Transcript
DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group (DSSA WG)
21 July 2011 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 21 July 2011 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-20110721-en.mp3

Attendees on today's call:
At Large Members
• Edmon Chung
• Olivier Crépin-Leblond
• Cheryl Langdon-Orr
• Andre Thompson
• Patrick Vande Walle
ccNSO Members

• Sean Copeland, .vi
• Luis Diego Espinoza, .cr
• Ondrej Filip, .cz
• Takayasu Matsuura, .jp
• Jörg Schweiger, .de (co-chair)
GNSO Members

• Greg Aaron – (RySG)
• Don Blumenthal – (RySG)
• Rossella Mattioli – (NCSG)
• Scott McCormick – (CBUC)
• Mikey O'Connor – (CBUC)
• Adam Palmer – (CBUC)
NRO Members

• Mark Kosters (ARIN)
• Carlos Martinez (LACNIC)

SSAC

• No members

ICANN Staff:
Bart Boswinkel
Julie Hedlund
Patrick Jones
Gisella Gruber

Apologies:

Mark Elkins, ccNSO

David Conrad, SSAC

Bill Manning, Expert

Jim Galvin, SSAC
Rafik Dammak, GNSO

Coordinator: We're now recording.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's DSSA call on Thursday the 21st of July. We have Patrick Vande Walle, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Mike O'Connor. Olivier Crepin-LeBlond, Rosella Mattioli, Takayasu Matsuura, Adam Palmer, Mark Kosters, Sean Copeland, Ondrej Filip, Edmon Chung.

From staff we have Patrick Jones, Julie Hedlund, Bart Boswinkel and myself Gisella Gruber. Apologies noted today from David Conrad, Mark Elkins, Bill Manning, Jim Galvin and Rafik Dammak.

Don Blumenthal has just joined the call as well. And if I can please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes and for Patrick Jones and Patrick Vande Walle please say their sir names to allow us to identify yourselves. And Joerg Schweiger has just joined the call as well. Thank you. Over to you Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Gisella and welcome everybody. If you haven't joined the Adobe room that will be a good thing (unintelligible). Somebody needs to mute. We're getting a lot of walking around the kitchen kind of noise on the line.

The agenda is pretty straightforward today. (Unintelligible) let people update their statements of interest and then spend the bulk of the call on taking a look at the work that we did in Singapore around - oh.

Woman: Oh, I didn't end it.

Mikey O'Connor: I didn't either. I'll let Gisella take care of that.

Gisella Gruber-White: We're sorting it out, apologies.

Mikey O'Connor: No worries. Maybe we'll get audio on it. Who knows, make lemonade out of that one.

Anyways we'll spend most of the time summarizing the stuff we did in Singapore hopefully through Adobe. But if not I'll just - I'll do it over the phone and we'll (unintelligible) from there.

Just as a backup for people, I sent out the summaries of the Singapore meeting a few days ago on the main DSSA list. And if you roll back to that email while we're doing the statements of interest and just get the confidential information summary open on your own desktops, that way if the Adobe Room doesn't restart we...

Gisella Gruber-White: It's up again Mikey. I'm just letting everyone back in.

Mikey O'Connor: Okey-doke. While that's happening let's do the - always at least in the GNSO we always take a moment at the beginning of meetings to give people an opportunity to let us know about any changes in their statement of interest.

And so I don't have the Adobe room in front of me. I'll have to let people just sort of sing out. But if anybody's had a change of employment or a change of circumstance that would indicate that they should change their statement interest it would be a good time to let us know right now.

Rosella Mattioli: Well I'm Rosella Mattioli and I have a change.

Mikey O'Connor: What is that change Rosella Mattioli?

Rosella Mattioli: Actually I'm doing this six weeks internship (unintelligible) the universe state in Berlin about (unintelligible) about (BDP). And I don't know if it's like - it's important for the statement of interest that will change this part. And I would after like at the end of all this I would be (unintelligible) finish my (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Terrific. Thanks Rosella Mattioli that's perfect. If you could summarize that and Gisella what's the process we use these days to actually update the statements of interest?

Gisella Gruber-White: If you could send it through to us and we'll put it up on the wiki.

Rosella Mattioli: (Unintelligible) yes.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you Rosella Mattioli. Gisella here.

Rosella Mattioli: Yes, thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Anybody else with a change in their statement of interest? Not hearing anybody. Last chance, okay. I'm still not in the Adobe room or...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You need to refresh Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Pardon me Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You need to refresh. Reload the room and you'll get back in.

Mikey O'Connor: Enter okay. I've never had the Adobe Room fail before.

Man: Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: There we go. Gisella you're going to have to (unintelligible).

Gisella Gruber-White: Sorry we just got one very noise line there. We're just trying to find out who it is.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Gisella Gruber-White: I'm giving you the power now Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Terrific. We should be seeing it again. Okay. Thanks Gisella for getting that back going so quick. All right, so what we did in Singapore split into five groups. I adopted the convention of just putting people's names on the group. And we have one group that I didn't know the name of the person. So that's the mysterious question mark group.

What I thought we would do today is try something and if it works great. And if it doesn't we'll do something else. But we will develop a summary by letting each group sort of go through their work.

A lot of people were hoping that we would spend some time in Singapore doing this but I knew we wouldn't have enough time to really do these justice. So I didn't that but in fact planned on a call like today's.

So the way this call will work is we will just sort of work our way through the various groups, Mark Kosters's group, Edmon's group, (Scott)'s, (Katrina)'s, and the one I didn't know the name of.

We'll give you each a few minutes to just sort of tell us what you came up with. And then as we go we'll start building summary of this and see sort of where we wind up. So that's sort of the plan.

And so the question of the moment is who'd like to go first? Gracious pause and then if nobody wants to go first I'll just pick people at random.

Don Blumenthal: Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes sir?

Don Blumenthal: Hi. It's Don Blumenthal. I'm kind of in a noisy area so I can't talk long. But I thought I'd mention the question marks was my group. It was like me, Keith Drazek, Olivier. So for whatever that's worth I'll add that to the notes.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay well because you are going to be dropping off. I'll put Olivier's name on it. Go from there.

Don Blumenthal: I'm sorry. I didn't hear that. Like I said I'm in a noisy area.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay well since you're going to be dropping off a call soon I'll let Olivier be the summarizer when we get to that one.

Don Blumenthal: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Olivier's raising. Go ahead Olivier. Oh you may be muted Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond   Thanks very much Mikey. I was just going to mention I'm not sure whether it was our group because I thought I was in the same group as with Edmon.

So it would be strange to have two sheets rather than one. But if Don recognizes his handwriting there then fine. But it's definitely not mine.

Don Blumenthal: Okay maybe I need to retract. I did remember Edmon being in our group.

Mikey O'Connor: Here's the sheet. Somebody recognizes that sheet.

Don Blumenthal: I'm not on Adobe so I'll have to take your word.

Mikey O'Connor: Well we'll handle that as we go. Anyway anybody want to start summarizing? Excuse me while I roll the screen around a little bit.

Okay I'm going to start picking on - and I think I'll pick on Edmon and Olivier since they were in the same group. Open up your stuff.

I came up with my own sort of topology therefore you. Edmon, Olivier, either of you guys want to walk us through your stuff?

Edmon Chung: This is Edmon. I - a couple things. I guess first of all you talked about that earlier. I think I missed the last part of the session in Singapore so that might have been the reason for the inconsistency.

I'm actually just about to board my - I sort of mentioned it over email. So and I'm not in front of a computer and don't see the sheet. So I wonder if Olivier you can help me here?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond   Yes sure no problem. This is Olivier here.

Okay so looking at this what we did was to elect the main principles for confidential information, the fact that it would be containment by small teams that there will be a multiple number of small teams not just one. Because some confidential information will be shared among one team but might not be shared across the two teams.

Most of the information we'd imagine to be some trade secrets and trade data for analysis. But we could also set up several levels of disclosure such as Chatham house rules.

Because if you keep confidentiality at such a level that none of the information can filter out at all then the information's not even worth having since it's not going to benefit anybody.

So that was really the three things. And of course the signing of NDAs I think would be important for each one of those small teams.

And really the level of confidentiality would be defined in those NDAs. So I don't know if that explains much or any questions or comments on this?

Mikey O'Connor: I'll just manage the queue for a minute. Anybody got questions for Olivier and the rest of the group that worked on this?

Okay what I'm going to do, stick that in our summary as the starting point of our summary. And then as we go through the rest we can sort of compressed out the duplication.

I was curious Olivier and Edmon, about what Chatham House rules are. That was a new one. I meant to go off learn more about it and then forgot. Do you want to expand a little on that? That seems pretty interesting?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond   May I answer that Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Sure go ahead.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond   Thank you. Olivier for the record, Chatham House rules as its Wikipedia page mentions but which I don't have up at the moment is a

system whereas information can be freely exchanged inside a group but cannot be attributed to anyone specifically outside the group.

In other words, we can talk freely about some things inside the group but if someone comes up with some particularly important revelations about anything, those can be shared outside the group. But the attribution of those words is anonymous effectively.

Mikey O'Connor: It's nice protocol for that. That's pretty cool. Okay so anything else that you want to say about (unintelligible) second half of your conversation in your group, the types of materials?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Gisella Gruber-White: Sorry we're just going to - Gisella, we're just going to mute that line.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond   Mikey it's Olivier here. Could you repeat your question please because I didn't hear it?

Mikey O'Connor: Sure. I was just curious if we wanted to summarize at all the second half of your group's work. We're going to...

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond   Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: ...talk a little bit about types of confidential material?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond   Yes sure. We looked at the - Olivier here for the record. We looked at the types of confidential information or confidential material that would be shared. And we thought that it fell mostly into two categories, one being that actual data for analysis and the other one being internal processes or any trade secrets that any participants primarily would I say from industry would wish to share with the working group.

And having more than one trade participant in the working group does mean that this information might have to be compartmentalized between the different - between the different working groups and between the different participants so that they don't start having access to each other's data (unintelligible).

So this is why we - these were primarily the two types of confidential material that would be shared. And one might have to use Chinese walls for this. I'm not sure. But this is the way that we saw it.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay any comments about this part before I drag that up into our summary from the rest of the group? Nicely done Olivier, thank you.

I think what we'll do is we'll just sort of build out this summary as we go.

And since the way this page laid out let Mark Kosters go next because that way it will be right underneath.

So Mark Kosters do you want to walk us through what your group talked about and then maybe help me fit it into the summary?

Mark Kosters: Okay. So my group actually worked on a little bit more on the mechanics of the agreement. And Rosella Mattioli was just wonderful in her participation over the phone so very active as well as I'll mention.

There was a couple things. People in the group thought the nondisclosure agreement and Appendix of the charter was sufficient for a nondisclosure.

They thought that the agreement, that we needed to have this thing signed for those who wanted to share information from the very beginning.

And the assumption is underneath is that this would be done before the whole - for those people who want actually want to work with confidential

information that the mechanics would already be set up before information is starting to flow.

So you would have a - potentially have a group that would be receiving this information where all this - where NDAs are already signed (unintelligible) go ahead.

There was - people like the idea of having special different levels of confidentiality. And to be honest I can't - I'm trying to rack my mind on the three levels that we discussed. Maybe Rosella Mattioli can remember. I can't or I don't right now I don't have my notes in front of me.

Rosella Mattioli do you have anything to add?

Rosella Mattioli: Okay I have (a bit) of microphone also. Yes this is Rosella Mattioli. I think that's two levels of confidentiality were like secret. And I will look for them and then I'll pull from the chat so we can move on and we can add our (topics).

Mark Kosters: Okay Mikey I'm done.

Mikey O'Connor: All right any other comments? And do you think that I put your stuff in the right place? So I have taken much of your stuff and put it under the nondisclosure agreements area and I've expanded the - here's a question back to Olivier.

Does Chatham House handle levels of confidentiality fairly well in your experience?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond   Thank you Mikey. This is Olivier. No it's not something that deals with levels of confidentiality.

What it actually does is to make the information freely available outside so the information does not remain confidential but the source of the information remains confidential. It is there to help out with flow of information.

So I would say that Chatham House is one the lower levels of confidentiality.

If you want higher levels of confidentially you'd have to be outside of Chatham House rules and you'd have to mark things that restricted or whatever it is you wanted to find it out.

You might wish to restrict it to a small group, restrict it to only a handful of participants. But Chatham House is the lower part of the confidentiality.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond   Because there's a lower level than that. Sorry Olivier continuing rambling on. There's a lower level than that which is the full disclosure.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes so maybe we could replicate those. We could say full disclosure Chatham House and then higher levels. I guess I got these in reverse order.

The lowest level is full disclosure, then Chatham House, then higher more secure right, more sensitive?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond   That's correct yes.

Mikey O'Connor: Just going to take a short process checkpoint. Is this process driving people crazy or is - can we keep going this way?

They nice thing about this is that we sort of wind up with a self-documenting result. And if it's all right for people to see it on the screen as I type in I'll keep going. But if it's distracting or uncomfortable please let me know.

Okay so Mark Kosters that's it for your summary. Is that right?

Mark Kosters: That is correct. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Now figure out how to switch things around. Those other ones, if I leave the screen that small can people still read it?

Sing out if you cannot read it. It makes it easier for me to expand the topics if I can leave it this small.

(Scott) are you on the phone or anybody in (Scott)'s group? This would have been (Scott)...

Scott McCormick Hey Mikey. It's (Scott) here.

Mikey O'Connor: You're on, cool.

Scott McCormick Hey sorry I'm in the middle of a trade show so I'm trying to do two things two things at one time here so I do not have what you have up on the screen.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay let me just see if anybody else in (Scott)'s group is on the call. And if not I will summarize for you and you can hit me with a stick if I do it wrong how about that?

Scott McCormick Sounds good.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Anybody else in (Scott)'s group that's able to see Adobe and wants to do this? Okay let me do it.

One of the two major topics that (Scott) and his colleagues came up with was first the question what is sensitive?

And the two sub points that were made there was who defines it as sensitive? And then I think what the group said was let the source of the information be the primary definer of what the sensitive information is.

And it seems to me that this fits pretty well into this level of confidentiality discussion.

So I think what I'm going to do is put it over there that area. And I'm going to put it kind of at the top because it seems to me that that question precedes the rest which is it's defined as sensitive then it can be placed in its appropriate level by the group and managed by the appropriate rule.

The other topic that they talked about which I thought was really interesting was the answer to the question how to protect sensitive information.

And the group's answer was attempt to obtain and produce information without the need for nondisclosure agreements.

And I thought I would circle back to you (Scott) and put you on the spot a little bit. I thought this was a really interesting idea. And I was wondering if you could expand on it just a little bit?

Scott McCormick   Sure. So pardon the background noise if there is in the background.

Mikey O'Connor: It sounds good actually.

Scott McCormick   So what we were - coming from a few of our past from the group we had to deal with these types of situations and with other forms of data.

What we had come up with was basically if we need to solicit or each request information from a party to have that party sanitize it down to where you take out the details that may trace it back to a source.

So I'll use, you know, for example say with VeriSign for instance. We've questioned VeriSign for data. Instead of them coming back pushing on data they have a mechanism to post it through maybe the ICANN staff and without any association to VeriSign.

So to take out basically and create an anonymity to that data versus having it come from a direct source.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: (Scott) let me switch over to Olivier. Is this similar to the Chatham House idea or is...

Scott McCormick No.

Mikey O'Connor: ...it yet another thing?

Scott McCormick No it's not.

Mikey O'Connor: It's not okay. I think then what we're going to do...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And that wasn't Olivier.

Mikey O'Connor: No it didn't sound like Olivier. It sounded a lot more like Cheryl. Welcome back.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond Olivier here and Cheryl is a lot faster on the trigger that I am.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh ain't that the truth.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay so I'm going to put this in our principles. Again I think that, you know, I like the simplicity of that which is if the sensitivity never gets to the working group that certainly makes it a lot easier to manage.

And so maybe what we can do is try and figure out a protocol where unless it's really needed the non-sanitized detail just doesn't get to the working groups.

Because I am a little worried that the working groups will get wrapped up into a very complicated process that may slow them down a bit. Is that sort of where you were headed (Scott)?

Scott McCormick   Kind of yes, so for the most part. So the other question on that is -- and we don't know, you know, to this extent until we've posted this question -- is, you know, would a registry or registrar if we asked for duplicative data be okay basically sanitizing a report from themselves, you know, stripping out their name, passing it to ICANN staff for ICANN staff to distribute versus them distributing it?

So I don't know if they would have, you know, any concerns with that. But I think that or we can use a third party if need be to do that task.

Mikey O'Connor: Well that's exactly where I was headed. So you like channeled my typing. It's the thought of using an independent third party that. You know, when I was with the Big 6 firms, we used to do services like this where we would be the intermediary to strip off the identity.

Olivier, is your hand up from before, and I just didn't see it? Or is that a new hand?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: No Mikey. It's a new hand, Olivier here. I was just going to say this is effectively (Chatham housing) it, isn't it, the taking away the name. But I don't think that the (signatizing) part only looks at taking the name out, or the source of the information out and sharing it via a neutral third party.

I think there is some genuine information out there such as, I don't know, for example number of attacks daily on Network X. Which are particularly sensitive because this really is real data from out there.

And it might be used by the competition for whatever purposes. So I think there are two levels. There's the sanitizing it by taking names out, or (Chatham housing) it.

And the sanitizing by actually taking any sentence which is a little bit - which comes up with some real info, real strategic info out of the reports. And I'm a little concerned about that because taking any such information out of a report will probably make it less useful for us at the end of the day. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Let me capture that tradeoff.

Scott McCormick: Mikey, if I can be put in the queue. This is Scott.

Mikey O'Connor: Go ahead Scott.

Scott McCormick: So just to reply on that. Obviously there is data that will respond to specific networks. From my understanding, we are all under the (all find) the NDA on the (just) working group, which would restrict competitors from using that data against each other.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh.

Scott McCormick: Now I understand there's some legality there. But has everyone signed the NDA?

Mikey O'Conor: Scott this is Mikey. Let me break in on that. Actually not, it turns out that one of the things we'll do right at the end is take a look at the relevant parts of the charter.

And it turns out that we in the GNSO interpreted the charter a bit differently than it's actually written. The charter actually states that signing an NDA is not required for participation in the working group.

And the way the charter has envisioned this was that the NDA-required information would reside in sub-groups. And that sub-groups members would sign the NDA but that the whole working group did not require that. And that's part of what we need to sort out with this.

We in the GNSO (unintelligible).

Woman: We lost Mikey.

Scott McCormick: Hey Mikey, are you there? This is Scott.

Woman: He just (unintelligible) Mikey's just disconnected.

Woman: It was sort of (unintelligible) wisdom being (imparted). And then it just faded away. We in the GNSO...

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Well it's Olivier here. I just wonder as one of the co-chairs, shall I take over in the meantime while Mikey is offline and gets back in so we don't lose any time?

Woman: Sounds like a plan.

Scott McCormick: Sounds like a plan.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Okay right. Scott, have we finished with the part that you were going through or?

Scott McCormick: Yes. I was just bringing up the point about the NDA. So if the GNSO has, you know, read it differently than other parties - other (SSAP)s and groups, then I think that needs to be addressed.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: How do you think it should be addressed because the whole group will therefore not sign an NDA? But the confidential information will be shared among the sub-groups and will have signed NDAs.

Scott McCormick: Yes. So if we're putting this into sub-groups or putting it as I would call into caveat. And limiting just that group, that sub-group to the information. If there's NDAs in place I, you know, as is if putting that legal agreement in there I would feel safer sharing pertinent data with that sub-group. Now (stubs) my own personal opinion, not (side) of others.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Okay thank you Scott. You're back Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm back, sorry about that.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: No problem. I'll hand the baton back to you.

Mikey O'Connor: Any highlights of what I missed? Sorry about that, I've totally changed my telephone structure (unintelligible).

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Olivier here. Scott was just explaining the fact that the sub-group would have to sign an NDA. And so there's different levels effectively.

Mikey O'Connor: And I think that's the way our charter has envisioned it was that the NDA signing would take place at the lower level. Julie do you want to chime in on that?

Julie Hedlund: Hi Mikey, this is Julie. Yes, actually I think you're correct about that. I don't have anything to add to what you've said. I think it's very clear.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. All right.

Julie Hedlund: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Anything else Scott in your summary?

Scott McCormick: No, I'm good.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Well we've got two to go. So in (unintelligible) group, one of the interesting things that went on there is they actually named a platform. (Katrina) are you on the phone, anybody else that was in her group?

Luis Diego Espinoza: Yes Mikey, Luis Diego Espinoza (unintelligible). I mean (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Oh great, be the summarizer of what you all were talking about?

Luis Diego Espinoza: Yes, yes sure. We didn't talk too much. I'm sorry, you asked me for a summary?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Luis Diego Espinoza: Okay, I don't know what is (main steps). (Katrina) mentioned (right away). But personally I don't know - I do (no thing). But it looks like a (unintelligible) some (to certs).

We discuss what principles in these confidential information. And one of my important (risks) is half of information that is need (to works). In this way (unintelligible) don't have information that, you know, is not needed.

Usually there's many information, you know, (cherry). And none of the (unintelligible) information is needed. In the confidential information, this is a (unintelligible).

Then (unintelligible) important to take in account to have only the information needed to do the work. They're (routinely) talking about (what) the user name and - the user and password is not enough to protect information. We need a third or fourth level of protection. And encryption, when information to start, is important too.

Mikey O'Connor: Terrific. I was pretty interested in the (NESIS) platform. Is there anybody else on the call that knows anything about this? It seems like something useful to explore. So I put it in the summary.

Maybe the ops gang can take an action item to explore a little bit and see what it is and how it might work. And what it would cost and so on and so forth. And (come back) to the larger group with ideas about that and what we've discovered. Jorg go ahead. You may be muted Jorg. This one's a star 6 to un-mute.

Jorg Schweiger: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: There we go. Now you're on.

Jorg Schweiger: Yes, just want to add that we have been talking about the platform very, very briefly. And that it is a platform that has been provided for, or within the European community.

And there is a Website, www.(nica).eu where everybody can take a look at what is been provided. Although I'm aware of the fact that this might still be a prototype. And this prototype seems to be used by the (cert) organization.

That's all I know right now. But it might give some information or additional information currently.

Mikey O'Connor: Now the Website is?

Jorg Schweiger: I think it was www.(nica).eu.

Mikey O'Connor: I'll get that tuned up when I do the notes, any other thoughts about this from other folks? Okay, thank you for your summary.

Now this isn't really Olivier with the question mark. How do you throw a picture up and let people look at it? Maybe somebody on the call will recognize (unintelligible).

Oh, I was in (unintelligible). (Recognize) this one? If not I'll summarize it, but it's always better to not talk. I'm not hearing an overwhelming rush the gate. So I'll summarize it.

You might expect there is some themes that are (starting) to emerge that - across these groups. I think the (bution) theme falls into our (unintelligible) stop that.

Pretty extensive discussion about the levels of confidentiality. And so I think I'm going to put it in there. There, like that. Oops. And this was the conversation about the level of disclosure.

And again this seemed to me (fit). A level area, and there for now. Maybe the need to (org) issue could move in there too. (Unintelligible) had talked about mechanisms for agreeing to the public output, enforcement, (unintelligible). Olivier I see your hand up. Do you want to jump in on any of this?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thank you Mikey. It's Olivier here for the record. Just one thing, you put attribution to the three levels, on the branch of the three levels of confidentiality.

It actually could probably be on the how to protect sensitive info because attribution works along with what Scott was working on, which was the way to share information out of via ICANN staff or an independent third party.

So I gather without knowing what attribution meant, it probably wasn't in there.

Mikey O'Connor: So let's move it like that. Is that what you're...

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Whether the comments or whether the information as it should be related to any specific organization. Or whether it is shared anonymously.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: That's it, thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Nice spelling job Mikey. Oh, no spell check. Oh, you guys are going to get to (unintelligible) spelling. You know, it's been years since I had to admit to how bad I can't spell. But there you go. I'll fix that later.

How about Disclosure 1, did I put that in the right spot? Let's see, where did I - it's starting to get a little (unintelligible). Put it down here in the notion of confidentiality. We have internal, external, yes or no, published or not.

And then (unintelligible) interesting. Just needed to find who is internal and who is not. And in one of the other ones, the issue of sort of checking people in and out of the working group also got raised, which I thought was a pretty good check.

Oh, so my call quality isn't good. If I get closer to the mic Gisella, would that...

Gisella Gruber-White: Sorry Mikey. It's Gisella here. I don't know anyone else hears it. But occasionally you break off in this...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. What's...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: I've done is I (unintelligible) (voice MP) line. And I'm beating the heck out of my connection because I'm also using the same Internet connection to share my screen on. I bet that's what's going on.

But I will walk around my house and encourage people to stop using the Internet while I - continues. Let me know if it's really bad. And I'll try something else.

So back to the point of disclosure in the summary, I'm going to tentatively tick that as okay. We can (unintelligible). The next thing the group spoke about was again the gating of information (and out).

And Olivier, would you agree that this one is best placed close to the attribution one that (unintelligible)? Know if I put it up in here, that (unintelligible) more (mechanical) kind of (thing).

I mean what we could do is we could start building a, potentially a (mechanics) section. No, I'm not going to get carried away on that.

And then the other point that people in this group raised, which I thought was really interesting, was a code of conduct. And I wanted to pause and take maybe the last couple of minutes on - we're getting close to the end of the call and we'll have wrap this up.

But what do people feel about a code of conduct for the group as a thing to do? Are people enthusiastic about that, not enthusiastic about it, is it covered by the charter? What do people think? Jorg go ahead. Maybe muted Jorg.

Jorg Schweiger: Jorg for the record. I'm not too keen on setting yet another code of conduct in addition to what has already been said in a charter. So, and were we for sure

do have to agree on the code once again, I think what has to be done is quite clear.

And that is handle information that is supposed to be confidential. And come up with a result that is unimmunized in some way, or is usable for the group as a whole.

And I personally do not see yet another need to describe any professional information. But these are just my five cents.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Jorg. Anybody else got thoughts on this? This is maybe one to think about. And we might want to revisit next week. I haven't thought about it quite frankly. Never experienced one before at ICANN. And so I think I have to scratch my head over that.

I thought it was a pretty interesting idea to think about. And (unintelligible) it will go in the summary. We're five minutes away from the end of the call.

I want to take you really briefly what the charter says. And I'll fold this into the summary. But what the charter says is that there - sub-working groups may need to be formed.

The charter has less with the flexibility to do that. Even if we felt like we needed too. The charter then laid out essentially high level procedures, which when I look at them don't conflict with what we talked about. We essentially got to a lower level of detail than the charter did.

And then this point that we got too earlier in the call that in fact, participation does not require an NDA. But that participation in sub-group probably would, depending on the structure that we put in place.

What they were talking about with the sub-working groups is that sub-groups would only be required where sub-working groups need to access confidentiality - confidential (information).

I'm going to push back a little bit on that. We may actually find that we need sub-working groups for other things, simply because we need to break work in chunks.

And I don't think that the charters will beat us up if we do that. I think they were mostly trying to solve the confidentiality (information) problem. But I think that, you know, we may just find as we do then in some other working groups that we just need to break the work into pieces. And I wouldn't imagine that causes a problem.

And then the, some of the mechanics. So what I'll do is (I'm) going to fold all this together in that summary that we started building today. And maybe what we can do is circle back around and do it again in the first part of the call next week. And then move on to the next chunk.

So with that, we're two minutes away from the end of the call. I want to take a process checkpoint here and see what people thought of the way to give the work in Singapore its appropriate attention.

Did this feel like a good (unintelligible) to do that? Is there something I could do differently or better? I'd really want to hear about that, because quite frankly this is the first time I've attempted using this tool and doing this thing on a call this large.

And I'm not sure I did a good job. So any feedback would be much appreciated. If it's fine, there's no need for feedback. But if there's a course correction needed, please provide it either now. Or if there isn't time or you don't want to say bad things about me in front of everybody, feel free to send me an email.

But if I don't hear anything from people either right now or over the next week, I think I'll go ahead and do it again. Carlos made a good point that it is totally easier to follow if you were in Singapore, although I'm not sure.

Anything else before we...

Julie Hedlund: Mikey this is Julie. I just wanted to refer to the question that Mary Wong had asked to list as far as how to share the summary of the information from the Singapore meeting.

Mikey O'Connor: Right. Mary wrote an email, and I think it was just to you and me. Are those summaries that I published to the list going to get posted to the Wiki?

And good question. Let's ask the group. Does anybody have an objection if we posted those to the Wiki along with the summary that we're building right now? No reason not to do that.

But if anybody's got an issue, this would be a good time to raise that. And I'm getting lots of (unintelligible) coming in through the chat. So it sounds like that's what we'll do.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here Mikey. I don't have any objections. I think it should be. But rather than using your not quite set unique identifiers which include question marks, could we not just, the public digestion of our work out of Singapore, change the, you know, Olivier (Marcum) and (unintelligible) work chain ABCD or QXYZ. And I don't really care.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And therefore the question marks are no longer an issue because they're simply anonymized (work chains).

Mikey O'Connor: That sounds like a great solution to that puzzler. I'll do that. Great idea.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And I'm happy.

Mikey O'Connor: Cool. Okay. We're at the top of the hour, actually a minute past. So I'm going to end the call and thank you all for your (unintelligible).

And we, oh Jorg is - well I'll tell you what Jorg, we'll take your question offline. And what I would do just briefly is listen to the MP3, and take a look at my summary. And do essentially a compilation and compress out some of the duplication in it.

And then send a new document to the list that's the (first) draft of the summary, along with this complete summary so that we haven't lost anything.

My goal is to (unintelligible) information on the (way). So I'll keep preserving it all until we've gotten to a summary that we like. And then the final (say) will be the one that we really work from.

Okay, that's it folks. See you in a week. We're off. And we'll carry on from here. Thanks again.

Woman: Thanks Mikey. Thanks everyone. Bye.

Man: Thanks very much Mikey.

Man: Bye bye everyone.

Man: Bye bye.

END