ICANN
Transcript
DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group (DSSA WG)
06 September 2012 at 13:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group (DSSA WG) teleconference on 06 September 2012 at 13:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-dssa-20120906-en.mp3
on page
http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#sep

Attendees on the call:

At Large Members

Olivier Crépin-Leblond (ALAC) (co-chair)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (ALAC)

Andre Thompson (At-Large)

ccNSO Members

Wim Degezelle, (CENTR)

Takayasu Matsuura. Jp

Katrina Sataki.lv

Jacques Latour.ca

GNSO Members

Mikey O'Connor - (CBUC) (co-chair)

Don Blumenthal - – (RySG)

Rosella Mattioli (NCSG)

SSAC members:

Jim Galvin (SSAC Vice Chair)

ICANN Staff:

Julie Hedlund

Patrick Jones

ICANN

Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies:

Rick Koeller, .ca (CIRA)

Julie Hammer (ALAC)

Mark Kosters (ARIN)

George Asare-Sakyi – (NCSG)

Joerg Schweiger (cCNSO co-chair)

Bart Boswinkel

Coordinator: The conference call is now being recorded.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much (Tim). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is DDSSA call on the 6th of September, 2012. On the call today we have Mikey O'Connor, Olivia Crepin-LeBlond, (Warren Camary), (York Schrager), Katrina Sataki, Don Blumenthal, Mark Kosters, (unintelligible), (Zak Latoo), (Linda Gazelle) and (Rick Caleb).

We have apologies from Andre Thompson, Jim Galvin, (Julie Hammer), Rafik Dammak and (Bob Butchincore). From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Patrick Jones and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I would like to remind all parties to please state their names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Natalie and thanks (Tim) as well. Got the A Team today. Very cool. And welcome all of you on the call today. Our usual routine. The agenda's really short. It's just keep working on that data collection discussion about roles, gaps and overlaps and stuff. What you see on the screen is my next try. Take a look at that in a minute.

Anything that people want to add to the agenda or update your statements of interest? We'll just take that pause together. Okay, what you see on the

screen in front of you is the upshot of the call last week where I think I practically put Bart in the hospital because I wasn't paying attention to the chat and he was saying, "Mikey, we should let the various identified participants describe their role themselves.:"

And I wasn't paying attention, the poor dear. Just about lost him I think. So anyway, I went ahead and built a gizmo to do that and I sort of want to walk you through what I built to get your reactions to it. And the other thing that I did is I added - oh, that's awfully small. Hang on a minute.

I added a few more people to the list. I apologize for all this screen madness. But I went through a few reports - remember last time we were sort of working on this column, the column that describes all the different participants in the various and sundry, you know, research, standards, education, blah, blah, blah.

And I went through a few other documents and added to this list. We also had a tendency to sort of head down a rat hole on who is part of what and so on. And I sort of backed out of that garage I think. But I added a bunch of possible participants in - with the notion that we don't need to be deciding. We just need to try and identify as many as we can and reach out to them somehow and see if they would like to participate in this conversation.

So I just want to highlight that one change. And then go back to the gizmo that I built. The presumption that I have is that once we get this sort of data collecting gizmo in some sort of shape, that we would then distribute it to people and let them fill it out themselves.

I think that was really the gist of what Bart was frantically trying to tell me on the last call. I wasn't paying attention to the chat and I agree with him. I think that's the right way to do it. And at first, I was thinking that we could do this with some sort of online polling thing.

But I decided to build it in Excel first because - and as I built it, I realized that it may be better to leave it in Excel. So when you - as I walk you through all this, keep in the backs of your minds that I am sort of puzzling about which way to do this.

That's all presuming that this turns out to be something that you all think is a good idea in general. It may be that this is another swing and a miss by Mikey and that's fine too. But this is sort of where the thinking is at, at the moment. So let me just step you through what I've got here and see what you think.

So the first part, at the very top, is sort of who are you, what's your role, what's your authority kinds of questions. And I went ahead and filled this out because it seemed useful to do that, partly make a good example, but also because I learned a lot as I did that.

And this was sort of at the stage where I was still thinking this might get transformed into an online pool kind of thing. Then what I did is, for each of the, what I started calling activities and they're - you know, this is the same list, the research standards, et cetera, and it goes all the way down through the whole gaggle of things. It's the same list that you see on the top of this - this list.

Patrick Jones: Hey Mikey, this is Patrick. I have a question for you.

Mikey O'Connor: Sure, go ahead.

Patrick Jones: I see internal, external, sharing, steering. I know I missed the call last week but can you just explain what the difference is between the - on the relationships column, what it is by internal versus external?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, that came up probably actually two calls - I can't remember. But what Jim - Jim Galvin was on that call and he pointed out that there is stuff at the

edge that's purely inside an organization. You know, edge being sort of front line doing of the work.

And there's stuff that's purely inside an organization and then there's similar work but that's in collaboration with other organizations and I think the example that came up was compliance monitoring where there's internal compliance monitoring, which happens at the edge, but there's also compliance monitoring that's still an edge actual doing kind of activity where it's a collaboration between, say, registries and, you know, customers that demand a certain kind of compliance to a standard like the payment card industry standard or something like that.

Patrick Jones: Got it.

And so we just made the distinction between collaborative edge activities and purely internal edge activities. That's where that additional layer came from. And - but, you know, it's good to keep repeating that because, you know, we have a fair amount of overlap on the calls but it never hurts to say it again.

One of the things that happened as I went through this is that I realized that just by doing this, the definitions of these things may get better defined. And so one of the things that happened is that I've refined these phrases to include the phrase regarding, "The DNS," to sort of highlight the fact that when we're doing this research, we're not asking, say ISPs, which is the world I come from - we're not asking whether an ISP does research and analysis.

Clearly they do. Clearly almost any organization does that. What we're interested in is research and analysis with regard to the DNS with that narrow definition of the DNS that we're using in our study. And so I went ahead and tacked that phrase on to the list of activities throughout because otherwise the scope just goes crazy.

And, you know, we may want to circle back to that decision but that's one of the things that I learned as I did this, this week. The other thing that I lear- or another thing that I learned is that in my first try, I just had a binary decision and I realized that that's not terribly helpful. And so I put another scale in which I, for purposes of this discussion, have called their - the organization's level of engagement, as with everything else in this thing.

This is all on the table. This is not methodology that spilling in from anywhere else. This is purely a Mikey creation so, you know, there could be giant things wrong with this and we should work on fixing those. But what I did is, for each of these - well, you know, sort of chunks of the matrix, I give people the choice - and boy, that's getting small on the screen.

I apologize about that but I give people the choice between basically nothing. You know, I mean, I think it's a perfectly valid answer to put a blank in here and then, you know, just say well, this organization is no relationship. But if they have a relationship, they can have a relationship where they consume that research.

They participate in the research. They support it, i.e., you know, they provide tools or techniques or, that you know, they're a service provider that does this thing. Or they actually do whatever we're talking about. And so in the case of ISPs, when it comes to research and analysis regarding the DNS, the ISPs generally participate in that research but they aren't doers of it.

And when it comes to the sort of core steering which way is west, how is this going to be done kind of conversation, you know, of course this is completely unreviewed by any other ISP except me. But I've sort of backed off and said that, you know, the ISPs are probably going to be satisfied not to steer it as long as the steering does a good job and delivers the stuff in a timely way. I think ISPs would probably sit back and not want a seat at the table of steering that research.

So that's kind of the framework that I built. And then what I did is I went ahead and filled out the framework because I wanted to test it and sort of see how it works. And the filling out of it helped me sort of refine it as I went. But there's no particular reason to take you through all my answers at this point.

I think this is probably a good spot to stop and say, you know, how am I doing? Is this a good idea? Is this crazy? So I will. I'll stop and sort of let you react to the thing so far. Any thoughts one way or the other? I hate that shocked silence.

Yes, (Jacques) came into the chat saying I need to think. And I think that's probably right. This is a lot of stuff to digest all at once and, you know, it may be that the best thing to do is just - one way to do this would be to actually start walking you through some of the answers which would give you time to think.

But I'm less interested in your feedback on my answers because I think that when we get this instrument built, whichever way we build it, if we decide that this is the right thing to do, then I think we each need to go back to our respective constituencies and in my case, I've sort of got two of these to fill out.

I've got one for the GNSO constituency that I'm a part of, the ISPCP and I've got another one for Internet service providers in general. That - all right, Cheryl, I didn't see you coming in. And so what I did is I decided to try the broader category. I think the ISPCP constituency and the GNSO will have much narrower answers. We won't see nearly as many filled in boxes on that one. Patrick, go ahead.

Patrick Jones: Hi Mikey, Patrick Jones. So I do - I can see - and I need to look back at the last call or so that I missed, but I can see where they - something like this would be useful as, at some point we're going to need to go down the path of implementing the SSRT recommendations and there's this recommendation

four that says that we need to document and define the nature of ICANN's SSR relationships within the community to have a single focal point for understanding the interdependencies between them.

And having something like this, where all the different groups that have an interest or a role in the space, provide their contributions would help toward that mapping. So while I can see it's helpful, I also see that - I'm kind of struggling to see how this is a DSSA task, but maybe others have thoughts.

Mikey O'Connor: Well, I think that one of the things that I learned by doing this is that just to sort of replay the history of how we got here, in the DSSA report we have that little hexagonal chart that talked about - I don't have it up. Let me just bewilder your eyeballs for a minute and bring up the evolution of that chart because I think it's perhaps useful to have that in front of us as I see all this stuff.

Patrick Jones: Do you want to turn to Mark's question while you're pulling that up?

Mark Kosters: Actually Patrick kind of stole my thunder. I'm trying to figure out where this actually fits in the entire equation because once you have - once you start putting these things really truly in place, the (gaps) become readily known as you go through the exercises of dealing with security events. Trying to do it beforehand, I just don't know what the usefulness of that is.

Mikey O'Connor: Right. Well, so let me show you the picture that sort of got us going down this track. In our report, we sort of drew this first version of this picture mostly to place ourselves in a context, you know, so this shows up in the scope part of our report.

And during the course of that discussion, we had a big list of organizations that should probably be placed on this diagram, so that's one of the things that got suggested sort of during the last phase. And I brightly said, "Sure, I'll go do that," and I went off and promptly broke my pick because I realized that,

you know, even with the list that we had, which was registries, registrars, DNSO (arc), you know, ICANN constituencies, et cetera.

Just putting little dots on a chart like this wasn't going to work and so I sort of came back to the group the following week and said, "Yikes, this is going to be really hard to do." And so where we came out was that we would spend some time between Prague and Toronto trying to populate this chart.

And one of the things that we did is we refined it a bit and added more stuff to it. At some point I gave up trying to make it geometrical and turned it into circles because it's too hard to draw eleven sided diagrams or whatever it turned out to be.

And so that's sort of the next step down this path. And then from there, where we wound up was on the call last time, taking a look at - I'm going to shrink this a bit. This chart where we said, okay, here are all the people, and I've now added a bunch of people to it.

And here are all the possible places that they could fit on the chart. Where do they fit? And that was the point which Bart had a coronary and said, "This is going to be hard for us to do." Why don't we go out and ask people and the - and that's sort of the trail that led us to the gizmo that you're looking at today.

Now I'm not necessarily completed wedded to the idea that we have to do it. But if not us, then who, is sort of my question? And as long as we're pretty close to being this far down the road, why not at least build a structure to do it in and then give it a try? So anyway, that's sort of the - that's kind of the replaying the bidding. Mark, is that an old hand or a new hand? You want to circle...

Mark Kosters: I'm sorry. I've got to put it down.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. So, you know, I'm not sure that we could get it done by ourselves. But I think we could take a reasonable first stab at it and then hand it off to somebody else. Patrick, who do you think should do this if not us? Circling back to your question.

Patrick Jones: You know, I'm not sure. I do think that it would be useful and this may be the exact type of format that we would want to take to go out to all the various groups and do this exercise. I guess I asked my question because I wasn't sure that this was a DSSA function but there's a lot of value in someone doing it and it may be something that, from the staff side, you may need to, you know, get direction to use something like this to address recommendation four. Yes, I'm not sure yet.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, well, that's one of the beauty's of actually building one of these gizmos, is that as you build it, just like you know, I did last week, we learn things. And once built, you know, the nice thing about this is it's really cheap to build. And so if we decide to throw it away, that's fine. But at the same time, I think it might be useful for us to keep going on this partly just to sort of clarify for ourselves what our respective organizations might - I mean, I'm sort of anticipating a pretty lively discussion in the ISP constituency about this, for example.

Unfortunately I've got a call coming up next Monday where I'm going to try and do it. Let's see, Cheryl's got some stuff in the chat, talking a little bit about the level of engagement stuff. It says, that list makes sense but we probably need to socialize it. And I would definitely agree with that.

And then she also says it was discussed on the last call that we might do the initial level of analysis and review now as a sample at least and then could be a, you know, a tool or the basis for a refined tool for the future. And I think that's kind of where I'm at, is I don't think that we necessarily have to be the definitive source of the final product, but we could at least take a first (run) at it and I think that the upshot would be useful for us.

And it would certainly improve the quality of that part of our initial report where we were talking about this hexagonal, now round, diagram where we sort of say who fits and what, you know, what part of this larger ecology. So unless somebody sort of throws themselves on the tracks and says, "This is really a terrible idea," I think we should keep going and I think that it might be a really useful topic of conversation at the Toronto meeting when we've got everybody face to face just to sort of walk through what we've got so far, socialize it a bit as Cheryl said, and then see to what extent we could sort of help Patrick with, you know, what you're working on.

I think that's a kind of reasonable course. Now, does that make you crazy, Mark? I don't want to completely run away with this and leave you standing there sputtering on the side of the road going dangnabbit Mikey's done it again.

Mark Kosters: Well one of the things that I like Mikey is that I always learn new things from you so.

Mikey O'Connor: You're so diplomatic.

Mark Kosters: So I guess let's see where it's going but I'm kind of befuddled right now.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes okay well well let's sort of ride along on this for a while. I mean I'm learning a lot as I go and, you now, (sort of) been feeling a little bit like the teaching assistant reading one chapter ahead of the class.

And in many cases sort of writing this stuff the day before the lecture so, you now, I'm quite open to course correction on this stuff. But it was an interesting exercise and so maybe I'll take you through my answers just to give you a sense of what I was learning and again feel free to, you know, as (Jacque) said, you know, as you digest this and issues come up don't feel like I have to continue all the way through all of my answers.

It's - I'm mostly doing that as just another way to explain it to you and then so something comes up that bothers you or you think could be improved, you know, by all means just interrupt me and I'll try and keep an eye on hand raising if I miss you just break in on me.

But what I tried to do as I answered these for my imaginary ISP friends was, you know, for each of these things I would sort of say okay do we ISPs do research and analysis with regard to the DNS.

And to the DNS as we are defining it, the narrow definition of the DNS not - because clearly ISPs do lots of research when it comes to DNS. DNS is right at the heart of our business.

And so, you know, if you want to talk about DNS in general we do lots of stuff about that because we provide it to our customers, we rely on it for the routing that we do both between our customers and us and between us and our peers and partners in the ISP world.

So we do lots of DNS research but research into the DNS not so much. I mean - we I think do do it to the extent that SSR issues of the DNS impact our customers and our internal operations and so, you know, we certainly participate in that.

And we certainly also participate in research where the DNS affects our partners and I think that we share a lot of information about that especially when it comes to emerging practice strategies.

But as I mentioned before I wouldn't think that the ISP community would necessarily need a seat at the table to steer how that research gets done, you know, there are people that have a lot more stake in this game than us primarily the registries and the root server operators that can steer that research.

But I think that one of the things that emerged for me and this is sort of my standard phrase for when we're consuming it is that I think we'd be satisfied with steering as long as we could be confident that we could get access to the research and that the quality and the timeliness of the work was done well.

So that's sort of my standard answer when we're not participating in the steering part. Same sort of goes for standards, tools, and techniques that, you know, we do a lot of DNS and SSR for our customers because for many of our customers we are their DNS provider especially dial in kind of customers and DSL kind of customers and stuff like that.

And in addition, you know, we have very extensive internal DNS and SSR stuff that we have to do in order to be able to reliably route both between us and our customers and between us and our upstream and downstream providers.

And so again I think we do a lot of sharing in that area and we might even want to help steer those standards with this because its so close to the core of our business so I bumped this up a notch on that.

I don't think that we're the leaders of that but certainly ISPs participate in a lot of places like the (IATS) and on and so forth that work on those. The next one is the training and awareness one.

And there I bumped this up to doing it because we do do training about the DNS internal to our organizations. We have to partly because of the amount of routing and stuff that we do but partly because we also have to deal with a lot of end user questions about the DNS.

One of the things to bear in mind throughout all of this is that the ISP community is very much on the front lines with end customers when things go

haywire with the DNS and so we do a fair amount of training around this in addition to training about more general kinds of DNS.

So we do that at both levels. You know, this is the sharing level and one of the things that's right at the core of being an ISP is that we teach other how to do our jobs. This is especially true at the very beginning but especially among the smaller independent ISPs of which I represent several.

While we compete with each other we also teach each other how to do things. It's just part of the culture and so there's a lot of sharing going on in this. And the same goes with, you know, the sort of sharing of the techniques across the partners not just the doing of the stuff but the actual capability building.

But again I don't think of ISPs as needing to run that especially - I mean we do run it when it comes to other stuff but not with regard to the DNS. We would sort of look elsewhere for the materials, techniques that are - and as long as we can get access to those materials and they're good I think we're fine to stand aside on that (role).

So that's sort of one clump of things. The next clump is the front line kind of stuff and so this (unintelligible) expand this just a little bit so you can read the whole thing.

The first one is the operational and technical practices and control. Oh no I'm sorry. The first one is the technology selection. And again this is regarding the DNS. Now I wouldn't expect ISPs to be selecting and deploying technology as it relates to the DNS, i.e., the root servers or the registries.

But we probably partake of that and so - and this is where I started folding in a lot of the things that are in that clump. So this is stuff - sorry about the abbreviations - but the SW and hardware its, you know, DNS hardware and software of all the ability assessment systems DNSSEC.

All of this stuff we participate in because we have to hand that on down to our customers and we share it with others and so even though we aren't deploying the technology we are deploying some of the software.

And certainly with DNSSEC we're very interested in that because as I think we mentioned on the list, you know, when DNSSEC gets a little goofy we are often the ones that gets the calls from the customers saying how come I can't get to NASA.

So again I don't want to go through all of these at this level of detail but, you know, I think we're participants in that whereas the next one and actually the next three, I think we actually are part of the doing when it comes to the operational and technical practices that Internet response and in depth monitoring primarily because we are the edge for the DNS.

You know, we are directly customer basing and when there are incidents it's often either a dramatic impact on our customers when say a registry - when a TLB goes away and the opposite is also the case when its one of our customers with a source of an attack.

I think we are in that boat and so I gave - this was one of the few places where I gave a pretty strong engagement score and so I think we're, you know, we're very interested in things like business continuity, network security, best practices, methods, incident response, in depth monitoring all that kind of stuff. I think we're right there in the boat.

And I think we even want to participate - we don't want to run but we want to participate in the - even the core steering of that. Again because it's such a critical part of what we do. I don't think we need to run it but I think we do need to participate in that.

And again I need to run this whole (rant) by somebody besides me. This is entirely Mikey at this point. Then there's the last part and this is more the sort of managing, compliance monitoring and so on.

The only doing that I think we have in this is in the compliance part. Partly because I think we do a lot of internally defined SSR stuff around the DNS and we also do a fair amount of joint compliance monitoring with our upstream and downstream folks.

But again when it comes to the sharing and the steering for the most part we're either participants or we're customers of those processes. So this is a pretty extensive piece of thinking.

It took me the better part of a day to sort of chug through all these questions. I didn't do it straight, you know, I went off and did chores and let it set for awhile and came back.

But it took a long time to sort of (puddle) my way through all of these tiny granular little questions and as I say they're not done. This is got to get run by the ISP (committee).

And also I've got to run back to the dozen or so ISPs that I actually represent here at ICANN and run this story in front of them and see what they think before I consider anything except the ravings of Mikey's deranged plan.

But I thought it was useful. I thought it was a helpful thing to do and it helped define a bit in my mind what these categories I think meant. So anyway there's a longer version of the introduction and it didn't get interrupted so I think it maybe that this is one of those ones where we'll leave it for ya'll to think about - maybe pick it up again on the next call.

Unless there are thoughts I'm going to stop now because I'm running the risk of boring you to death I think. Any kind of closing thoughts before we wrap this up? I mean if this is the shocked silence people going oh dear Mikey is...

(Jacque): (Jacque) here.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes go ahead (Jacque).

(Jacque): So okay I think there's something there we need to work on it a little bit more. The only thing that what is needed is the second data summary with all the different organizations that we have in there. There's like 51 rolls or something or (unintelligible) 20 entries or 30.

Its going to take - it can take a long time to do that for each one but we should summarize this at the higher level like registrar, registry, ISP best ICANN as a whole but not every - I don't think I'd bring every ICANN organization in there is relevant.

But we need to capture all the different sectors in the industry and I'll try to populate the spread sheet with those maybe ten sectors.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, you know, as I was kind of coming out of last week's call I realized that we could - we could kind of go crazy in terms of that list.

(Jacque): Because I think...

Mikey O'Connor: You know, my thought was that it's always easier to make a list shorter than it is to make it longer later and so what I did is I sort of put a bunch of stuff on there as kind of a punch list for someone someday but not necessarily us to finish.

But the thing that I wanted to make sure is that we didn't forget that there are, you know, lots and lots of organizations that have a stake in DNS security and not necessarily to take it upon ourselves to populate this whole sheet.

I think that's where (Patrick's) comment is probably relevant as well which is - in filling out this whole thing probably isn't something that we need to feel like we have to do.

(Jacque):   So...

((Crosstalk))

(Jacque):   So use this as a framework so if you're an ISP you look at this and you say incident response on the external side if you don't work with your upstream and downstream partners, then your - if you're an ISP like line number the ICANN number 22.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

(Jacque):   If you don't work with your upstream and downstream partners and this (remark) says you should then you're not a good participant in the Internet (echo) system. That's how they should do their gap analysis.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes and I'm not sure that at this stage of the game we even need to get that that far. I think at this stage of the game we might just leave this as a question to all of these communities and then just post it as (answers).

(Jacque):   This is the recommended - like if we cover all the major components.

Mikey O'Connor: It's a framework. Oh it sure. Yes it's a framework and I think the key is the distinction between collecting the information and then I think the next phase and I think this is what I heard you say (Jacque) maybe I misunderstood you was that we would also prescribe.

We would say this is the best practice. I think there's a fair amount of discussion between those two stages of this thing.

(Jacque):   So (lets have) all the major participants fill in the box and then we assemble all of that we may find out that you know what the core steering for incidence response there's nobody does the do part for incidence response.

Mikey O'Connor: Right.

(Jacque):   And that's a major gap that needs to get...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes - yes that I agree. Yes and I think that that's really where this exercise fits in our mission which is that this is the gap analysis part of the mission and remember that's part of our charter is to figure out gaps and overlaps in the capabilities.

So, you now, its - as we move through this I think what we have to do is sort of wait for the DNS the (Board) DNS framework committee to kind of catch up with us but eventually we do need to be able to come back to a chart like this and be able to say yes here are some gaps that we found.

And then Cheryl is oh Cheryl is in the chat thing but at this stage it can also be or still be a sample set that is presented. And I think that's true - that's part of the reason I filled out the ISP one is just to give a representative example and partly to test the thing to see whether it was working right.

Any other thoughts at this stage? It's a big mouthful to swallow and I apologize for that but what I'll do is I don't think that this has changed since the version I sent to the list and it's also on the (Wiki).

I might send it to a list again just as a reminder and let people look at it this week now that you've sort of heard the rant behind it and maybe we can come back to it next week.

My thought would be that this is probably something that we can't just send out to a mailing list, you know, I'd be pretty uncomfortable sending this to the ISP community and saying fill this out.

I think they would have a hard time doing that but I think that what we could do is take this to our respective constituents and walk them through it together and it might not be a bad idea to do it the way I did it where you fill out a preliminary pass on your own and then take it to the people you represent and say well here is my first try and here is sort of the rationale behind it.

What do you think and get their reactions to it. It would probably take a while but then I think the goal would be to try and get a few of these back in time for Toronto.

So that we could have a version of this set - had a few more lines in it than just ISPs so that we could socialize and then in Toronto and get people's reactions and so on. That would also give (Patrick) and the staff some time to digest the implications for the work that they have to do.

And Cheryl is saying yes it has to be presented socialized in our component parts of ICANN and then go beyond. So I think that's kind of the emerging track that this is...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's me agreeing.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. But, you know, we take this as individual members of the DSSA and so yes indeed folks this is where the burden of works shifts from Mikey to you.

You take it to your respective constituents grind through an iteration and bring it back and we consolidate it.

Okay I think with that it's almost the top of the hour. (Jacque) has got to drop off anyway so - and it's a good time to stop. Rick is typing - I think I'll hang on for Rick's comments. Do we know the date of the work group meeting in Toronto?

Yes Rick it's the same slot. It's the Thursday around eleven-ish. I think there was some turbulence as to whether it was 11 or 11:30 but late morning Thursday. There's a sort of all security all the time. There is a meeting on Thursday morning with SAC and Board committee and us all in a row in the same room.

Okay that's it. See you in a week. Enjoy and Natalie and Tim I think we can put the brakes on the train and turn off the recording and all that stuff and call it a day. Thanks.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thanks Mikey.

END