

Transcript

DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group (DSSA WG)

26 July 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 26 July 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-20120726-en.mp3>

on page

<http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#jul>

Attendees on the call:

At Large Members

- . Olivier Crépin-Leblond (ALAC) (co-chair)
- . Julie Hammer (ALAC)
- . Cheryl Langdon-Orr (ALAC)

ccNSO Members

- . Jörg Schweiger, .de (co-chair)
- . Takayasu Matsuura, .jp
- . Rick Koeller, .ca (CIRA)
- Jacques Latour, .ca (CIRA)

GNSO Members

- . Mikey O'Connor - (CBUC) (co-chair)
- . Don Blumenthal – (RySG)
- Rosella Mattioli (NCSG)

SSAC members:

Jim Galvin (SSAC)

Scott Algeier (expert)

ICANN Staff:

Julie Hedlund

Gisella Gruber

Apologies:

Mark Kusters (ARIN); (co-chair)
Patrick Jones

Coordinator: We're now recording.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. On today's DSSA Working Group call on Thursday the 26th of July we have Mike O'Connor, Scott Algeier, Jim Galvin, Jacques Latour, Don Blumenthal, Rick Koeller, Takayasu Matsuura. We also have Jorg Schweiger who's just joined us.

We have apologies noted today - sorry, apologies. From staff we have Julie Hedlund and myself Gisella Gruber. And apologies noted today from Mark Kusters, Patrick Jones and Cheryl Langdon-Orr will be joining us shortly on the Adobe Connect room as well.

If I could also please just remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Gisella and welcome all. After our Prague's last summer hiatus, nice to get back in the groove again. First up is just a quick look at the agenda and then we'll update our statements of interest and get underway.

I think this is really mostly just a catch each other up day. I'd be interested in hearing what you all thought after Prague, you know, anything that happened there or thereafter that you'd like to talk about. I think it's always good to catch up on that.

And then we'll spend a little time as you've seen on the list the co-chair/staff leadership ops group has been sort of chatting about the way forward partly because of some of the conversations that happened in Prague. So I think

we'll spend the rest of the time talking about that, getting your reactions to that and call it a day.

So is there anything that people would like to add to the agenda before we move ahead? Okay. I have a statement to my - or an addition to my statement of interest. So I'll lead off the SOI conversation.

It turns out that when the great reveal of the new TLD strings took place, I was surprised to discover that four of my .com names are exact matches to applied for strings. So for example, I have bar.com. I actually share that domain name with the (fu) at bar.com. And we were surprised to discover that someone has applied for (totbar) as a TLD string.

So I have four exact matches .coms to apply for TLDs and I don't know what that means in terms of my statement of interest. But I'm declaring it just to let people know that there may come a time when I have to recuse myself of something because of that.

Is there anybody else that's got a change that they'd like to share? Okay. Let's just move right on. I'm going, you know, do the usual Mikey take notes and pre-mind thing. I'd just like to hear from people what they discovered, what they learned, what they observed, anything that happened at the Prague meeting that might be relevant to where we're at or a report or findings. Anybody got any thoughts that they'd like to share?

Don't all go at once. I hate it when people, you know, fight to get on the floor like that. Go ahead Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Hi. It's Julie Hedlund for the transcript. Mikey I thought it was really useful that our meeting was (unintelligible) directly and even in the same room by the Board DNS Risk Management Framework Working Group.

And as you are well aware, a couple of us (unintelligible) group and we were able to share information. And I think it was really excellent that they were able to draw on some of the work that this group had done in the next set. So I don't know if you want to expand on that at all.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah I do. I'll touch on it now and then I think we will undoubtedly circle back around to that when we get to the sort of way forward discussion. But I agree it was really helpful I think for the Board committee to hear what we've been doing and essentially get dragged through it.

And then it was extremely helpful for us to hear about their plans. And for those of you who left after the Board committee, there was a small group of folks who lingered in the room to sort of work on the task list that is in the Board's request for proposal for consultants to figure out the risk management framework.

Julie and I were in that group and then a number of people from the Board committee including Bill Graham, the Chair, (Ron) and several others. And I think we had a really productive discussion where we essentially agreed that the first try on the work plan from the Board group had a couple of problems.

One was that it really overlapped over what we were doing. It was essentially another risk assessment. And the other problem was that it didn't really have the full scope of what's really needed to be done in a risk management framework.

So it was sort of two things that needed to be talked about. It was too narrow and it was zeroed in on exactly what we're doing. And I think that that discussion was really helpful and led then to a sort of frenzied series of emails between that subgroup that afternoon and ultimately led to a dramatically improved set of tasks that's in the new version the RFP for the Board Risk Committee - Risk Management Group.

So it's very much I think the result of that scheduling that that all happened. And I think we kind of saved the day by having it set up that way. So I agree that was a really helpful thing.

Jacques, go ahead.

Jacques Latour: Hi. Jacques for transcript. What I got from that - the Risk Management Group is they want to build - they want to do a risk assessment on the internal operations of ICANN. That - and I saw that as inward looking inside how ICANN do day-to-day operation and were outward looking toward the Internet. So that I - that's the way - that's what I saw in there.

Mikey O'Connor: I think that that's right. Although it wasn't as clear as it could have been in their document. But, you know, I think you're on to a fundamental difference between the two groups, which is the, you know, the scope of our view is broader than theirs.

Jacques Latour: Yeah. I don't think there's much overlap. It's mostly around how you do security incident management or their framework for security besides their day-to-day operations. So it's much different scope than what we're looking at.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. And there again, I think that one of the things that was nice in the post session was sort of try to get some clarity around that. And I think that the new version of the work plan, which may - if I was really a (droid) - see if I can do this. Really a (droid thing) without hosing up the - and I'm mumbling for Cheryl. Hi Cheryl. Welcome to the call.

I'm trying to figure out whether I can find it. Yeah. Look at that. I found it. Oh, that popped up in right exactly the right spot so you can even see it on your screen. Okay. So let me show you the new version of their work plan. And this is quite a bit different than the one that you saw in the meeting so that

that's - first there were the definitions. Oh, you can see those on the screen. Those didn't change much.

But then not surprisingly some of our pictures made it in to the revised draft to sort of clarify what a risk management framework really is. And you've seen this before so I'm not going to go through it in any detail at all except to point out that this new draft is essentially being presented to the bidders as the kind of thing that we're looking for in this work that they're going to do.

The other picture that we presented was this one, also one that's familiar to you. So these two pictures sort of lead off the new version of the work plan and this is the version that went out for bids.

And then in that first part of the work plan what the Board Risk Committee is really looking for is these five deliverables. Those are really - there really are five deliverables. If I were unbelievably a (droid) I would be able to put that last paragraph in the bulleted list.

So basically the new version of their work plan is saying why don't you describe what's in a risk management framework? Why don't you describe who should be doing what in that framework? Then describe, and this is back to your point Jacques, the inward looking view because this is inward looking. But it's now in a broader context.

And then the, you know, once those scope boundaries are described, describe the risk model is sort of code - we built a risk model in our risk assessment work. That's that compound sentence that you ticked us off on Jacques.

But, you know, we want - you know, I think in the Board work it would be really helpful for us if they also defined a risk model that went a little bit broader because, you know, our risk model really only talks about this - the first one in this pre-chunk list, you know.

We built the model for assessing risk. But, you know, what about a model for planning what to do about the risk and also a model to kind of keep an eye on how things are going. We haven't touched that. That's outside our scope. So presumably they're going to do that or this one.

And then once all that's done, the consultant is going to take a look at both definitions of ICANN, both ICANN the organization, which would be the inward looking thing; and ICANN the community, which would include us to deliver all that.

So this ought to be a really useful interesting report. And I think it will help us a lot in our work. And I think the key question in the way forward is whether we should wait for them to get this done before we carry on. So kind of plant that in your mind because that's sort of the question of the day on the second half of the call.

Then there's a big task, which is take all that, send findings out to the community and socialize it within the community and see whether they got it right. And if they did, great. And if they didn't, fold some of that community reaction in.

So that's the first deliverable there is some sort of materials that summarize the whole thing. We'll likely see a public and staff comment cycle that'll summarize them and then presumably revise the work that they did.

And then that's essentially where the RFP - the first contract I think of the RFP will stop. And then - and part of the reason for that is because that's a boatload of work right there. It's going to take quite a while.

And Bill Graham is still very concerned that, you know, we deliver some results or we see some results I think by - I don't think by Toronto. Maybe by Toronto. I can't remember. If Patrick were on the call he could square us

away on that. But certainly by Beijing. And, you know, just that pile of work that I just stepped you through will certainly take a good chunk of those months to get done.

Then in the RFP is a potential Phase 2 project, which would be to actually do one round of this thing once it's agreed to within ICANN and the community. And I think part of the reason that Bill wanted to section this off is because this could take quite a while.

I mean you know from our experience how long just a risk assessment could take. And so he didn't want to commit to an additional maybe year of work without some deliverables. But it's - we sketched it out in this work plan so that, you know, we don't forget.

And so the first thing would be to essentially marshal the resources that will be need to do this assessments and presumably, you know, this will I think may even have to be folded into the budget cycle. This is above my pay grade. I didn't pay a whole lot of attention to this part.

But, you know, tools, procedures, I'm real interested in that. I would presume that they would steal a lot of the stuff that we've done or refine it or make it better or maybe present us with a better version of what we've done.

But then they would also be building tools for that broader context, you know, the risk mitigation tools and data collection and all that kind of stuff. And then they'd go off and do one, you know.

And in a risk assessment again I would expect a lot of collaboration between that inward looking one that presumably is done and what we've done. And maybe we would even participate in that.

Then they would go on a build a risk plan and maybe, you know, and this is basically walking around that six-sided diagram. They might develop a bunch of tools that could be used to mitigate the risks.

They would certainly establish a process to monitor some key indicators and then an optional thing in the optional phase. So we have two layers of optional would be to come back through and do the risk assessment one more time so they would completely complete the cycle of the risk management framework again inside of ICANN or at least within the ICANN corporate scope.

And presumably at the end of the day they would evaluate how well this all worked and come up with some sort of plan to transition from this sort of one time piece of work into an ongoing process that ICANN staff would presumably be responsible for maintaining. And then, you know, off they go into RFP mechanics.

But, you know, that work plan was really created almost from whole cloth in that session that took place after that three session, you know, that meeting in the morning.

So, you know, to sort of re-amplify what Julie was saying, I think that that presented a huge opportunity for the people from the SSRD, our group and the Board DNS Risk Committee to brief each other on what we did and then fortunately there was another half hour in everybody's schedule for that group that remained.

And I think we got an awful lot done in that room session and came out with a much better work plan than the one that was originally being proposed, which was quite sketchy and basically was only the risk assessment steps.

So maybe I'll stop. Sorry about the big long rant but, you know, especially Julie and I had a lot to do with that work plan and I think it's useful to bring the rest of you a bit up to speed on what happened there.

Are there any - as I went through that work plan, were - did anybody have any reactions like oh my gosh, that's a terrible thing, why on earth are they doing that or anything like that? Because I think there is room to still shape that if that little group got something wrong.

The RFP has not been out for response all that long. It's only been published I think for a week or two maybe. And so if there's some glaring omission or really bad idea in there, I think that we could flesh that out and maybe get it back to Patrick to insert into the tender process.

Not seeing anybody throwing themselves at the bear cave. Let's see, Jorg, there's chat. Oh I'll give you credit even though Rick came up with it Jacques. Jacques is saying Rick came up with the compound sentence thing. He - and Jacques just takes credit. I think that's only fair. I do that all the time.

And then Jorg is highlighting some that we talked a little bit on the ops call about. Jorg, are you on the call too? Do you want to jump that in to the call transcript? See if he - how fast he can get off mute. Now he's trapped into talk.

Jorg Schweiger: So I'm in talk mode now as I'm informed. So it takes quite some time to switch it. Well, I think there's nothing more to say than just to make clear that I think that ICANN should stick to (its remits) and the (remits) surely are with respect to their roots of operations. So ICANN I think they could run the initial model - the initial risk management model. They do come up with applying it to their own operation.

They could by the way for sure propose that somebody else might adopt it. I doubt that they could in any way make other parties or oblige any other party

to use the framework. So it's just kind of a here's what we came up with. It doesn't make an awful lot of sense if you would apply it, please do. This is what we can do for you. It's just delivering something that you might use and you might want to adopt. But we being ICANN can't force you to use it.

Mikey O'Connor: Right. Right. And I think that's - the reason I wanted you to say that is because I think that there's a lot of nuance in that that's really important for us to be aware of as this unfolds.

And I think that gets back to Jacques' initial point, which is the inward looking (unintelligible) of the to projects. And it's often hard to keep that distinction clear. So I think that that's one of the things that we're going to want to make sure that we do going forward is keep reminding people of the difference between what we're doing and what the DNS Board or the Board DNS Risk Management Committee is doing.

My hope is that some or a lot of the work that they do will be useful to the rest of us. I think it would be a bit of a disappointment if they didn't come up with stuff that the rest of us could steal in some form or another. But I think you're right Jorg to make clear that it's purely optional for other organizations to use any or all of what the ICANN Risk Management Framework eventually turns into.

Any other observations from Prague that people want to share or anything else on this particular thread before we more on to our way forward? We're sort of at the halfway point in the meeting. I'd like to turn over to that pretty soon. But if we've missed anything, I don't want to cut it unnecessarily short.

Okay. I think one of the things that struck the co-chair on our call was how confusing this all was and whether or not we should modify our approach to sort of our immediate next set of tasks. And we've been talking about it for the last couple of meetings.

I don't think we're really at consensus. I don't think there's violent disagreement amongst the group. But part of the problem that we've had is that it's been very difficult to get all five of us on the phone at the same time. Summer holiday season is on us. It's just been really hard to get us all together on the phone.

So I don't think that we are at any sort of violent disagreement but we haven't really nailed this down. And we felt like it was useful to sort of take our thinking as it stands right now out to you all because especially those of you on this call are sort of the hard-core participants and, you know, you have lots of good ideas that we like to steal.

So we thought we'd put our thinking in front of you and let you beat it up a little bit and hopefully that'll feed back into where we're at and we'll sort of come to a go forward plan pretty soon.

So I'm going to switch from this little mind map to a Word document that this is purely a Mikey document at this point.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: ...on conversations that - in the ops group and sort of weaving it into this document. And so especially Olivier, (Jergin), Jim feel free to beat me up if this is off the rails because I've been sort of doing this as a sidebar.

Basically in the report what we say is the next thing we're going to do is we're going to go deep. We're going to go do a risk assessment based on the framework that we've built. So we're going to build scenarios that identify gaps, evaluate the risk, et cetera.

And as we talked about this, sort of several threads have emerged in the conversation. One is that the - one of the major reasons why we were established - we the DSSA were established was the pressure to establish a

DNS CERT under the ICANN umbrella has abated a bit. And so we wanted to sort of step back and see if that made a difference to what we're going to do.

Another is that, you know, either the overlap or the perceived overlap between these three groups, the SSRT, us and the Board DNS Rick to the Framework Committee has, you know, that whole little story I just told you about what happened after the meeting there's that sort of complication.

And one of the things that I think that we're all really not wanting to do is make us, the DSSA, especially you, the volunteers that do all this work, do work unnecessarily - the work that's duplicated by somebody else.

And so just to expand on that idea a little bit...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: ...we've got - oh, Jacques, are you on mute? Somebody's not on mute. I'm hearing background noise. Everybody check your mute.

The work that comes out of that work plan that we just walked through I think informs and refines what we do. At least it creates something that we might want to steal some ideas from. Because this will be presumably a big deal, risk management consultant, that has their own views. Remember we sort of built our own. It's possible that they would have some ideas that we want to steal before we do ours.

But the other is that in there optional Phase 2 they're proposing to do one cycle and that cycle would include a risk assessment. And the question is sort of how to coordinate the inward-looking - presumably inward-looking risk assessment that they would do with the outward-looking risk assessment that we would do.

Again we don't want to confuse ourselves or the community with these two things that sound an awful lot alike unless we're very careful in the way that we describe them.

And so one of the things that we were thinking we might do is sort of wait a bit before we kick off our risk assessment just to sort of let that project catch up with us. And so then you go well that's fine but we've got a lot of momentum; what would we do in the meantime to sort of keep that momentum going?

And is it even a good idea to maintain that momentum? I think that the - that the leadership group is pretty much in agreement that we want to keep the momentum going. I don't think anybody wants to stop. It's just how to do this in a way that we kind of keep people's engagement and interest without unnecessarily kind of confusing a parallel effort with a slightly different scope.

So one of the things that we did is we sort of mapped out some stuff that absolutely has to happen between now and Toronto anyway. You know, sort of have a review and consolidation phase in a way that's in front of us.

One of the things that's clear is that we do need to sort of map out some of this overlap gap stuff both between us and the Board DNS Risk Management Committee but, you know, also between us and the SSRT. And if you spin through the SSRT report very early in their series of recommendations is a please that the sort of gaps and overlaps in this get identified and worked out.

And so one of the things that we could do between now and Toronto is work on that because we've already identified that in our report as something we want to do anyway. And that will actually be I think a pretty interesting piece of work.

Then another thing that needs to happen between now and Toronto - at least for me and the GNSO - and I presume for the others in some of the other

ACs and SOs as well - in the GNSO I need to go back through a public comment cycle so that I can get to the GNSO Council and have them approve the report that we've written so far.

And presumably we'll get some comments in the public comment cycle that will modify what we've got in this report. And so we need to go out, get the public comments, fold them into our report, get on the Council's agenda and hopefully get this approved by Toronto. I think that that's quite doable between now and then but it's not going to be real close before Toronto that we'll get all that done.

Then another thing that some of us have been talking about is that the methodology that we built has some sort of rough edges. Julie, I think, pointed out just before we went to Prague that the numeric scales that come out of those spreadsheets right now are pretty extreme. They range from 10 million to 1000 or something like that.

And we might want to tune that up a bit. And one of the things that I was thinking is that it might be nice to split that worksheet into a build scenarios half and an evaluate scenarios half so that all the number crunching is on one tab and all of the choice-making - the multiple choice stuff is on another tab. So that's another thing that needs to happen between now and then and that could get folded into the final report.

And let me just zip back to the chat because I'm getting ahead of the chat. Julie mentioned, when I was talking about the gaps and overlaps stuff, Julie Hammer said that we might want to look at the gaps and overlaps between all the groups that we identified that are involved in SSR as well as the gaps and overlaps between the DSSA Working Group and the Board Committee.

And I agree with that. We have a page on the report where we present that six-sided diagram where we have a big list of organizations that participate in

that. And it might be really interesting to just go ask them where they view themselves on that diagram and, you know, nothing more than that.

I mean, one of the things about the Internet and the DNS is that it has no authoritarian or authoritative center. But it might be really interesting to know sort of who plays where on that map so that if nothing else we can ask each other for help when we are doing those kinds of things.

So I think that's right that the gaps and overlaps isn't just the sort of bureaucratic overlap between us and the Board Committee and the SSRT but it's really a broader conversation that could be very low key but could at the same time be very helpful to the community.

And then Jacques chimed in on the methodology refinement thing and said that, you know, converting these to a log scale might help a lot in terms of the crazy scale of the numbers. And Julie is also thinking that the bid sensitivity analysis might help. And I think that that's exactly the kind of thing that at least I was thinking about when I put this bullet in this little list - refining the methodology would be a useful thing.

So that, you know, one of the other things that I think Julie suggested - and I can't remember - Julie and I have been ramming, jamming away in the background on email on this. I think Julie also came up with the idea that it might be good to come up with sort of a way to get back to a scale for the sum.

You know, we've got scales for all of the subsidiaries that range from, you know, really, really bad to not a big deal at all and we might want to fold some of this arithmetic in to a way to evaluate the risk - the total risk for the whole scenario on that same kind of a scale, you know, critical, urgent - urgently - or urgent action required all the way to not a big deal or not even really a risk at all.

And, you know, I think that's the sort of thing that given a bit more time, you know, we can fold into that methodology. That methodology came together awfully fast and it does have some rough edges to it for sure.

And then the last thing that I think we could do between now and Toronto is give people a chance to - you know, again speaking from the GNSO perspective a lot of the folks in my organization have dropped off. And, you know, I need to go back to the GNSO and check with the people that have dropped off. A lot of them have dropped off because they have new jobs or because they've got other GNSO duties that have really taken a lot of their time.

So I think this is an opportunity to sort of rebuild the ranks at least from the GNSO and maybe from the other ACs and SOs as well. And so anyway that's kind of some stuff that needs to happen no matter what.

And then we sort of got two options that we've been talking about in the leadership group. One is to just keep right on going sort of - well precisely the way we described in our report. The other is to take a little bit of a breath and wait either until Phase 2 of the board project starts or at least until Phase 1 is done so that we can steal their results.

And presumably they would have a lot of the work done by Toronto and maybe we could steal their results and carry on. The trouble with launching our risk assessment work at exactly the same time that the board launches theirs is if they start with a risk assessment, which they very well might, and we start with our risk assessment we might confuse everybody. So that's what we've been talking about.

The last little thing is if this - if any of this required a charter change - and I just jotted down a conversation that we had that said that in Section 4 of our charter we've got a way to do that; we the co-chairs can propose a

modification to the charter and circle back to our respective ACs and SOs and get that done so that's really just a note more than anything else.

So at this point I'd like to stop - Julie's got her hand up. Anybody else who wants to jump in the queue this would be a good time to do it and we'll let you guys talk for a while. Julie, go ahead.

Julie Hammer: Yeah, it's Julie Hammer. Mikey, one thing I'm thinking too is whoever wins the board's request for proposed - and if awarded the contract it would be really good to make available to them the tools that this group has developed.

It won't necessarily mandate that that is something that they use but at least have it as a consideration in their work on developing the framework so that they're not doing it in a vacuum and they may even provide us some very, very useful feedback on the tool in addition to that other sort of - the framework diagrams that have been provided in the RFP.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, that's a good one. That is a good one. I think that in the RFP - just take a little risk here and see if this works. Excuse me while I blind your eyes. My recollection was that they mention us - Patrick mentions us and the SSRT - somewhere in this document. This is all the legal stuff. I thought there was but I guess not. Oh there we go. I knew there was - a set of prior works. And...

Julie Hammer: Yeah, it might get buried in the...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I think that's right. I thought it was more prominent. I think it may have been more prominent. So I think it's good to - good to highlight that. And I think that's easily arranged with Patrick to get us a little bit more closely tied in to the consultant. Both directions. That's a good one.

Anything else, Julie, before I move on to Jim?

Julie Hammer: No, no thanks, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Jim, go ahead.

Jim Galvin: Well since we don't - this is Jim Galvin for the transcript. And so since we don't seem to be sparking too much conversation here on this question of what to do going forward let me say something a little bit provocative here and see if that sparks a little more discussion from people.

I think perhaps I've been a bit in the minority on the Ops calls in proposing a slightly different interpretation of the alternatives for what we might do based on everything that Mikey has very nicely collected there for us to consider.

I actually suggested outright that we should - setting aside the process by which one might do this - going up one level I think the DSSA Working Group should simply step back and declare success. We should obviously conduct whatever charter changes would make this possible. But we should declare success and be done. Our draft report should be it. We should do whatever we need to close that off, update our charter to allow us to move on.

The work that we're proposing here - that we'd like to continue with I would suggest we simply make as a recommendation that it should be continued or perhaps as we get into some of the things that Mikey was talking about that we ought to do.

I mean, we might shape the recommendation to suggest that, you know, the Board Risk Committee should reevaluate the future activities or, you know, maybe the supporting organizations should take a deeper look at whether or not, you know, the risk assessments are still relevant or if they need some different scope or refinement based on all of the other things that are going on up here.

I might be digging into a little too much detail so let me just take a step back and say that, you know, given all the things that have happened up here and particularly the waning participation in this group it just seems like an opportune time, the landscape is very different than it was before.

Let's find a path to declare success, be done, end the working group and leave everything else as a future recommendation for work to be completed. That's my suggestion or comment.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Jim. And my apologies for not sort of putting that out there. This document is the result of - for me a transition between one computer to another is like a lobotomy. And in the process of doing this that one dropped out somehow. And so it's good to get it back in. I'll refine it. Because I have extensive notes on this it's just fallen off the list so there you go.

What does that do for people? I mean, that's certainly another option. And, you know, there was pretty lively debate on the leadership group call about all this. What's the sense of - those of you who are here - now we've got a third option to take a look at. Any reactions to those?

See, I'd better - (unintelligible) disagreeing in the chat. Jacques is not sure yet. Rick would like to see a continuation. Oh, Rick's on. Oh well since Rick's on I guess we can't give all the credit to Jacques for the compound sentence thing. That's too bad. We were doing that before.

Jim Galvin: So, Mikey, may I add some clarity while we're listening to people type or watching people type?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah sure, go ahead.

Jim Galvin: I want to be careful because it's just the way you wrote the notes there to sort of express a little bit more completely. I think that there - we should regard

what I said as kind of a principle not an absolute. So I'm saying declare success and be done and recommend that our work be continued. But I think there's a - there's some space in there for us to, you know, decide exactly what done is.

I mean, there's still some things that we really should finish in our existing document. We want to take in any comments that we receive. You know, I mean, exactly where we draw the line between being done and recommending future actions is certainly a point of discussion.

You know, I think it's pretty easy to - it's straightforward to suggest that the actual risk assessments themselves are probably something to leave to the future. I think that's mostly what I feel most strong about. You know, past that point everything is subject for future discussion and debate about where to take that.

My real concern with moving forward with the risk assessment is, again, there are what 30, you know, odd people who are listed on this working group and here we are with 15 or something like that and we've got a, you know, fairly small consistent set of people.

I mean, in many ways it just feels like this is an opportune time to make this kind of shift because as Mikey had listed up here you can refresh leadership and participants. There are a variety of ways in which one might do that. But, you know, sort of moving from one working group to another is one way to do that.

And that also gives you the opportunity of reexamining, you know, your landscape and the actual scope of work and, you know, assessing how those things go together. And I think that that's kind of an important part of this opportunity.

You know, the landscape really is very different now than it was two years ago when we came into existence and that's really what I have in my mind when I'm thinking that, you know, there's a good break point here and there are some reasons why that break point is valuable.

Anyway I guess my main comment is I don't want my Option 3 here - I'm a little concerned about how it might be recorded. I know you're trying to be a little terse there, Mikey. But I don't want it to be taken as a, you know, a very absolute, you know, stop dead. I think there's some space in there to really, you know, to be - what that - what done really means versus what we might leave to go forward. So thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Let me just keep typing here for a minute.

Scott Algeier: So, Mikey, this is Scott Algeier.

Mikey O'Connor: Hi, Scott, go ahead.

Scott Algeier: Hi, how are you, sir?

Mikey O'Connor: Just fine.

Scott Algeier: So a couple quick - a really quick comment and observation. Now I think if the - this conversation kind of highlights the need to recalibrate what the goals are of the group. And, you know, whether we met the original goals and if we did so then, you know, maybe there's time to figure out a way to wrap it up. And if we didn't meet the original goals then maybe we should identify or reaffirm what the goals of this group are so that we can, you know, get on track with a strategy to implement that.

Because it seems, you know, a little bit (unintelligible) the objectives of the group and the mission of the group keeps expanding a little bit. We're - try to

go into more detail. We try to go - it seems to me sometimes that we're trying to look at everything instead of focusing efforts.

And so as we determine what we want to be doing I think it's good for us to review what the original mission was, how we are in meeting that mission and what need - what steps we might need to take if we're on track or off track.

Mikey O'Connor: So a little quick and dirty word - note taking here. Thanks, Scott. Anybody else got thoughts on this? Let's see, I'm back to the chat. Jörg is in there with we should discuss Jim's suggestion with a larger number of participants. Oh and we're over the top of the hour. Dang-nabbit.

I think we're going to have to stop here. Julie's got her hand up. Julie, maybe you get the last word and then we'll wrap this call up. Sorry, I lost track of time.

Julie Hammer: Okay, Mikey. Julie Hammer for the transcript. Just a comment really whatever option the group does consider going forward in your list I think it would be important to consider what are the skills that - and knowledge that we need in the people in the group to actually be able to do that. And that goes hand in glove with the sort of renew and refresh idea that we need to consider next steps from a viewpoint of what skills does the group need to have then to actually do it.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. I think with that we'll call it a day. I think we'll probably just pick this up again. The Ops group is pretty fragmented these days because of holidays so we don't foresee having a full set of Ops folks on the same call for quite some time. So we'll talk about it on Monday some more and come back to you next week with another thrilling episode of the DSSA.

I think that Gisella may not be able to wrap this meeting up so I'm going to do that. So thanks for coming. We'll see you in a week.

((Crosstalk))

END