANN’s current definition of its SSR remit and limited technical mission on 6 March 2013. The public was able to comment on that Framework until 20 May 2013. The final version of the FY14 SSR Framework was published on .

The next opportunity to review would be in publication of the FY 15 Framework in 2014, and as part of the SSR RT2 kicking off in 2015.

### Implementability

Staff does not believe this recommendation has been or can be fully implemented due to the need to periodically review definitions and implementation. However efforts are underway and they do not foresee any problems during implementation.

### Effectiveness

Based on improvements that were made between the FY12 and FY13 versions of the Framework that are now reflected in the FY14 version, this recommendation was effective.

## Summary of Community Input on Implementation

In total 19 public comments were received during the public comment period associated with the publication of the draft FY 14 SSR Framework document. Summarizing those comments:

* There were multiple expressions of concern regarding resource allocations and potentially overwhelming the Security team as a result of an increased workload if the FY 14 SSR Framework is fully implemented;
* Several comments suggested that intra-ICANN and inter-organization engagement efforts by the Security team should be strengthened;
* Broadening the Framework’s perspective from ICANN the organization to ICANN the Community would be beneficial;
* Activities and initiatives should be organized according to the identified categories;
* Suggestions related to improving the Framework document, e.g., adding text to graphics, providing more detail on roles and responsibilities, etc.

However, the majority of commenters indicated they believed the information provided regarding ICANN’s SSR remit and limited technical mission provided for a “good basis for future developments.”

## Summary of Other Relevant Information

None.

## ATRT2 Analysis of Recommendation Implementation

This recommendation can be viewed as being comprised of three parts:

1. The definition of ICANN’s SSR remit and limited technical mission, with community review and gaining of consensus;
2. The implementation of that definition; and
3. Repetition of that definition/implementation process.

Taking each of these parts in turn:

### Definition, Soliciting Feedback and Gaining Consensus

The FY14 Framework has been published after a public comment period. Based on public input and subsequent revisions to the FY14 Framework prior to final publication, it would seem consensus (at least as far as ICANN normally measures consensus) was reached.

### Implementation

As noted by Staff, this recommendation is not yet implemented. However, ATRT2 notes that reasonable efforts towards implementation are underway and given the recommended cycle of definition/implementation/review, this recommendation will never be fully implemented.

### Definition/Implementation Repetition

The annual Framework-driven review of SSR remit and limited technical mission definition/implementation seems appropriate albeit this is a matter of opinion.

## ATRT2 Assessment of Recommendation Effectiveness

This recommendation has been effective in providing a framework in which ICANN’s SSR and limited technical mission can be defined and modified over time.

# Recommendation 3

“Once ICANN issues a consensus-based statement of its SSR remit and limited technical mission, ICANN should utilize consistent terminology and descriptions of this statement in all materials.”

## Analysis of Previous Review Team Recommendation

The definitions of security, stability, and resiliency are often inconsistent and can vary depending on industry, venue, and publication/speaker. This can make clarity in understanding proposals and implementation decisions challenging. In order to minimize the chances of misunderstanding, the SSR-RT recommended ICANN publish and use consistent terminology and descriptions of security, stability, and resiliency within all their materials.

## Summary of ICANN’s Assessment of Implementation

Implemented.

### Actions Taken

On 8 July 2013, Patrick Jones, Senior Director of Security, posted the definitions ICANN uses for the set of terms surrounding the concepts of security, stability, and resiliency and their context at <http://blog.icann.org/2013/07/icanns-security-terminology/>.

### Implementability

Staff does not believe this recommendation has been fully implemented, however efforts are underway and they do not foresee any problems during implementation.

### Effectiveness

Staff believes the implementation of this recommendation will help all parts of the organization have a common understanding of ICANN's SSR role and remit and use consistent terminology in its materials and discussions.

## Summary of Community Input on Implementation

To date, no comments were received on the blog posting.

## Summary of Other Relevant Information

Staff has stated that they plan on performing internal webinars, staff instruction, and publication of the statements prior to the ICANN Buenos Aires meeting in November 2013.

## ATRT2 Analysis of Recommendation Implementation

The definitions ICANN uses for security, stability, and resiliency has been published by the Security Team and efforts are underway to inform the rest of staff of those definitions.

## ATRT2 Assessment of Recommendation Effectiveness

Within the context of the Security Team, the exercise of making a statement about ICANN’s use of the terms “security”, “stability”, and “resiliency” has been effective in providing clarity regarding those concepts.

There has been insufficient time to evaluate the effectiveness of this recommendation on wider ICANN efforts.

# Recommendation 4

“ICANN should document and clearly define the nature of the SSR relationships it has within the ICANN Community in order to provide a single focal point for understanding the interdependencies between organizations.”

## Analysis of Previous Review Team Recommendation

ICANN's SSR relationships take many forms, and other than the ICANN website sections showing its MOUs, agreements and partnerships, there is no central location at ICANN for easily seeing (internally or externally) ICANN's SSR relationships.

The SSR-RT felt it would be helpful for ICANN to document and define the nature of the SSR relationships that exist for the organization (to parties in the community, the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, but also to non-contracted parties and partners), and place this information in a location where ICANN and the community can see the description of the relationships and consider interdependencies.

## Summary of ICANN’s Assessment of Implementation

Implementation underway.

### Actions Taken

Internally, staff has identified four types of SSR-related relationships if has within the ICANN community:

* Collaboration on threat awareness;
* Coordination;
* Technical engagement; and
* Organizational risk management.

From this categorization, which includes relationships either through partnerships, MOUs, or contracts, staff is in the process of documenting the relationships that fit into these categories.

Publicly, the first step has been the development of an infographic depicting the SSR functions at ICANN, showing the organizational risk management function, threat awareness, coordination function and subject matter expertise function. Within each of these areas will be a mapping to show the associated relationships. Version 1.0 of the infographic was included in the FY 14 SSR Framework.

### Implementability

This recommendation is not yet fully implemented.

### Effectiveness

The exercise to develop the functional graphic has helped sharpen the language on ICANN's security related technical engagement and staff has made improvements to their material for the community.

## Summary of Community Input on Implementation

Several commenters during the public comment period of the FY14 SSR Framework document suggested that while the infographics where helpful, “the cartoon graphics do not stand on their own” and that additional text describing the relationships would be helpful.

## Summary of Other Relevant Information

None.

## ATRT2 Analysis of Recommendation Implementation

While not yet fully implemented, staff has taken concrete steps to implement this recommendation.

## ATRT2 Assessment of Recommendation Effectiveness

As the implementation of this recommendation is not yet complete, its effectiveness cannot be fully assessed.

# Recommendation 5

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

## Analysis of Previous Review Team Recommendation

ICANN's SSR relationships are not well documented. Changing this and making it apparent both for the organization and community to see how ICANN has extensive relationships in SSR, should enable effective working arrangements and show how these relationships support ICANN's SSR goals.

Easy to find documentation of SSR functions and relationships so that the organization and community can see the functions and relationships and have an understanding of their connection to ICANN's SSR goals is desirable.

## Summary of ICANN’s Assessment of Implementation

Implementation underway.

### Actions Taken

As described in the assessment of the implementation of recommendation 4, staff is in the process of documenting and categorizing SSR-related relationships, including the identification of existing MOUs, Agreements, contracts, partnerships, and informal relationships.

This recommendation has resulted in better coordination between departments, e.g., regular calls and interaction between the Global Stakeholder Engagement group and Security and regular discussion between Policy and Security.

### Implementability

Once relationships are documented and categorized, staff believes it should be possible to implement this recommendation.

### Effectiveness

As this recommendation has not been implemented, it is not yet possible to fully determine effectiveness. However, this recommendation does highlight areas for better coordination and collaboration internally between departments so that there is recognition of existing relationships and how these contribute to effective working arrangements.

## Summary of Community Input on Implementation

This recommendation has not yet reached a stage in which there would be input on implementation.

## Summary of Other Relevant Information

None.

## ATRT2 Analysis of Recommendation Implementation

The implementation of this recommendation has not yet reached a stage at which an analysis of implementation can be performed.

## ATRT2 Assessment of Recommendation Effectiveness

As the implementation of this recommendation is not yet complete, its effectiveness cannot be fully assessed.

# Recommendation 6

“ICANN should publish a document clearly outlining the roles and responsibilities for both the SSAC and RSSAC in order to clearly delineate the activities of the two groups. ICANN should seek consensus for this across both groups, recognizing the history and circumstances of the formation of each. ICANN should consider appropriate resourcing for both groups, consistent with the demands placed upon them.”

## Analysis of Previous Review Team Recommendation

The ICANN Bylaws contain provisions for SSAC and RSSAC, specifically Article XI section 2.2 and section 2.3 respectively. SSAC has published its Operating Procedures at <http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/operational-procedures-18jan13-en.pdf>, per implementation of the SSAC Review. The ICANN Board recently approved a bylaws change for RSSAC on 11 April 2013.

In order to provide some clarity to the roles and responsibilities of each Advisory Committee and to avoid confusion and conflict, text supported by both committees should be published that describes the respective roles and responsibilities for SSAC and RSSAC.

Further, both Advisory Committees should have appropriate resourcing (staff and budget).

## Summary of ICANN’s Assessment of Implementation

Implementation underway.

### Actions Taken

The roles and responsibilities for SSAC are already defined in its Operating Procedures however there has not yet been an effort to seek consensus from RSSAC on those roles and responsibilities. In November 2012, SSAC members were presented with the proposed implementation path and were supportive of the approach at that time.

The roles and responsibilities for RSSAC are being examined and revised during a reorganization of that Advisory Committee after the Board's adoption of the bylaws change for RSSAC.

### Implementability

There has been a delay while waiting for RSSAC bylaw changes. This is a recommendation that will involve community-staff collaboration to be implemented so implementation is not fully within staff’s control.

### Effectiveness

As this recommendation has yet to be fully implemented, it is not possible to provide an analysis of its effectiveness.

## Summary of Community Input on Implementation

There was no comment period or other mechanism for community input associated with the publication of the SSAC Operating Procedures or the RSSAC reorganization.

This recommendation has not yet reached a stage in which there would be input on implementation.

## Summary of Other Relevant Information

RSSAC is in the process of significant reorganization. Full implementation of this recommendation is impossible until that reorganization is complete.

## ATRT2 Analysis of Recommendation Implementation

This recommendation can be partitioned into 3 separate tasks:

1. Publish a document clearly outlining the roles and responsibilities of SSAC;
2. Publish a document clearly outlining the roles and responsibilities of RSSAC; and
3. Resourcing each Advisory Committee appropriately.

Taking each of these tasks in turn:

### Documenting SSAC Roles and Responsibilities

Within its Operating Procedures, SSAC has self-defined its roles and responsibilities. No efforts have yet been made to gain input or consensus from RSSAC or the larger community as to whether those roles and responsibilities are appropriate.

### Documenting RSSAC Roles and Responsibilities

RSSAC is in the process of reorganizing itself. No efforts have yet been made to gain input from the ICANN community on that reorganization.

### Resourcing

ICANN has established a budget and provided staff resources for both SSAC and RSSAC. Specifically, SSAC has received [XXX – SSAC budget] and is supported by [XXX – SSAC support staff FTEs] and RSSAC has received [XXX – RSSAC budget] and is supported by [XXX – RSSAC support staff FTEs].

## ATRT2 Assessment of Recommendation Effectiveness

As the documentation of SSAC and RSSAC roles and responsibilities is not yet complete, its effectiveness cannot be fully assessed.

Whether the resource allocations for SSAC and RSSAC are sufficient to meet the demands placed on each Advisory Committee is, of course, a subject of opinion.

# Recommendation 7

“ICANN should build on its current SSR Framework by establishing a clear set of objectives and prioritizing its initiatives and activities in accordance with these objectives. This process should be informed by a pragmatic cost-benefit and risk analysis.”

## Analysis of Previous Review Team Recommendation

The SSR-RT felt the SSR-related objectives in the ICANN Strategic Plan were not clearly mapped or prioritized, and this was reflected in the earlier versions of the SSR Framework prior to FY 13's version. In order to address this, the SSR-RT felt ICANN should build from improvements in the FY 13 SSR Framework to establish a clear set of objectives and priorities related to SSR.

## Summary of ICANN’s Assessment of Implementation

Implementation underway.

### Actions Taken

Improvements have been made towards the recommended clarity in the FY12, FY13 and FY14 Frameworks. Further improvement will be made with the mapping of priorities to the Management delivery system and the “At Task” system[[1]](#footnote-1) used internally by staff to keep track of their projects.

Technical engagement is one of the priorities for ICANN’s Security Team.

### Implementability

Implementation of this recommendation was dependent upon completion of the FY 14 operating plan. It also depends on the use of the “At Task” system, the development of next Strategic Plan, and will involve internal discussions with other departments and the Executive team. However staff believes this recommendation to be implementable.

### Effectiveness

Staff believes implementation of this recommendation will lead to general agreement across the organization of the SSR objectives and priorities and will help show a better connection between the published strategic objectives and the SSR initiatives.

However, as this recommendation has not yet been implemented its effectiveness cannot be established.

## Summary of Community Input on Implementation

At the ICANN meeting in Beijing, the ccNSO was supportive of continued priority for technical engagement and training. ICANN executives have recognized SSR as one of the pillars in the regional strategies being developed for Africa, Asia-Pacific, Middle East and Latin America & Caribbean.

## Summary of Other Relevant Information

None.

## ATRT2 Analysis of Recommendation Implementation

This recommendation can be partitioned into two separate tasks, both informed by cost-benefit and risk analyses. These tasks would be:

1. ICANN should establish a clear set of SSR-related objectives; and
2. ICANN should prioritize its initiatives and activities in accordance with these objectives.

With regards to the first task, a clear set of SSR-related objectives has yet to be established. Despite this, staff has prioritized initiatives and activities that are supported by at least some portion of the community (e.g., the ccNSO).

Since the second task depends on the completion of the first task, the second task has not yet been started.

## ATRT2 Assessment of Recommendation Effectiveness

As this recommendation has yet to be fully implemented, it is not possible to provide an analysis of its effectiveness.

# Recommendation 8

“ICANN should continue to refine its Strategic Plan objectives, particularly the goal of maintaining and driving DNS availability. The Strategic Plan and SSR Framework should reflect consistent priorities and objectives to ensure clear alignment.”

## Analysis of Previous Review Team Recommendation

The Review Team felt the SSR objectives in the 2012-2015 Strategic Plan were not well refined and aligned with the SSR Framework. This recommendation called for improvement of the Strategic Plan objectives related to SSR.

## Summary of ICANN’s Assessment of Implementation

Implementation underway.

### Actions Taken

The Security team has been contributing to the Strategic Visioning effort for a new ICANN Strategic Plan, and encouraging the use of materials developed for the FY 14 SSR Framework which describe ICANN's SSR functions into 4 main areas (organizational risk management, technical engagement & thought leadership, coordination, threat awareness).

### Implementability

Completion of this recommendation depends upon development of the next Strategic Plan. While staff did not see additional costs related to implementation, organizational discussions for the next Strategic Plan will be involved, followed by the alignment of the SSR Framework to the Strategic Plan.

### Effectiveness

As this recommendation is not yet fully implemented, its effectiveness cannot be determined.

## Summary of Community Input on Implementation

None.

## Summary of Other Relevant Information

None.

## ATRT2 Analysis of Recommendation Implementation

This recommendation strongly depends on the development of Strategic Plan objectives. Staff has been providing input related to SSR for the Strategic Plan.

## ATRT2 Assessment of Recommendation Effectiveness

The implementation of this recommendation has yet to reach a stage at which its effectiveness can be assessed.

# Recommendation 9

“ICANN should assess certification options with commonly accepted international standards (e.g. ITIL, ISO and SAS-70) for its operational responsibilities. ICANN should publish a clear roadmap towards certification.”

## Analysis of Previous Review Team Recommendation

The SSR-RT spent some time discussing international standards and recommended ICANN assess its certification options against commonly accepted international standards for its operational responsibilities, make a determination on whether to pursue certification, and if so, publish a clear roadmap for certification.

## Summary of ICANN’s Assessment of Implementation

Implementation underway.

### Actions Taken

ICANN has achieved SysTrust certification for the DNSSEC Key Signing Key Management infrastructure, and is exploring SysTrust certification for IANA (which would include ICANN’s IT department) and is pursuing EFQM certification.

Assessment is currently underway for certification of other aspects of ICANN’s operational responsibilities.

### Implementability

Staff has not yet found insurmountable issues related to implementation but has noted that assessment can be costly and implementation of all controls necessary for certification (depending on the certification selected) may require additional time and budget.

### Effectiveness

As implementation of this recommendation has not yet been completed, assessment of effectiveness cannot be performed. However, staff believes implementation of this recommendation will show that ICANN carefully considered certification and will have demonstrated operational excellence in its operational responsibilities.

In addition, staff believes implementation of this recommendation will institutionalize the best practices needed to sustain certification (depending on certification or standard chosen) and will demonstrate ICANN's improvement toward operational excellence.

## Summary of Community Input on Implementation

In comments provided during the public comment period associated with the final report of the SSR Review Team, Andrew Sullivan of Dyn, Inc. suggested certification should focus only on areas where the functions ICANN performs are “substantially the same as functions already well- understood.”

## Summary of Other Relevant Information

In-person discussions with the outside consultant brought in for EQFM certification has indicated that the first round of assessments are typically used to identify the areas in which additional work is needed. As such, a poor showing in that assessment should not be taken as a negative.

## ATRT2 Analysis of Recommendation Implementation

While not fully implemented, staff has taken significant steps towards assessing the value of certification for ICANN’s operational responsibilities, including either initiating or completing certification for the most critical of those responsibilities (DNSSEC Key Signing Key Management, IANA, and IT).

More specifically, this recommendation can be partitioned into two tasks:

1. ICANN should assess operational certification options; and
2. ICANN should publish a clear roadmap towards certification.

With regards to the first task, Executive staff has assigned this responsibility to the CIO/CTO role for which it has an open job requirement posted. Further efforts on implementing this part of the recommendation have been deferred until that role is filled.

Initiating the second task associated with this requirement depends on the completion of the first task. As such, the second task has not yet been implemented.

## ATRT2 Assessment of Recommendation Effectiveness

While not a function of ATRT recommendations, the SysTrust certification for DNSSEC Key Signing Key Management has been effective in increasing the level of trust in ICANN’s efforts related to root KSK handling.

Similarly, IANA certification, while also not a function of this ATRT recommendation (it is required by the IANA Functions contract), should provide an increased level of trust throughout that portion of the community that makes use of IANA’s functions.

As certification for other parts of ICANN’s operational responsibilities has not yet been determined much less completed, its effectiveness cannot be assessed.

# Recommendation 10

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

## Analysis of Previous Review Team Recommendation

When the Review Team had started its work, Compliance was a smaller team and the community strongly felt that ICANN needed to step up efforts in this area, provide adequate resources, and develop and implement a more structured process for monitoring compliance.

The desired outcome was for adequate resourcing of ICANN's contractual compliance enforcement and improvement in ICANN’s ability to enforce contractual compliance.

## Summary of ICANN’s Assessment of Implementation

Implementation underway.

### Actions Taken

Improvements, which continue to be undertaken, were made by and to the Compliance team throughout FY 13. Compliance has grown in size and published a number of tools to enable better contract compliance enforcement.

### Implementability

This recommendation depends strongly on the resources available to the Compliance team. To date, resources have been made available and the recommendation is being implemented.

### Effectiveness

Compliance, while improved, still needs work. This recommendation improved Executive team focus and from that perspective, has been effective.

## Summary of Community Input on Implementation

While comments from individual community members suggest Compliance may have improved in their ability to enforce contracts, some comments suggested that far more is needed. In particular, questions were raised about sufficient staffing and resources being made available today, with concerns expressed about the Compliance department being able to meet the significantly increased demands that will result from implementation of the new Registrar Accreditation Agreements and Registry Agreements.

## Summary of Other Relevant Information

None.

## ATRT2 Analysis of Recommendation Implementation

This recommendation can be partitioned into three sub-tasks:

1. ICANN should continue its efforts to step up contract compliance enforcement;
2. ICANN should provide adequate resources for this function; and
3. ICANN should develop and implement a more structured process for monitoring compliance issues and investigations.

Each of these sub-tasks will be examined in turn:

### Step up enforcement

Given the wording of this recommendation and data suggesting increased enforcement efforts, it is difficult to argue the recommendation has not been followed.

### Provide adequate resources

Similarly, given the increase in budget and staffing for the Compliance department, it is difficult to argue resources haven’t been provided. Whether those resources are adequate is, of course, a subjective evaluation.

### More structured monitoring/investigations

As with the other two sub-tasks associated with this recommendation, it is difficult to argue a more structured process for monitoring compliance issues and investigations has not been implemented.

## ATRT2 Assessment of Recommendation Effectiveness

As the wording in the section associated with implementation status might suggest, assessment of this recommendation is rather subjective. While data suggest the Compliance department has improved enforcement, has additional resources, and has implemented a more structured monitoring and investigation regime, the effectiveness of these efforts are somewhat in doubt. In particular, concerns have been expressed about whether efforts to date to improve compliance will be sufficient to deal with the increased requirements that arise as a result of the new RAA and RA.

However, as this recommendation has yet to be fully implemented, it is not possible to provide a complete assessment of its effectiveness.

# 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.”

## Analysis of Previous Review Team Recommendation

The SSR-RT noted that the administration of the new gTLD program and IDN Fast Track were significant SSR issues that should be prioritized and implemented with a more detailed set of objectives and activities. They noted that ICANN should develop and implement measures of effectiveness for these areas.

More specifically, the SSR-RT recommended the development and implementation of specific measurements will help strengthen ICANN's focus and effectiveness, improve the ability of the community to gauge ICANN's progress, and measure success of the new gTLDs and IDN Fast Track programs relating to ICANN's SSR objectives, including measurements of effectiveness of mechanisms to mitigate domain name abuse.

## Summary of ICANN’s Assessment of Implementation

Implementation underway.

### Actions Taken

This recommendation is as yet unimplemented.

### Implementability

This will be a community-staff collaborative recommendation, and will also depend on terms of reference for the Affirmation of Commitments Review on Competition & Consumer Choice.

### Effectiveness

As this recommendation is as yet unimplemented, it is not possible to assess its effectiveness.

## Summary of Community Input on Implementation

This recommendation has yet to reach a point at which the community can provide input.

## Summary of Other Relevant Information

None.

## ATRT2 Analysis of Recommendation Implementation

As this recommendation is as yet unimplemented, it is not possible to assess its implementation.

## ATRT2 Assessment of Recommendation Effectiveness

As this recommendation is as yet unimplemented, it is not possible to assess its effectiveness.

# Recommendation 12

“ICANN should work with the Community to identify SSR-related best practices and support the implementation of such practices through contracts, agreements and MOUs and other mechanisms.”

## Analysis of Previous Review Team Recommendation

The underlying issue was that there should be clearer identification of SSR-related best practices for the community and encouragement for putting those best practices into contracts, agreements, MOUs and other mechanisms as best as possible.

The desired outcome was for a staff-community dialogue on SSR-related best practices, with the incorporation of best practices into contractual mechanisms as much as practical and possible.

## Summary of ICANN’s Assessment of Implementation

Implementation underway.

### Actions Taken

This recommendation has not yet been fully implemented and will involve community-staff dialogue. Staff believes the Law Enforcement recommendations on the RAA and inputs into the new gTLD registry agreement have brought the implementation of this recommendation closer.

Staff plans on producing a list of SSR-related best practices and identifying where those best practices are incorporated in contracts, MOUs, and other agreements for tracking purposes.

### Implementability

This recommendation will involve community-staff dialogue for full implementation.

### Effectiveness

As this recommendation has yet to be fully implemented, it is not possible to assess its full effectiveness.

## Summary of Community Input on Implementation

In comments received during the public comment period for the final report of the SSR Review Team, the Registries Stakeholder Group questioned whether the implementation of best practices could be “supported through contracts”.

## Summary of Other Relevant Information

While not a direct outcome of this recommendation, the new RAA and RA provide require the implementation of SSR-related best practices.

## ATRT2 Analysis of Recommendation Implementation

This recommendation can be partitioned into two separate tasks, namely:

1. Working with the Community to identify SSR-related best practices; and
2. Supporting the implementation of such practices through contracts, agreements and MoUs, and other mechanisms;

To date, SSR-related best practices have not yet been identified in a formal way either by staff or the Community and as such, this task remains unimplemented.

The addition of SSR-related best practices to the RAA is a concrete step towards implementation of this recommendation, however how well that aspect of this recommendation translates into practice is as yet unknown.

## ATRT2 Assessment of Recommendation Effectiveness

As this recommendation is as yet unimplemented, it is not possible to assess its effectiveness.

# Recommendation 13

“ICANN should encourage all Supporting Organizations to develop and publish SSR-related best practices for their members.”

## Analysis of Previous Review Team Recommendation

Individual participants in ICANN Supporting Organizations may follow best practices, but there has not been an effort to encourage all SOs to develop and publish SSR-related best practices. Some activity is occurring within stakeholder groups in the GNSO and the ccNSO does have a Tech Working Group that is looking at Security practices for ccTLDs, however more comprehensive efforts should be undertaken to encourage all Supporting Organizations to develop and publish SSR-related best practices for their members.

## Summary of ICANN’s Assessment of Implementation

Implementation underway.

### Actions Taken

Staff is in the early stages of this recommendation and implementation is still underway. Initial efforts have involved participating in the ccNSO Tech Working Group, which is looking at publishing a form of guidance for TLD operators (best practices is a sensitive term for ccTLD operators), and reaching out to the stakeholder groups within the GNSO and the ASO.

Staff has contacted the Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees and Stakeholder Groups, asking for feedback on approaches to implementation. To date, informal feedback has been received from the Registrar Stakeholders Group and an initial response from the ISP Constituency.

### Implementability

This recommendation will involve community-staff dialogue for full implementation.

### Effectiveness

At this early stage, it is not yet possible to evaluate this recommendation’s effectiveness.

## Summary of Community Input on Implementation

In comments received during the public comment period for the final report of the SSR Review Team, the Registries Stakeholder Group questioned whether it was realistic for the GNSO to develop and publish SSR-related best practices due to the diversity of the GNSO.

## Summary of Other Relevant Information

None.

## ATRT2 Analysis of Recommendation Implementation

As this recommendation is as yet unimplemented, it is not possible to assess its implementation.

## ATRT2 Assessment of Recommendation Effectiveness

As this recommendation is as yet unimplemented, it is not possible to assess its effectiveness.

# Recommendation 14

“ICANN should ensure that its SSR-related outreach activities continuously evolve to remain relevant, timely and appropriate. Feedback from the Community should provide a mechanism to review and increase this relevance.”

## Analysis of Previous Review Team Recommendation

ICANN’s SSR-related outreach has centered on technical training and participation by ICANN staff in community activities (IETF, Network Operator Group meetings, RIR meetings such as RIPE NCC, regional IGFs and at the Internet Governance Forum).

The recommendation was supportive of existing outreach activities and recommended ICANN ensure these activities continuously evolve to remain relevant, timely and appropriate. There should also be a feedback mechanism to review and increase this relevance.

## Summary of ICANN’s Assessment of Implementation

Implementation underway.

### Actions Taken

The Security team has increased its targeted approach to receiving feedback from ccTLD community, regional operators, the Business Constituency, registries and registrars, but also to make sure other parts of the community are involved in these discussions (governments & law enforcement, non-commercial stakeholders, academia & civil society, operational security community).

As this recommendation will never be fully completed (due to the need for activities to “continuously evolve”), continued efforts on this recommendation has been addressed in FY 14 budgeting, and staff is now in the process of delivering on requested trainings and engagement.

### Implementability

Staff believes this recommendation has been met with the annual SSR Frameworks and their approach to engaging with TLD operators, law enforcement and community groups. However, this recommendation is very open-ended and will never be "done".

### Effectiveness

Staff has received broad community support for the types of technical engagement performed by ICANN Security and we do think this outreach is evolving to meet the needs of the community.

Staff believes ICANN has improved its support for meeting community SSR-related outreach needs over the last 2 years.

## Summary of Community Input on Implementation

Feedback provided directly to staff has been largely positive of the SSR-related outreach and engagement.

## Summary of Other Relevant Information

There are an increased number of requests from to the Security Team from the Global Stakeholder Engagement team for SSR-related outreach and engagement at Internet Governance events (ITU, WSIS Forum, IGF, OECD, etc) and there has been an increase in speaking requests with the implementation of the Speakers Bureau tool.

## ATRT2 Analysis of Recommendation Implementation

The Security Team has been active in outreach, particularly in the context of DNS-related technologies albeit there is little evidence of outreach activities that address other aspects related to ICANN’s limited SSR remit, e.g., IP address-related SSR concerns.

## ATRT2 Assessment of Recommendation Effectiveness

Based on the increased number of requests for speaking engagement, training, and other outreach-related activities ICANN has been receiving, it would appear this recommendation has been effective.

# Recommendation 15

“ICANN should act as facilitator in the responsible disclosure and dissemination of DNS security threats and mitigation techniques.”

## Analysis of Previous Review Team Recommendation

This recommendation aimed to encourage ICANN facilitate responsible disclosure and dissemination of DNS security threats and mitigation techniques and to provide a standard process for those in the community who may have information of potential DNS security threats to share them in a manner in which they can be acted upon.

## Summary of ICANN’s Assessment of Implementation

Implementation underway.

### Actions Taken

ICANN published responsible disclosure guidelines on 11 March 2013 at <http://www.icann.org/en/about/staff/security/vulnerability-disclosure-11mar13-en.pdf> , a blog post describing those guidelines (at <http://blog.icann.org/2013/03/icann-coordinated-disclosure-guidelines/>), and presented those guidelines at the ICANN meeting in Beijing. An update was published on 5 August 2013 and is available at <https://www.icann.org/en/about/staff/security/vulnerability-disclosure-05aug13-en.pdf>

### Implementability

This recommendation was (and is being) implemented with no unforeseen issues.

### Effectiveness

The implementation of this recommendation has helped streamline ICANN processes and channels for directing information on DNS threats and mitigations.

## Summary of Community Input on Implementation

Anecdotally, some concern was expressed that the disclosure/dissemination processes do not fully account for escalation of issues where impact occurs outside of ICANN and those directly involved, e.g., notifying appropriate bodies when an issue might impact critical national or global infrastructures.

## Summary of Other Relevant Information

None.

## ATRT2 Analysis of Recommendation Implementation

With the publication of the Coordinated Vulnerability Disclosure guidelines, ICANN has documented a process by which it can facilitate the responsible disclosure and dissemination of DNS security threats and mitigation techniques.

## ATRT2 Assessment of Recommendation Effectiveness

This recommendation appears to have been effective in providing the groundwork for ICANN to act in a facilitator role. Whether or not the community makes use of ICANN in that role has yet to be fully established.

# Recommendation 16

“ICANN should continue its outreach efforts to expand Community participation and input into the SSR Framework development process. ICANN also should establish a process for obtaining more systematic input from other ecosystem participants.”

## Analysis of Previous Review Team Recommendation

The recommendation supported the Security team's outreach activities and noted that this work should continue in order to expand community participation in the SSR Framework development.

The underlying issue was to support the continued outreach with the community to encourage review and feedback on the SSR Framework, but that ICANN needed a process for obtaining input from other ecosystem participants.

## Summary of ICANN’s Assessment of Implementation

Implementation underway.

### Actions Taken

The Security team conducts regular briefing with SSAC before the completion of the annual SSR Framework to ensure SSAC members have an opportunity to provide feedback on the draft approach. After publication, the Security team conducts targeted outreach to all SOs, ACs, and stakeholder groups. The Security team also reached out broadly to other groups in Civil Society/freedom of expression community, law enforcement, the academic community, standards organizations, and regional organizations to encourage review and feedback.

### Implementability

Outreach is more than one-way and as such, staff sees a need for feedback from stakeholder groups that the interaction to date is in line with community expectations. While private or off the record feedback has been very positive, much of this feedback has not yet translated in significant public comments on the annual SSR Frameworks. This is somewhat reflective of community priorities on competing public comment periods, but staff is aware that the community places a high value on security (from the regional strategies and from discussion of security in other contexts such as at WTPF, WSIS Forum, etc).

As such, staff believes this recommendation has been met with the annual SSR Frameworks and their approach to engaging with TLD operators, law enforcement and community groups. However, this recommendation is very open-ended and will never be "done".

### Effectiveness

This effort has helped identify new groups to engage on outreach, and helped refine the description of ICANN's SSR functions.

Outside of ICANN, the explanation of ICANN's SSR functions and role has helped increase the awareness of ICANN's role and remit and involvement in the support of DNS capability building. This work provides ICANN (and the community) with a key service and substantial goodwill.

## Summary of Community Input on Implementation

No formal community input has been publicly provided, however informal and/or private feedback to staff directly has been positive.

## Summary of Other Relevant Information

None.

## ATRT2 Analysis of Recommendation Implementation

This recommendation can be broken down into two sub-tasks:

1. ICANN should continue its outreach efforts
2. ICANN should establish a process for obtaining more systematic input from other ecosystem participants.

As discussed in the analysis of the implementation of recommendation 14, ICANN’s Security Team has continued its outreach efforts and has expanded Community participation and input into the SSR framework development process. While a recommendation of this nature will never be complete, significant efforts have been made towards implementing this component of the recommendation.

With regards to establishing a process for obtaining more systematic input from other ecosystem participants, this sub-task of this recommendation has not yet been implemented.

## ATRT2 Assessment of Recommendation Effectiveness

Outreach efforts appear to have been effective and are ongoing.

Establishing a process for obtaining more systematic input from other ecosystem participants has not yet been implemented so its effectiveness cannot be assessed.

# Recommendation 17

“ICANN should establish a more structured internal process for showing how activities and initiatives relate to specific strategic goals, objectives and priorities in the SSR Framework. It also should establish metrics and milestones for implementation.”

## Analysis of Previous Review Team Recommendation

ICANN has an internal process for mapping activities and initiatives for Strategic goals, objectives and priorities in the SSR Framework. The process used for showing how activities relate to strategic goals and objectives was not as clear as it could be when the SSR RT began its work. The Review Team thought it important to ensure ICANN had a process for connecting activities and initiatives to specific goals.

## Summary of ICANN’s Assessment of Implementation

Implementation underway.

### Actions Taken

The Security team is contributing to the next Strategic Plan development and will also be using the “At Task” system and the Management delivery system to align strategic goals to specific initiatives and activities. As such, this recommendation is being addressed with the development of the next Strategic Plan, and the implementation of the “At Task” system with FY 14.

### Implementability

Discussions are continuing with the development of the next Strategic Plan.

### Effectiveness

Staff believes this effort will help improve the awareness of ICANN's role and remit in Security and how the Strategic goals are aligned with ICANN's SSR functions, however as this recommendation has yet to be implemented, its effectiveness cannot be assessed.

## Summary of Community Input on Implementation

This recommendation has yet to reach a point where community input can be provided.

## Summary of Other Relevant Information

None.

## ATRT2 Analysis of Recommendation Implementation

This recommendation can be partitioned into two sub-tasks:

1. Establish a more structured internal process for showing how activities and initiatives relate to specific strategic goals, objectives, and priorities in the SSR framework; and
2. Establish metrics and milestones for implementation of the goals, objectives, and priorities in the SSR framework.

To date, neither of these sub-tasks has reached a point where their implementation can be analyzed.

## ATRT2 Assessment of Recommendation Effectiveness

This recommendation has yet to reach a point where its effectiveness can be assessed.

# Recommendation 18

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

## Analysis of Previous Review Team Recommendation

This recommendation aimed to provide more information to show how the previous year's SSR-related activities as documented in the SSR Framework had been addressed in a clear and transparent manner for the community.

The desired outcome was to include a status report for the previous year's activities as an additional section in the annual SSR Framework in order for readers to be able to easily see the progress in completing the activities that had been projected in the previous Fiscal Year's Framework.

## Summary of ICANN’s Assessment of Implementation

Implemented.

### Actions Taken

In the FY 13 SSR Framework, a status report showing FY 12's activities and results was incorporated, completing this recommendation. In the FY 14 SSR Framework, the status report for FY 13 appears as Appendix B.

### Implementability

There were no unforeseen problems with implementation of this recommendation and it was implemented with the FY 13 SSR Framework and refined with the publication of the FY 14 Framework in March 2013.

### Effectiveness

This work has provided an example for other departments on how to track and report progress on initiatives annually.

## Summary of Community Input on Implementation

In comments received during the public comment period for the final report of the SSR Review Team, the Registries Stakeholder Group strongly supported this recommendation.

Staff received positive comments from the community on the FY 13 Framework for incorporating the status report, and the SSR Review Team noted this was also a positive development in its Final Report.

## Summary of Other Relevant Information

None.

## ATRT2 Analysis of Recommendation Implementation

This recommendation has been implemented.

## ATRT2 Assessment of Recommendation Effectiveness

Based on community input, this recommendation appears to have been effective in providing a status report of the previous years progress in implementing the SSR framework.

# Recommendation 19

“ICANN should establish a process that allows the Community to track the implementation of the SSR Framework. Information should be provided with enough clarity that the Community can track ICANN’s execution of its SSR responsibilities, while not harming ICANN’s ability to operate effectively. The dashboard process being used to track implementation of the ATRT recommendations serves as a good model.”

## Analysis of Previous Review Team Recommendation

At the time the SSR RT report was developed, the Review Team thought the Security team could do a better job explaining how activities were being tracked from the previous Framework.

## Summary of ICANN’s Assessment of Implementation

Implementation underway.

### Actions Taken

With the FY 13 to FY 14 Framework, the Security team has made improvements in reporting progress on prior year activities. This will continue to improve as the work the Security team performs becomes tracked in “At Task” system for the community to see.

### Implementability

Staff believes this recommendation will be implementable through the “At Task” system.

### Effectiveness

As this recommendation is in the process of being implemented, its effectiveness has yet to be established.

## Summary of Community Input on Implementation

In comments received during the public comment period for the final report of the SSR Review Team, the Registries Stakeholder Group strongly supported this recommendation.

## Summary of Other Relevant Information

According to staff, the SSR RT did not document progress between the FY 12 and FY 13 Frameworks in their report.

## ATRT2 Analysis of Recommendation Implementation

Staff’s implementation of this recommendation depends on the deployment of the “At Task” system. As that system is yet to be fully deployed, implementation of this recommendation cannot be analyzed.

## ATRT2 Assessment of Recommendation Effectiveness

This recommendation has yet to reach point where its effectiveness can be analyzed.

# Recommendation 20

“ICANN should increase the transparency of information about organization and budget related to implementing the SSR Framework and performing SSR-related functions. Information should be provided with enough clarity that the Community can track ICANN’s execution of its SSR responsibilities, while not impeding ICANN’s ability to operate effectively.”

## Analysis of Previous Review Team Recommendation

The ccNSO and other stakeholders provided comments on the FY 12 SSR Framework that ICANN needed to provide more information and increase transparency of the organization and budget for SSR. The Review Team picked up on this.

## Summary of ICANN’s Assessment of Implementation

Implementation underway.

### Actions Taken

This recommendation is being addressed with the implementation of the FY 14 budget and operating plan and use of the “At Task” system for providing more transparency on the budget sections related to SSR.

### Implementability

Implementation of this recommendation is well underway with the development of the FY 14 budget, pending the adoption of the budget and operating plan and updating of related projects and initiatives in the “At Task” system.

### Effectiveness

This recommendation has not yet reached a point where its effectiveness can be assessed.

## Summary of Community Input on Implementation

In comments received during the public comment period for the final report of the SSR Review Team, the Registries Stakeholder Group strongly supported this recommendation. Andrew Sullivan of Dyn, Inc. felt that the recommendation should be “self-evident” and that “[t]ransparency requires that interested parties can understand the information.”

## Summary of Other Relevant Information

None.

## ATRT2 Analysis of Recommendation Implementation

This recommendation has not yet reached a point where its implementation can be analyzed.

## ATRT2 Assessment of Recommendation Effectiveness

This recommendation has not yet reached a point where its effectiveness can be assessed.

# Recommendation 21

“ICANN should establish a more structured internal process for showing how organization and budget decisions relate to the SSR Framework, including the underlying cost-benefit analysis.”

## Analysis of Previous Review Team Recommendation

As with recommendation 20, the ccNSO and other stakeholders provided comments on the FY 12 SSR Framework that ICANN needed to provide more information and increase transparency of the organization and budget for SSR. The Review Team picked up on this.

## Summary of ICANN’s Assessment of Implementation

Implementation underway.

### Actions Taken

This recommendation is being addressed with the implementation of the FY 14 budget and operating plan and use of the “At Task” system for providing more transparency on the budget sections related to SSR.

### Implementability

Implementation of this recommendation is well underway with the development of the FY 14 budget, pending the adoption of the budget and operating plan and updating of related projects and initiatives in the “At Task” system.

### Effectiveness

This recommendation has not yet reached a point where its effectiveness can be assessed.

## Summary of Community Input on Implementation

This recommendation has not yet reached a point where the community can provide input on its implementation.

## Summary of Other Relevant Information

None.

## ATRT2 Analysis of Recommendation Implementation

This recommendation has not yet reached a point where its implementation can be analyzed.

## ATRT2 Assessment of Recommendation Effectiveness

This recommendation has not yet reached a point where its effectiveness can be assessed.

# Recommendation 22

“ICANN should publish, monitor and update documentation on the organization and budget resources needed to manage SSR issues in conjunction with introduction of new gTLDs.”

## Analysis of Previous Review Team Recommendation

Organization and budget for SSR issues is provided in via the Security team, but also reflected in the new gTLD program (e.g., DNS Stability Panel, EBERO, other process steps, etc). The desired outcome of the implementation of this recommendation was to improve the amount and clarity of information on the organization and budget for implementing the SSR Framework and performing SSR-related functions.

## Summary of ICANN’s Assessment of Implementation

Implementation underway.

### Actions Taken

Implementation of this recommendation is well underway with the development of the FY 14 budget, pending the adoption of the budget and operating plan and updating of related projects and initiatives in the “At Task” system.

### Implementability

The implementation of this recommendation is related to the completion of the FY 14 budget and operating plan process. No implementation issues are anticipated.

### Effectiveness

This recommendation has not yet reached a point where its effectiveness can be assessed.

## Summary of Community Input on Implementation

This recommendation has not yet reached a point where the community can provide input on its implementation.

## Summary of Other Relevant Information

None.

## ATRT2 Analysis of Recommendation Implementation

This recommendation has not yet reached a point where its implementation can be analyzed.

## ATRT2 Assessment of Recommendation Effectiveness

This recommendation has not yet reached a point where its effectiveness can be assessed.

# Recommendation 23

“ICANN must provide appropriate resources for SSR-related Working Groups and Advisory Committees, consistent with the demands placed upon them. ICANN also must ensure decisions reached by Working Groups and Advisory Committees are reached in an objective manner that is free from external or internal pressure.”

## Analysis of Previous Review Team Recommendation

Security-related activities with the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees are currently done in a number of working groups (for example, the cross-community DNS Security & Stability Analysis Working Group), but these are not currently tracked across all SO & ACs specifically for SSR. This work is also done through SSAC and RSSAC.

The emphasis of this recommendation from the Review Team was to ensure RSSAC (as well as SSAC, but primarily RSSAC) was sufficiently staffed and resourced to meet the demands placed upon it. In addition, the recommendation grew from an analysis of the root scaling work by SSAC and RSSAC, and SSR-related working groups should be able to do their work free from external and internal pressure.

Per the Review Team's discussions, they stated that input had been received that SSAC felt pressure to deliver an answer to a specific problem within a limited timeframe. As such, SSAC and RSSAC should have sufficient resources to provide high-quality work in a reasonable time frame.

## Summary of ICANN’s Assessment of Implementation

Implementation underway.

### Actions Taken

The approach taken to implement this recommendation has been to divide the recommendation into:

1. Conducting an inventory of the existing SSR-related working groups and Advisory Committees;
2. Creating a description or documentation of the budget process for SO/AC input); and
3. Describing the standard operating processes to show how SO/AC/working group decisions are reached in an objective manner.

Implementation of the three sub-tasks of this recommendation is still in progress.

### Implementability

Implementation of this recommendation is still in progress.

### Effectiveness

As this recommendation is not yet fully implemented, its effectiveness cannot be assessed.

## Summary of Community Input on Implementation

Discussion with the chairs of SSAC and RSSAC suggests a common view that ICANN has not declined requests for budget for either Advisory Committee, however staff resources may be spread a bit thin for providing the most effective support.

## Summary of Other Relevant Information

RSSAC is in the process of reorganizing itself. As a result, it is possible that RSSAC resource requirements may change.

The third part of this recommendation, specifically that ICANN “must ensure decisions reached by Working Groups and Advisory Committees are reached in an objective manner that is free from external or internal pressure” is laudable, however while objectivity is a worthwhile goal, it is challenging to imagine any decision that is free from both external and internal pressure.

## ATRT2 Analysis of Recommendation Implementation

Taking a slightly different view of the implementation of this recommendation than staff, this recommendation can be partitioned into two sub-tasks:

1. ICANN must provide appropriate resources; and
2. ICANN also must ensure decisions reached by Working Groups and Advisory Committees are reached in an objective manner that is free from external or internal pressure.

Both RSSAC and SSAC have had budget and staff resources allocated to them so from that perspective this recommendation has been implemented.

[XXX – budget for SSAC and RSSAC]

With regards to ensuring decisions reached objectively and are free from pressure, this component of the recommendation has yet to be implemented.

## ATRT2 Assessment of Recommendation Effectiveness

Whether the budget and staff resources are consistent with the demands placed upon those Advisory Committees is, of course, a matter of opinion.

# Recommendation 24

“ICANN must clearly define the charter, roles and responsibilities of the Chief Security Office[r] Team.”

## Analysis of Previous Review Team Recommendation

While the Security team has maintained a webpage (<https://www.icann.org/security>) and published an annual Security, Stability and Resiliency Framework, since 2009, the Review Team felt greater clarity on the roles and responsibilities of the ICANN Security team vs. other Security-related functions within ICANN and its Supporting Organizations would be helpful.

## Summary of ICANN’s Assessment of Implementation

Implemented.

### Actions Taken

This recommendation was implemented largely with the FY 13 SSR Framework (improved in the FY 14 version) and with the publication of an updated section of the Security team page on the ICANN website.

### Implementability

Staff believes this recommendation has been implemented.

### Effectiveness

The outcome so far has been increased recognition of the role and remit for ICANN in Security and a better understanding of the structure of the Security team.

## Summary of Community Input on Implementation

The feedback so far has been very positive.

Some commenters during the public comment period associated with the publication of the draft FY14 SSR Framework document recommended that in addition to the infographic describing the Security Team’s charter, text should be provided. In addition, some commenters indicated more detail should be provided regarding the roles and responsibilities of staff.

## Summary of Other Relevant Information

None.

## ATRT2 Analysis of Recommendation Implementation

This recommendation can be partitioned into three sub-tasks:

1. ICANN must clearly define the charter of the Chief Security Officer Team;
2. ICANN must clearly define the roles of the team members; and
3. ICANN must clearly define the responsibilities of the team members.

Despite page 16 and 17 of the FY14 SSR Framework discussing informally how SSR fits into ICANN’s functional areas, it may be argued this does not “clearly define” the Security Office’s principles, functions, and organization. However, taking the view that the charter of the Security team will need to be somewhat dynamic in order to deal with the changing SSR-related environment likely to occur in the future, the informal approach the Security team has taken in documenting their charter is likely appropriate.

The roles and responsibilities of the team members are reasonably well defined on page 17 of the FY 14 SSR Framework.

## ATRT2 Assessment of Recommendation Effectiveness

As the specification of the Security team charter and staff roles and responsibilities has been done, this recommendation has proven to be effective.

# Recommendation 25

“ICANN should put in place mechanisms for identifying both near and longer-term risks and strategic factors in its Risk Management Framework. This process should be informed by insights from research, business partnerships, ICANN Supporting Organizations and other sources. ICANN should publish information about risks, recognizing the sensitive nature of some of these factors.”

## Analysis of Previous Review Team Recommendation

ICANN has had a Board Risk Committee for several years and ICANN staff has conducted enterprise risk assessments over the past few years. The SSR RT Final Report described the need for a more structured process for identifying near and longer-term risks, and that ICANN should publish information about risks, with the understanding that risk-related information may be sensitive.

## Summary of ICANN’s Assessment of Implementation

Implementation underway.

### Actions Taken

ICANN retained Westlake Governance to develop a DNS Risk Management Framework. A draft framework was presented in Beijing and was published for comment for Durban.

Staff is currently working on implementation and will be incorporating the work of the DSSA Working Group into its efforts.

### Implementability

This recommendation is being implemented with no unforeseen issues.

### Effectiveness

The public comments from the open sessions with the DNS RMF have been positive and in support of a stronger risk management function at ICANN.

## Summary of Community Input on Implementation

The publication of the Westlake-authored DNS Risk Framework was followed by a public comment period (still ongoing as of this writing) as documented at <http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/dns-rmf-final-23aug13-en.htm>. Summarizing the comments received to date:

* The Westlake-authored DNS Risks Framework has a number of gaps and does not integrate with other SSR-related activities undertaken by ICANN;
* There is significant disappointment that the work of the DNS Security and Stability Analysis working group was not incorporated more fully into the DNS Risks Framework;
* The choice of framework architecture (ISO31000 over NIST 800-30) may have been sub-optimal;
* The DNS Risks Framework is quite limited and may not incorporate a sufficiently broad focus to address ICANN’s overarching SSR-related responsibilities.

In addition, participants in the DSSA working group expressed displeasure of the DNS Risk Framework effort as it appeared to be discounting/dismissing the efforts undertaken by the DSSA working group.

## Summary of Other Relevant Information

ICANN has had a Board Risk Committee for a number of years. ICANN staff has conducted enterprise risk assessments in 2009 and 2011 and is undergoing a reassessment at the time of this writing.

Staff has indicated to the DNS RMF that the work of the DSSA will be incorporated into the implementation of the Risk Management Framework and not lost. Staff views the DSSA work as having been valuable and believes it has helped jump-start the review of DNS risk areas.

## ATRT2 Analysis of Recommendation Implementation

This recommendation can be partitioned into two sub-tasks:

1. ICANN should put in place mechanisms for identifying both near and longer-term risks and strategic factors in its Risk Management Framework; and
2. ICANN should publish information about risks, being aware of that information’s sensitive nature.

As suggested by the hiring of Westlake Governance to produce a DNS Risks Framework, ICANN is in the process of implementing the first sub-task of this recommendation. The mechanisms in place to date include:

* Regular reporting by staff to the Board Risk Committee;
* Reporting to the CEO and the Executive team on risks as they arise/are identified;
* Providing input into the ICANN Strategic Plan to identify strengths, weaknesses, and risks; and
* The Finance Department associating budget towards risk-related activities (identification, outreach, mitigation, etc).

The publication of the Westlake DNS Risk Management Framework can be viewed as completing the second sub-task associated with this recommendation.

## ATRT2 Assessment of Recommendation Effectiveness

While efforts are underway to create a Risk Management Framework, those efforts are not yet complete and may have been hampered by the Westlake DNS Risk Framework vs. DSSA Working Group controversy. As such, it is not possible to fully assess the effectiveness of this recommendation.

# Recommendation 26

“ICANN should prioritize the timely completion of a Risk-Management Framework. This work should follow high standards of participation and transparency.”

## Analysis of Previous Review Team Recommendation

The SSR RT placed an emphasis on developing a risk management framework as early as possible. The desired outcome is for the completion of a risk management framework developed through community participation and transparency.

## Summary of ICANN’s Assessment of Implementation

Implementation underway.

### Actions Taken

The Board-level DNS Risk Management Framework Working Group is prioritizing the implementation of this recommendation. There has been participation by community members in open public sessions at the ICANN Costa Rica, Prague, Toronto, and Beijing meetings. With the publication of the Westlake Governance DNS Risk Management Framework, a public comment opportunity was made available.

### Implementability

This is being addressed with Westlake Governance, we think the work to date has been open and inclusive, and participation has been welcomed.

### Effectiveness

The feedback from the community during public sessions on the Risk Management Framework has been positive.

## Summary of Community Input on Implementation

As discussed in the summary of Community input on recommendation 25, there is some unhappiness related to the perceived similarity of efforts between Westlake Governance and the DSSA Working group.

## Summary of Other Relevant Information

None.

## ATRT2 Analysis of Recommendation Implementation

Based on documented efforts to create a DNS Risk Framework, it would appear ICANN has prioritized the completion of that framework. However, implementation may have been hampered by a lack of clarity between the role filled by the Westlake Governance effort and the efforts of the DSSA Working Group.

## ATRT2 Assessment of Recommendation Effectiveness

Completion of the Risk Management Framework has been prioritized and provides for participation and transparency, albeit whether the standards of participation is high or not is a matter of opinion.

# Recommendation 27

“ICANN’s Risk-Management Framework should be comprehensive within the scope of its SSR remit and limited missions.”

## Analysis of Previous Review Team Recommendation

The goal of this recommendation was to constrain ICANN’s Risk-Management Framework to be within ICANN’s SSR remit and limited missions but within those constraints, the Risk-Management Framework was to be comprehensive. However, the lack of objective criteria associated with being “comprehensive” limited the value of this recommendation.

## Summary of ICANN’s Assessment of Implementation

Implementation underway.

### Actions Taken

ICANN hired Westlake Governance to develop the DNS Risk-Management Framework. This Framework was introduced at the ICANN meeting in Beijing and a draft was published at the ICANN meeting in Durban for public comment.

### Implementability

This recommendation is being implemented and staff has not run into any unforeseen problems or issues.

### Effectiveness

The feedback on Westlake's approach has been positive.

## Summary of Community Input on Implementation

Comments provided during the public comment period associated with the publication of the Westlake Governance DNS Risk Framework document suggests some members of the community do not believe the framework to be comprehensive. Some examples of indicative comments:

* “[Westlake’s view that Availability, Consistency, or Integrity of the DNS is outside of the scope of the Risk Management Framework] is a very limited view of risk management focused only on whether the DNS is at risk – not whether everything in the Internet that relies on the DNS is.” – Comment from Verisign (<http://forum.icann.org/lists/comments-dns-rmf-final-23aug13/pdfEXbAYduQ3s.pdf>)
* “The ALAC deplores that at this point in time, the proposed Framework is far from being detailed at a  more granular level” – Comment from ALAC (<http://forum.icann.org/lists/comments-dns-rmf-final-23aug13/pdfEiMIkBXExM.pdf>)

## Summary of Other Relevant Information

None.

## ATRT2 Analysis of Recommendation Implementation

As discussed in recommendations 25 and 26, there has been some controversy regarding the implementation of the DNS Risk Framework related to the role of the DSSA Working Group. When looking specifically at the efforts related to Westlake Governance’s preparation and publication of the DNS Risk Framework, some questions exist regarding the comprehensiveness of that framework.

## ATRT2 Assessment of Recommendation Effectiveness

Based on the comments referenced above and similar comments both in other public comments and relayed during the ICANN Durban meeting, there may be some question as to whether the Westlake Governance DNS Risk Framework is “comprehensive within the scope of ICANN’s SSR remit and limited missions” however it must be acknowledged that comprehensiveness is a matter of opinion and those opinions appear to vary significantly.

# Recommendation 28

“ICANN should continue to actively engage in threat detection and mitigation, and participate in efforts to distribute threat and incident information.”

## Analysis of Previous Review Team Recommendation

This recommendation aimed at ensuring ICANN remain active in efforts relating to threat detection and mitigation as well as distributing threat and incident information. Implicit in this recommendation is a focus on threats and incidents related to ICANN’s role in the management of the Internet’s unique identifiers and responsible distribution of information related to those threats and incidents.

## Summary of ICANN’s Assessment of Implementation

ICANN staff believes this recommendation has been met with the understanding that threat/incident detection, mitigation, and information disclosure are an ongoing task that will never be completed as long as ICANN is in the role of coordinating the Internet’s system of unique identifiers.

### Actions Taken

ICANN staff, in particular (but not limited to) the Security Team, participate in a number of security-related conferences and meetings and is involved in activities such as Computer Emergency Response Teams.

In addition, the ICANN Security Team published *“Coordinated Vulnerability Disclosure Reporting at ICANN”* at <http://www.icann.org/en/about/staff/security/vulnerability-disclosure-05aug13-en.pdf> (to facilitate responsible distribution of information related to threats and incidents.

### Implementability

Implemented, albeit with the caveat that threat/incident detection, mitigation, and disclosure are an ongoing area of involvement.

### Effectiveness

ICANN participates in trusted security circles and this will continue.

## Summary of Community Input on Implementation

No community input was received on this recommendation, however anecdotal input from the parts of the security community suggest ICANN efforts in this area are helpful.

## Summary of Other Relevant Information

None.

## ATRT2 Analysis of Recommendation Implementation

The Security Team has been quite engaged in the ongoing implementation of this recommendation.

## ATRT2 Assessment of Recommendation Effectiveness

This recommendation has been reasonably effective in facilitating ICANN’s involvement in venues in which threats and incidents are revealed, mitigations discussed, and disclosures made. Continued and increased involvement will be critical to ensuring ongoing effectiveness.

1. The “At Task” system is a Project Management Reporting tool. The system has been deployed and staff is in the process of refining how much of the information placed into the system is available for public view. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)