Joint Charter Drafting Work Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 27 October 2010 at 1200 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Joint Charter Drafting Work Group on 27 October 2010 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-jcd-20101027-en.mp3

On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#oct
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:
At-Large
Sébastien Bachollet
Dave Kissoondoyal
Cheryl Langdon-Orr

ccNSO
Chris Disspain, .au, ccNSO Council Chair
Ondrej Filip. .cz
Hiro Hotta, .jp

GNSO
Greg Aaron, RySG, Afilias
Rafik Dammak, NCSG
Chuck Gomes, GNSO Council Chair, RySG
Kathy Kleiman, RySG, PIR
Scott McCormick, CBUC
Jaime Wagner, CSG, ISCPC

NRO
Arturo Servin, LACNIC

Support Staff
Bart Boswinkel, ccNSO
Glen de Saint Gery, GNSO
Gisella Gruber - White, At-Large
Julie Hedlund, GNSO
Patrick Jones, ICANN
Kristina Nordström, ccNSO

Apologies:
Jörg Schweiger, .de
Rodney Joffe, RySG, NeuStar
Yuri Ito, ICANN

Gisella Gruber-White: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. On today's first Joint Charter Drafting Workgroup call on Wednesday the 27th of October we have Chuck Gomes, Chris Disspain, Jaime Wagner, Rafik Dammak, Arturo Servin, Greg Aaron, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Scott McCormick will be joining us shortly, Sebastien Bachollet, Hiro Hotta, Dave Kissoondoyal, Kathy Kleiman, Ondrej Filip.

And from staff we have Kristina Nordstrom, Bart Boswinkel, Julie Hedlund, Glen de Saint Gery, and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. Scott McCormick has actually joined the call now. We have apologies today from Rodney Joffe, Jorge Schweiger and Yuri Ito.

Can I please remind everyone with the large group on this call to please state your names when speaking for transcript purposes? Thank you. Over to you Chris and Bart.

Chris Disspain: How come I get the short straw or whatever analogy you care to use? I thought - if it's all right with everybody I thought it might be useful if I spent maybe a couple of minutes just doing a very broad brush background to how we ended up here on this call and then we can talk about the document and what our goals are.

Is that okay with everyone or does anyone object to that perhaps? Perhaps there's a better way of doing this. Okay good. So the - the reason for having this working group draft this charter arose from discussions originally between me and Cheryl and Chuck as to how to deal with the discussions or to deal with the topic of DNS search and the situation of plans being made about security and stability of the DNS.

And we felt and we said in a letter to Rod and the board of ICANN that we felt that the best way forward was for us to form a cross-AC and SO working group to deal with - to consider the questions of security, stability and

resilience. And the first step to do that would be to draft a charter and being a cross - the goal being a cross AC and SO working group it's therefore necessary to have a cross AC and SO charter drafting working group which is what this is.

And what we should all have in front of us with a little bit of luck if you've got the Adobe room, and if you haven't it's been sent to the list as a document, is a straw man draft charter although I'm not quite sure we can call it a straw man if it's version 5. But anyway it's a draft charter of what is intended to be called the Joint DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group.

Chuck, Cheryl, have I covered - anything you guys want to say apart from that on the background?

Chuck Gomes: You've done fine Chris.

Chris Disspain: Cheryl? Cheryl, you're obviously on mute. You've given me a tick in the Adobe - oh how impressive. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I gave you a little green check because...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Disspain: Thank you very much. I wonder - I'll have to learn how to do that so I can give myself a tick. Okay so Bart would you like - do you think you should take us perhaps take us briefly through the - to the document with a goal to getting relatively quickly to the meaty bits which are perhaps the - the highlighted alternative methods of running the working group? Does that sound sporting to do Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah that's fine, that's fine. So I would say that the meaty bit is that for my perspective the objective, scope, activities and the deliverables so that's...

Chris Disspain: Yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: ...Section 2, I think that's the first thing the working group might want to discuss. And then this second bit is - I'm scrolling down - is in fact the Section 3 on member, staff and organizations. Just to give you some background so the two alternatives are (base safe) on the one hand side as is stated there from the joint working groups where the ccNSO is participating, that is Alternative 1.

It is one way of structuring it and the alternative, 2, is say it's my understanding that's the way the working groups are structured which includes the GNSO and is based on the latest version of their working group guidelines.

And I think that is the question - now I'll say in email to the list I proposed first to have a closer look as a starting point to the objectives because that in my view determines, yeah, the structure of the working group as well and what else the working group wants to include.

And then say in the next call focus - or even during this call if we - if the working group agrees quickly on the purpose and the scope of activities deal with the alternatives and maybe some discussion on the marriage of the alternatives. I think that's the very high level overview.

Chris Disspain: Sounds fine to me, Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: I'll scroll back to the...

Chris Disspain: Yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: ...objective and purpose maybe as a starting point.

Chris Disspain: Good idea.

Bart Boswinkel: There you are.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sebastien has his hand up, Chris.

Chris Disspain: Thank you Cheryl. Hello Sebastien.

Sebastien Bachollet: Hello Chris and hello everybody. I just wanted to acknowledge that I sent
                       14 days ago comments on this document and nobody else make any
                       comments. But I would like very much that we start - we not to start - at what
                       moment we take into account my question and comment on this document
                       when you want as you want Mr. Chair.

Chris Disspain: I think that's fine and I'm sure we will. I think Bart's point, Sebastien, which I
                    think is a valid one is that pretty much everything we talk about flows - is
                    much easier to discuss once we're clear on the objectives and the scope and
                    the deliverables of the working group.

                    I noticed - I haven't got your comments right now in front of me but I do know
                    that you made some comments about acronyms and the names of the
                    working group and various other things. And I'm sure that we'll get to that if
                    that's okay?

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes it is.

Chris Disspain: Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Great, am I off mute? Thank you...

Chris Disspain: You appear to be judging by the fact that I can hear you.

Kathy Kleiman: Very good, very good. It's a cold, wet day - it's a cold, wet early morning; I'm
                   still waking up I'm afraid. But first I wanted to thank you and Cheryl and

Chuck for a tremendous amount of work and attention to this issue and dedication and just amazing responsiveness to the community when - over the last few months.

It was - and creating - and having the vision to create this working group. So thank you so much for that. I know we've only seen the tip of the iceberg of the time you've put into this issue.

I have a question that I bring from the Registry Stakeholder Group and I just wanted to check as we look at the objectives, the scope of activities, the deliverables, are there any underlying assumptions we should be bringing to us about - that the working group has built into it about where it's end point will be or about what ICANN does?

We're doing all of this in the context of the DNS cert discussion and so we were asked is there - one of the questions that was raised in the stakeholder group was, you know, are we assuming DNS cert will continue and that ICANN will run it or, you know, what are our underlying assumptions?

And I said I thought that everything was up for grabs and that that was what we were looking at. But I wanted to ask you as the framers and leaders of the discussion.

Chris Disspain: I'll give you my response and then if anyone else specifically, Chuck and Cheryl, given that we were the ones involved in the discussion at the beginning want to chime in the answer is there's - we were very determined to make sure that this was not - the resulting working group from this charter is not a working group about DNS cert it's about stability and security and resilience.

And one of the things that it is supposed to be looking at and let's be blunt the trigger - one of the triggers if not the trigger for its existence is the suggestion that there should be a DNS cert. So it seems to me that questions about the

DNS cert are - will come later for this working group. The first question is, you know, is there a problem? Is there a need? And...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Needs analysis.

Chris Disspain: ...what is the problem? A risk analysis, a needs analysis and so on.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Chris Disspain: So I think the best way that I could answer that question, Kathy, is to say that that a DNS cert is not off the table and who runs that DNS cert is a matter - if indeed there is one is a matter for discussion. But that the intention of this working group was to be able to make those decisions from a position of being...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Fact-based...

Chris Disspain: ...yeah, fact-based informed decision. Cheryl? Chuck?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh I kept interjecting so you'd better go to Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: That's all right Cheryl, go ahead.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Disspain: We're used to that so you just carry on.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you boys although the key points was it needs to be a needs analysis basis, it needs to be fact-based outcome. Things like a DNS cert would be part of a landscape but it should not come with preconceived ideas or we're as guilty as what we're critical of which is not our design or our desire.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Disspain: Does that answer your question Kathy?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah it...

Kathy Kleiman: It does, very well.

Chuck Gomes: Let me chime in briefly too. I think...

Chris Disspain: Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: ...all of you said it well. And I've said this within the registries group as well. There really are no assumptions of what the conclusion should be. So the idea of this working group is to evaluate the facts that are out there, the analysis out there, the need, etcetera. And so we should - the working group should go into it with no particular assumptions or intended outcomes other than some deliverables to - whatever the charter defines as deliverables.

Chris Disspain: Well that's right. Although it does raise a couple of - the scope of the working group raises a couple of interesting questions I think about the composition of the working group and the rules. But I think if it's okay with everybody and there are no other questions it would be useful I think for Bart to move through what we've drafted and then we can discuss it with some sort of context around it rather than just content. Is that - everyone's okay with that?

Kathy Kleiman: That's great. And thank you...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Disspain: No problem Kathy. Bart, you're on.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. First of all I think we - I assume we keep focusing on the objective, scope and deliverables for the time being.

Chris Disspain: For now, yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah so I think the objectives I think that's really (unintelligible) into one and goals I think, yeah, I think, yeah, you captured it in your comment on Kathy. Scope of activities in the draft what we - what was the assumption is that at this stage it will be very, very difficult to already foresee what the working group will encounter.

Say there is - clearly there is a lot of work done already. And out there probably there needs to engage with the real experts on DNS security and expert groups like DNS (unintelligible). So the intention was that, say, the actual working group will - as a first step defines it's own work plan and try to come up with a - say a timeline and a schedule as well.

So the expectations of all the stakeholder groups, yeah, can be aligned with the work of the working group. And so - and I think that is captured in Section 2.2.

Deliverables and timeframe so the work plan is in 2.3 as a first start - first step. And I think the question about the - what to do with the outcome, that is I think is the final report and that is 2.4. Note that in 2.1 there is the possibility to - for the working group, say, the actual working group to come up with some, say, further steps for the SOs, AC.

But in principal the final report will be delivered to the participating supporting organizations and advisory committees. And it's up to them, say, to adopt the final report and take the - if any of the recommendations into account and for following action.

I think that's about, yeah...

Chris Disspain: Can you scroll back - Bart, can you scroll back to the - up the page a bit to the actual scope? And while you're doing that, Patrick, you've got your hand up. And Kathy, you've still got your hand up while it's a joy to see it you might want to put it down again.

Kathy Kleiman: I would be happy to do that.

Chris Disspain: Patrick.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Unless she wants to talk again.

Patrick Jones: Thanks. So I have two questions. One is related to the scope. If we have suggestions on tightening up the language in the scope of activities should we send those through Bart...

((Crosstalk))

Patrick Jones: ...so that's one question. And the other is do you know how external experts might be able to participate in this working group if they're not directly coming from one of the SOs and ACs? So for example we've already...

Chris Disspain: Sure.

Patrick Jones: ...been made aware of three or more people who are expert in this area who might have something to contribute and neither are associated with large businesses or organizations and have background experience in this. They might provide some benefit to the group so we'll talk about how they may or may not be able to participate in this.

Chris Disspain: Yes but, Bart, there's a bit in here somewhere that talks about inviting independent experts is three not?

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Yes...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: By invitational cooption, yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah it's - say that is part of the second section. So in both alternatives there is the possibility for external expert either to be invited or through staff to be, say...

Chris Disspain: That's right.

Bart Boswinkel: ...suggested to the chair.

Chris Disspain: Thanks. So Patrick there is that possibility and not just possibility but intention and in fact some of us already had discussion with people like (OR) and others about providing independent input. And if you don't mind we'll get to the membership discussion a bit later but fundamentally there is absolutely no problem with that.

The Security and Stability Advisory Committee, for example, Steve Crocker's view is that the SSAC should be involved in this working group in an independent expert capacity rather than in a membership capacity. And that's - so they would certainly be part of that.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Disspain: And there's no reason at all why people such as - not just, you know, not just people involved in the technical side but businesses involved shouldn't belong so there's no problem there. And we'll get to the membership in a minute.

And in respect to the scope there's no - any input at all is valued and welcomed. So if you send it to the list to the attention of Bart and Julie who are both holding the pen on the - jointly holding the pen or holding two pens or whatever - on the charter that would be fine.

Patrick Jones: Okay and then...

((Crosstalk))

Patrick Jones: ...a final...

Chris Disspain: Sorry, yeah?

Patrick Jones: Yeah, and then just to note that, you know, from a - from my perspective on staff we're fully supportive of whatever efforts this working group takes. And, you know, I'm participating - at least following along to help this effort so think of us as ready and willing to help.

Chris Disspain: Good, thank you. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, just a clarification. I've been assuming that any of these external groups as Patrick mentioned they - members of those groups could be a part of the working group on an ongoing basis if they wanted or they can participate with regard to just particular areas where we want their expertise. Am I correct on that?

Chris Disspain: I think that makes sense Chuck. I had a chat with Bart earlier on this evening and we talked about - and since you brought it up let's discuss it at least in outline now. We talked about the fact that probably there will be sub-working groups within this working group.

And that there may well be, you know, intensely technical bits that some smaller group of people may go off and discuss and come back and report.

And so, yes, there will be plenty of opportunity for people to come in either as observers to the working group, as members of the working group across the whole of the working group or as expert input into specific areas.

I think that flexibility is built in. Does that make sense? Is that what you - does that make sense Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, yeah, I just thought I'd - I think you and Cheryl and I probably were on the same page. I wanted to make sure...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Disspain: Yeah, so...

Chuck Gomes: ...had the same understanding.

Chris Disspain: Sure. So Bart, 2.2 sets out - well let's go to 2.1. Two one says that the objective is to use the collective expertise to solicit input, advice and report on the level, frequency and severity of threats for DNS. Now that's - the reason for that is because, you know, the starting point for any - there is a problem and we need a solution is well what are the threats?

The second thing is what are the current efforts and activities to mitigate those threats and the third thing is effectively a gap analysis that says there are gaps in the security response.

And so I'm conscious that obviously, you know, people are - we're not going to - we're not going to settle this on this call but is there anyone who's got any input - specific input on Paragraph 2.1 at this stage?

Kathy Kleiman: Chris, this is Kathy.

Chris Disspain: Yes Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Now I've raised my hand too. Just there might be - if we're talking about edits there might be reference points to some of the other - there are a number of collection activities that are taking place or about to take place also inspired by the DNS cert debate.

One is (OROC) and RISG, the Registration, Infrastructure Security Group, are working on a very detailed study of Internet security - not just DNS but Internet security broadly. And I think that study is ready to launch soon and that will be widely distributed. So I just wanted to point out as others have done on this call that there may be other types of input and research that we can call upon.

Chris Disspain: Oh sure and I - Bart, can we - Bart if you think there's a need for us to say that specifically can we find some way to say that in a document?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes I think...

Kathy Kleiman: Yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: ...I think the best way to do that is with the scope of activities that the - say what we've done in previous drafts and I will include it in the updated version that the working group should take into consideration all other initiatives going on...

Chris Disspain: Yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: ...something along these lines.

Chris Disspain: Yeah.

Kathy Kleiman: Perfect because - great.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah you don't want to - say, what you don't want to do is two or three groups doing the same thing at the same time; it's a waste of resources.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, do not duplicate it.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Chris Disspain: Well hang on, let's not move too far away from the core ICANN model.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Now come on, you said you were going to play nice, Chris.

Kathy Kleiman: But otherwise I think it's very well phrased. Thank you.

Chris Disspain: Anyone else got any comments or input on 2.1?

Bart Boswinkel: Just one thing, Kathy, can you put your hand down please?

Kathy Kleiman: Yes I think you need a master puppeteer on the background putting our hands down for us.

Chris Disspain: Kathy you're letting the theme outside - your - multitasking is not...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'll take her aside and sort her out later, don't worry.

Chris Disspain: Thank you Cheryl. Did I hear another voice...

Kathy Kleiman: Only after a drink Cheryl.

((Crosstalk))

Greg Aaron: Yes this is Greg Aaron.

Chris Disspain: Hi.

Greg Aaron: Hi. As we get started we should probably think about some definitional issues
                 that have come up in some other past working groups. I was chair of the
                 Registration Abuse Policy Working Group and in that group we had a long
                 discussion of what DNS security actually is or what the health of the DNS.

                 You know, and there is, you know, there's a very wide range of opinion and
                 assumptions out there that I think we should be aware of and discuss so we
                 can kind of get on the same page.

                 On one hand some people think the security of the DNS is about the core
                 system, you know. Other people think it involves everything that happens on
                 or through the DNS. One of the things we have to be aware of and come to
                 some agreement on is where in that section we are.

                 If we're talking about everything that happens on the DNS that might be out
                 of scope for example. So we have to be very careful about the assumptions
                 and make them clear.

Chris Disspain: Are you - are you comfortable - are you comfortable at least to start limiting it
                 by reference to ICANN's mission?

Greg Aaron: I think that's a really good thing to do. Although different people will still
                 disagree about...

Chris Disspain: Well we're never going to get complete agreement.

Greg Aaron: Yeah. If we had some explicit references, for example, to ICANN's charter
                 and bylaws, example...

Chris Disspain: Right.

Greg Aaron: ...that would help get people oriented.

Chris Disspain: Sure. Bart, do you think - Bart and Julie do you think you can find a way of...

Bart Boswinkel: I think - if you look at 2.2 - I don't know if this - if this is say the point of reference. But the second sentence is - say - but this is more a scope of activities...

Chris Disspain: Yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: It reads it should take into account ICANN's coordinating...

Chris Disspain: Yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: ...nonoperational role in managing Internet naming and numbering resources.

Chris Disspain: I think that's right and I think that does cover it but I also take the point that it - we should probably put them up front. But Bart you and I know - if we go back to some of our standard documentation with overarching principals...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Chris Disspain: ...we might need to have at least a couple of overarching principals for this charter one of which is, you know, always being subject to the boundaries of ICANN's mandate or something.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Chris Disspain: Is that okay?

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Chris Disspain: So if you make a note of that and we perhaps do a second draft based on this
                    call and see - it might get messier before it gets clearer but at least we'll
                    tease out the issues, yeah?

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Chris Disspain: Okay. Anyone else on 2.1? Okay...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Chuck, just jump in, mate.

Chris Disspain: Yes Chuck.

Chris Disspain: Yes Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, yeah, Chris, this is more of a logistical point but for the sake of those
                    who in the group who are not on it I think it would be helpful when we get
                    done today if a redlined version of the changes that Bart makes on this is
                    distributed to the list for those people so it's real clear what was done and it'll
                    probably minimize people asking questions about...

Chris Disspain: Absolutely.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Disspain: I agree. I agree.

Bart Boswinkel: That's - Chuck, that's the way we, say, we normally do it. So what will happen
                    is there will be a redlined version of this one and a clean version in order to -
                    so - for the discussion itself. Just check with the redline on the next call and
                    then the clean version to move forward the discussion.

Chris Disspain: And just to impress Cheryl, Patrick, you have your hand up.

Patrick Jones: Sorry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Are you indicating that I'm easily impressed Chris? Because I'm not.

Chris Disspain: Cheryl, you take multitasking to a whole new level. Patrick did you want to say something or did you...

Patrick Jones: Yeah.

Chris Disspain: ...accidentally raise your hand?

Patrick Jones: No I did not. I just wanted to point that I've put my suggested edits for the scope in the chat and...

Chris Disspain: Oh okay.

Patrick Jones: ...take it from there.

Chris Disspain: Cool.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...to raising his hand.

Chris Disspain: I'm sorry, I can't deal with this I've got hands up, I've got chat, I've got a document. I've gone into overload.

Kathy Kleiman: Welcome to the new world.

Chris Disspain: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Isn't that why Chuck and I are on the call?

Chris Disspain: Yeah absolutely.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We can help - we can help you guys.

Chris Disspain: Thank you for...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Disspain: Anyone else want to point - why don't I - how come I got this hat? I did not...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Disspain: Cheryl...

Chris Disspain: ...and said good evening everybody and suddenly...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I blame Bart, right?

((Crosstalk))

Chris Disspain: I blame Bart for everything but that's, you know, a different...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Then it backfires on you.

Chris Disspain: It does. Are we able to move on from 2.1? Are there any other comments or questions on 2.1? Thank you for your edits, Patrick. Two point two is the scope. So we have comments and suggestions or input on the scope.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Should we make particular reference to those two studies that Kathy indicated were about to fly or...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: What I'll do is - sorry, this is Bart. What I'll do is - I think there are more studies than just these two and maybe even external studies. I will take into, say, maybe even under the, say, the - under the overarching principals as Chris suggested, include something that the working group should take into account the existing studies and other activities going on in this field.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay that's - just there on the language I want to see so it's existing, ongoing and emerging studies from...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...dot, dot, dot, you know.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, something like that but just to - what Kathy indicated as well.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, okay.

Chris Disspain: The RISG (OROC) study according to just...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Disspain: ...hand up. Hang on, Bart. Hold on, Bart. Kathy.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay.

Kathy Kleiman: On a slightly different point I just wanted to double check the wording here. The DSSA WG shall take a proactive role - I'm in the second paragraph - shall take a...

Chris Disspain: Yeah.

Kathy Kleiman: ...proactive role in fostering participation and input from the relevant communities and expert groups and provide regular feedback to the participating SOs and ACs on its progress. Does that exclude the regular types of public comments that we engage in? There's been a bit of concern that things have been held without inviting everyone to participate.

                   You know, in the ICANN way we have to let everyone have their two cents so just wanted to make sure that the language includes that and everybody's thoughts.

Chris Disspain: You mean that...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...outreach to public comments but...

Chris Disspain: Output from the working group will be subject to public comment, is that what you mean, Kathy?

Kathy Kleiman: Yes definitely as well as perhaps some interim work as well.

Chris Disspain: Well any - I mean, output may be draft reports or interim reports and so on.

Kathy Kleiman: Yeah, great.

Chris Disspain: Bart, do we specifically say that anywhere?

Bart Boswinkel: I think it is...

Chris Disspain: In reporting or...

Kathy Kleiman: Depending on the...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah it's in reporting but, say, the basic thought was when we drafted this, say, this working group will report back and is controlled by the SOs and ACs. And it should report regularly - on a regular basis to these SOs and ACs. What we could include that say if they produce an interim report for public comment that should be included in the work plan as well and the schedule for it so people can anticipate when something comes out.

But it's a bit of, say, in my view it's a bit of a tradeoff between the type of work of this working group and the, say, the transparency and openness. So that's why we - at least with the SOs and ACs and if they produce a report and their final report that should be open to - for public comments anyway in the ICANN model.

Chris Disspain: Well I think there's two things that arrived from that, one is it's a function of logistics. With a cross AC and SO working group you can do two things, you can either have the working group deliver its report directly to the SOs and ACs and have the SOs and ACs use their own processes of putting it out for comment or you can have the working group itself put stuff out for public comment.

And clearly the most efficient and effective way of doing that is to have the working group put out its stuff for public comment, right?

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Chris Disspain: And that's something that - Kathy, I assume that's what you would want to have happen?

Kathy Kleiman: Well I think you're right, every SO and AC may have a different way of doing it as well as that opportunity to comment at the end.

Chris Disspain: Yeah.

Kathy Kleiman: I suggested some language. And part of the reason for this by the way is that there was a pushback - a concern there were certain invitation only meetings that were held early on in this.

Chris Disspain: Yeah.

Kathy Kleiman: And there was a concern about those so I just want to - it would be nice to telegraph openly that everyone will be able to have a...

((Crosstalk))

Kathy Kleiman: So what I said was provide regular feedback and opportunity for comment to the participating SOs and ACs on its progress.

Chris Disspain: Okay.

Kathy Kleiman: And that leaves every SO and AC to choose their own timeline and that's it.

Chris Disspain: I think that's fine subject to a couple of things that I wanted to address. And in fact I've just put my own hand up to remind myself. But currently, you know, I have...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Chuck was up first.

Chris Disspain: Cheryl and - Chuck, off you go.

Chuck Gomes: No go ahead, Chris, finish what you were saying.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, no, you go. I've got - I want to come back on a much larger point.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I was just going to suggest that it might be helpful to have a sentence
                 in this area that basically says that all working group members are
                 encouraged to keep their respective groups updated and to solicit feedback
                 and provide that feedback into the working group.
                 And so what I'm talking about does not at all detract from what we're saying
                 about reporting and keeping...

Chris Disspain: No.

Chuck Gomes: ...and public comments and so forth but rather making sure that the working
                 group members take on the responsibility of ongoing interaction with their
                 groups and bringing that back into the working group.

Chris Disspain: Yeah. And we could also perhaps - we could also perhaps add to the - to the
                 useful - or to the communication channels by having liaisons appointed
                 specifically liaisons appointed...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Are you still channeling me, Chris? Chris...

Chris Disspain: Am I channeling you/

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...channeling me. You're channeling me again.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Disspain: I wondered what that strange feeling was.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We three Cs, you know, I don't know, Chuck, you know...

Chris Disspain: Go ahead. Go ahead, Cheryl.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...when we 3 Cs that - 3C cubed is not working as well as it - scary.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...the only other thing I was going to do - the only other thing I was going
                      to do was perhaps suggest some language or sentence if not here in the
                      overarching principals which go to the accountability and transparency
                      standards that we will be intending to operate under.

Chris Disspain: Okay. But - was there anything else, Cheryl or...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No that's okay.

Chris Disspain: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You can go back to channeling me when you're ready.

Chris Disspain: Well I want to throw out - I want to throw up a banner.

Bart Boswinkel: Cheryl, put your hand down please.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Disspain: Yeah, Cheryl, get on with it. I wanted - I want to throw perhaps a slight and
                    hopefully not too large, banner into the works which is this. Accepting
                    completely the need for reporting, for public comment, for output, for output
                    and opportunity to comment and all sorts of ways it does occur to me that
                    there may very well be circumstances in the work of this working group where

in order to get information and to have meaningful conversations about security and stability issues it will be - it may be necessary to not be public.

And I wonder whether - how we deal with that and how we build that in. I can envision a circumstance, for example, where you might want to have - whereas someone involved in running a registry I would be fine and comfortable sitting in a room with other registry operators be they Gs and Cs having a discussion about some security issues that I may be less comfortable having with others. And I'm not sure how we deal with that.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Disspain: Sorry?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Chris I think that goes...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well it is now that I've jumped in - I was talking at the same time. I think that goes to - with an upfront statement on the standards of accountability and most importantly the transparency that we intend to operate in.

If you assume transparent behavior but recognize that the nature of the topic means there will be necessity to go in camera and then that's just the way it is. I'd also assume that there will be some agreements or formulas or I'm sure legal will come up with something.

Oh no, that's right you are a legal person, Chris, you can come up with something that will bind, control or otherwise encourage the members of the work group to behave in an appropriate with regard to, you know, undertakings on how secure some of the discussions on security need to be.

Chris Disspain: Okay I think there are...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We can't put everything on the front page of the local paper it's just...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Disspain: No I think there are two things that arise out of that. Chuck I can see your hand. I think there are two things that arise out of that, one is the need to have members of this working group agree to a level - to agree to some level of confidentiality about information that they may receive.

But secondly I think there's this sort of higher level issue which is that there may be a need to have sort of split off sessions or split off working groups that really are closed to have discussions. And I have a couple of specific examples but Chuck, what did you...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I just wanted to say - first of all agree with everything that's being said on this. But specifically state that what is being said needs to be stated in the charter that's all.

Chris Disspain: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Chris Disspain: Yes, I agree. And I'm hoping that Bart and Julie are sort of taking useful and copious notes here so that we don't have to remember what it is we've said tomorrow.

And the sort of example I'm thinking of is - and again I don't want to, you know, sort of pick on anybody - but sometimes in these - in these sorts of conversations you get things like well I know there's a problem but I can't give you the details because that's, you know, I can't tell you.

And we need to be able to - for this work - for this working group to end up being authoritative, (sensible) and accepted by the community generally we need to be able to create an environment in which it is possible for people to come and say as long as I know that what I'm about to tell you is going to stay confidential then I'm prepared to tell you.

And it's quite clear that that's not going to be able to be the case across - probably across the whole of the working group. It may be that, as I said, we have to have sort of subsets.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Disspain: Because trust is not - trust is not about me telling you you should trust me, trust is about you trusting me which is not the same thing. Okay Bart is that - are you sort of clear on at least the bigger message in all of that that gives you some opportunity to take some stuff away from this and do some work?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. And I think for Julie as well.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah and this is Julie. I should say that actually there is a procedure that I could borrow from. It's a - it's something that's in the SSAC operating procedures that will be published shortly for...

Chris Disspain: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: ...handling confidential information in cases like this. And...

Chris Disspain: That's brilliant.

Julie Hedlund: ...for separate groups to form and even to have lists that are not public if necessary, you know, to handle certain types of sensitive information. So I can take a draft that maybe pulls in some of those items and...

Chris Disspain: Yeah.

Julie Hedlund: ...include that in the redline version.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's be brilliant, Julie. And...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...especially the grounds from (unintelligible) exceptions and the rules that run with the exceptions so the wider community is assured that it's not enclaving - that it's just for enclaving sake.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah.

Chris Disspain: Okay. That's a sort of - kind of a side track to a degree but obviously relevant to scope. Having sort of got input and comment 2.1 tonight - or today and is there any more input and comment on 2.2 that we need to deal with now, substantive stuff that we need to deal with now? Or can we move on?

Okay good.

Bart Boswinkel: I think we...

Chris Disspain: Sorry Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah I think the finalizing here was - and we touched upon it was deliverables and timeframes. I think that was - that would conclude this discussion on the scope.

Chris Disspain: Bart when do we next - when is our next call due?

Bart Boswinkel: I think in two weeks or something.

Chris Disspain: Okay cool.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, this is Julie. It's at the same time in two weeks, that's November 10.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Chris Disspain: Okay let me...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I do like predictability. Thank you Julie.

Chris Disspain: Yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, so what we'll try to do - and I think because we almost hit the hour now
                    is - and I think already diving into the - or maybe address the final sections.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Chris Disspain: So Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah I'd like to just at least have a quick look at the annex as well in
                    terms of the deliverables I think that...

Chris Disspain: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Disspain: Okay. So the annex.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's a bit sparse talking about.

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: This is Annex A but I think what we have here as well is these are say normal - before we go into - on the next call say revisit the redline version and dive into the membership and everything that's associated with it and the working procedures.

Say Section 4, 5 and 6 are more the miscellaneous. And if the working group could have a discussion on these I think these are the least contentious ones. So we ensure that we don't need to (invest) them at the next (unintelligible) in the circle.

Chris Disspain: I'm sorry, Bart, you lost me. Are you saying you would now like to talk about 4, 5 and 6?

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Deal with the simple stuff while we're together.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Chris Disspain: Okay. So before we do that can we just quickly make sure that apart from perhaps editorial changes that 2.3 and 2.4 are okay which is the work plan and the reporting and - I mean, I can't see any problem but if anybody wants to raise their hand please do so now.

Bart Boswinkel: I'll scroll up to 2.4.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Chuck, you put your hand down.

Chuck Gomes: I wanted to stay on track with what Chris wanted to do right now. I'll come back in.

Chris Disspain: Thanks. So unless anyone's got a problem with the work - again I'm not particularly interested in word-smithing edits but if anyone has a problem with the real - the stuff 3.1, 3.2 and 2.4.

Okay not so while you're scrolling down to the - past the Section 3, Bart - what did you want Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: I was just going to mention two things as we come to an end of our meeting, number one I think the three of us have talked in terms of trying to make sure that we have a draft charter for the SOs and ACs to consider in Cartagena.

Chris Disspain: Absolutely.

Chuck Gomes: I guess I'm asking the question is that still our target? I hope it is. And secondly Sebastien had some I think fairly simple suggestions at the very beginning of the document. Should we consider those very quickly? If it can be done quickly, if it can't we're out of time so...

Chris Disspain: I have no - I didn't have a single - I didn't have a problem with any of what Sebastien said. I mean, I agree with the fact that we should try and get some clarity around the acronyms. But Sebastien did you specifically want to deal with the stuff that you raised right now or are you comfortable that we'll pick it up on the - I didn't think any of it was contentious so are you comfortable we pick it up on the list or do you want to discuss it?

Sebastien Bachollet: No it could be done on the list, there's no problem it just - it's not happened before this meeting but if it's happen after that's okay. No problem.

Chris Disspain: So if we agree that some - if we agree between now and two week's time we deal with your issues on the list you're okay with that?

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Sorry in regarding the definitions so Julie and I will have a look at it and, yeah, now we move this to make it, yeah, consistent.

Chris Disspain: Okay. So, Bart and Julie could you - would you be prepared to just look at what Sebastien...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Chris Disspain: ...because most of what he said I think was stuff around the use of acronyms and so on and additions and headings and if we could just kind of take that stuff in and work - just include it in the next redline version that would be brilliant.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Chris Disspain: Okay because I don't think any of it was - I think most of it was just incredibly constructive and useful and...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And if anyone disagrees they had opportunity.

Chris Disspain: Yeah. And yes, Chuck Cartagena is still the goal I think or as Cheryl would say, hell yeah.

Chuck Gomes: And what that means is we need to have something by mid-November so we need to...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Chris Disspain: Yeah. Yes true. So in an effort to not run this call too far over...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Four, five and six.

Chris Disspain: ...4, 5 and 6, anyone got any comments?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just because you've got an early flight in the morning, Chris, come on, you can do 4, 5 and 6.

Chris Disspain: I don't mind running it over, it doesn't affect me; I'm just concerned about - I mean, for me it's like it's just midnight, Cheryl, what would I care?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We'll make the early morning risers work too, come on.

Chris Disspain: Does anyone have any comments on 4, 5 and 6 which just seem to me to be sort of like...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Pro forma stuff.

Chris Disspain: ...pro forma.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah it is but just to make sure...

Chris Disspain: Well on that basis can I...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So democratic.

Chris Disspain: Yeah. Can I make a couple of - can I make a couple of points about Point 3 which is the yellow highlight and the green highlight before we close the call for people to think about? And then if necessary we can put it in writing but it just struck me as I was - I was having a conversation earlier on this evening about this.

I'm not necessarily sure that either of these work. And it goes back to my point about the need for trust, the need for confidentiality, the need for perhaps having closed meetings and the need for the possibility of working groups within the working group.

And I just...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Work teams.

Chris Disspain: Work teams, I'm sorry, work teams, thank you Cheryl, within the working group. And I would just ask that perhaps if we accept that our next call is basically going to be about this that we perhaps do some thinking and maybe some discussion on the list?

I've got nothing against the GNSO's way of doing things but my question - and it is a question - is whether it is necessarily appropriate to impose the GNSO's mechanisms on what is a cross-constituency working group in the same way that I would say is it necessary to impose the ccNSO's methods. And I can see Sebastien and Chuck both have their hands up. Sebastien.

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes I think if we - if we can find a way to take the good from both proposition will be great. I am sure that there are some interesting points in the cc-way of doing and the g-way of doing and we could find some (concern) could be improvement.

My second point is that to say on the Point 5 of the green side of the document that the 3 point - (unintelligible) too it's - I guess it was a cut and paste and it talk about internationalized data registration. And I'm not sure that was the call of this working group specifically.

Chris Disspain: Yeah.

Sebastien Bachollet: But it's a question. Thank you.

Chris Disspain: No thank you I think that's probably quite right. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: I just want to be clear that I don't think there's any intention on the part of the GNSO...

Chris Disspain: No, no, no.

Chuck Gomes: ...to say that its procedures need to be followed. I think what Julie did is put these in there as a starting point. And what I would like to encourage if there's somebody or maybe more than one person that would like to do so is before our next meeting somebody develop a hybrid of these two things like Sebastien suggested. I think that would be very helpful and make our time in the next meeting much more effective.

Chris Disspain: I agree with that. And I guess that means, Bart...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: There is one other issue I can see arising, say, from the discussions. And I think this is why we rely on Julie is including in the whole membership or in the Section 3 the whole notion of confidentiality and everything else.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Chris Disspain: Yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: So - and that will change - probably will change both sections. So Julie, what I suggest is that Julie and I will come back with, say, a more hybrid model that includes this whole section about confidentiality for the members.

Chris Disspain: Okay that would be fantastic, Bart and Julie. And can I ask you to try and do that within maybe five days so that we don't...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: As if we don't have anything else to do.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think...

Chris Disspain: ...possibly seven, maybe eight so that we have at least - we have at least six days...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Chris Disspain: ...maybe even seven to look at it before we have our call, is that okay?

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, yeah we'll try...

Chris Disspain: Okay and, you know, I mean, you can - and if you want to run stuff past me and Chuck and Cheryl in the meantime just to get a sort of sanity - well perhaps not with Cheryl but certainly with me and Chuck to get a sanity check...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm holding that against you Chris. Go on...

Bart Boswinkel: Sebastien has his hand up.

Chris Disspain: Sebastien. Do you still have your hand up Sebastien or is a new hand?

Sebastien Bachollet: No.

Chris Disspain: No? He's gone.

Sebastien Bachollet: It was an old hand.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Disspain: And indeed Sebastien, you are in fact an old hand like...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: He is indeed an old hand...

Chris Disspain: ...like many of us.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The word expertise - despite the fact that I managed to get a whole lot of
                    letters that don't belong in it - in that chat space - if we're looking at language
                    on confidentiality I'd also like to look at language on expertise. Yeah, this is
                    not a matter of, you know, I don't have enough people from Region X, Y, Z
                    and this is a matter of you need to know what you're talking about; you need
                    to know your stuff.

                    We're not doing a primer version of what security, stability and resiliency is or
                    means as an...

Chris Disspain: Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...outreach exercise, it's a get your hand down and your tail up and know
                    what you're talking about.

Chris Disspain: Right okay.

Bart Boswinkel: So if - Cheryl, if I understand you correctly you want to include some almost
                    criteria for membership as well?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah well that people should be able to, you know, give their bona fides
                    on expertise. This is not just a - now if we look at the open working group
                    model which I'm a whole hearted believer in, you know, there are times when
                    things need to be a little more streamlined and this is one of them.

Chris Disspain: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. We'll include that, say, and for all of you say that will be included in a redline version or maybe even in a separate document.

Chris Disspain: Yeah, I think - Bart, I think just to pick up on that Cheryl says, I mean, I think that's right but I think we just need to - well my view is that the closest thing that I've had experience of to this has been the ccNSO newly formed ICANN finance working group which is a long term working group that we've set up to deal with financial issues, contributions by the ccTLD community and finance generally.

And what we've said in that charter is that when we call for volunteers we actually want - we want people with finance experience. There's not a lot of point in volunteering for this working group if you're a techie who doesn't understand the way a balance sheet works.

It strikes me that to some extent there are issues with this particular working group that need to be - with this security and resiliency working group that are going to need to be dealt with and that is that, you know, to a degree we clearly need to have a high registry buy in across the Cs and Gs.

We need to have a registrar buy-in and we probably need to have a political understanding and public policy understanding...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Public oversight, yeah.

Chris Disspain: ...public oversight buy-in. But Bart, we need to be - because of the necessity for levels of trust and cooperation and openness we need to be very careful about, you know, just making it open to anybody. And Kathy you've got your hand up.

Kathy Kleiman: Yeah, I don't think I'm saying anything different than what I'm hearing but I may be a slightly different nuance. I understand the trust, I understand the expertise and I understand that this is an issue I think that you and Cheryl and Chuck have been wrestling with for a while.

But also we don't want to exclude - I can see it not opening up completely but also I just know I've studied kind of the history of say weapons systems in the United States and there was for a long time a debate that you can't talk about nuclear weapons unless you're an expert in it and that excludes the civilian participation for the most part.

So here too we had this balance of the security experts coming...

((Crosstalk))

Kathy Kleiman: ...to the table. And I'm not - but also the community working with the issues as well. And so somehow we have to put that in.

Chris Disspain: I absolutely agree. Let me make - let me - Kathy, that's completely correct and let me make it perfectly clear how I feel. If provided that there is a possibility of a group within this group going into its own separate session to notch things out and come back and say stuff to the bigger group I have absolutely no problem in the bigger group, you know, the concept that you would exclude people because they're not technically competent like that is ridiculous.

But I think we need to allow for the fact that this is such a sensitive area that there will be a need at times for people to disappear into their own little tent.

Kathy Kleiman: Agree completely. Absolutely. And you're right in order to foster an environment where people can share the information we're going to need there does have to be trust and you can't force that.

Chris Disspain: Yeah.

Kathy Kleiman: So - okay so it's a subgroup that will come out from time to time perhaps to gather this information and bring it back to the larger group. That's great.

Chris Disspain: Well that's certainly how I feel about it, yes. And...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Disspain: ...one of the skills is - sorry Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I was just going to say and I'd be looking at the principals of accountability and transparency coming in here where, you know, meetings are open, (our cards) are open wherever possible. You know, a little bit like the ATRT has been doing its current work, there are occasions when clearly we've got to go hide in a little hole and then come back and say well we've got an outcome, this is what it is and you don't need to know how we got to it - that type of thing.

Chris Disspain: Yeah.

Kathy Kleiman: Very good. Great discussion, thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Disspain: ...that the Accountability and Transparency Review Team needed to do that. But let's not worry too much about that. Hey it's 10 past the hour and I'm confident that we're past our running time. So any last burners before we close down?

Bart, Julie, you guys okay and clear about what needs to happen in the next few days?

Julie Hedlund: Yeah...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...I'll go ahead - and Bart, I'll do a first cut at the redline version and send it off
                    to you to take a look at.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay that's fine.

Chris Disspain: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bart sounds thrilled.

Chris Disspain: Any last - any issues before I go to bed? Good day, delightful. Thank you all
                    very much indeed. See you in two weeks.

((Crosstalk))

                              END