

DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group (DSSA WG)
TRANSCRIPT

Tuesday 24 May 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 call on Wednesday 24 May 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-20110524-en.mp3>

on page

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#may>

Link to Working Group Wiki space:

<https://community.icann.org/display/AW/Joint+DNS+Security+and+Stability+Analysis+Working+Group>

Attendees

Greg Aaron, RySG

Don Blumenthal, RySG

David Conrad, SSAC

Olivier Crépin-Leblond, ALAC Chair (co-Chair)

Andrew de la Haye, RIPE NCC

Luis Diego-Espinoza, .cr

Mark Elkins, .za

Byron Ellacott, APNIC

Jim Galvin, Afiliis (SSAC Vice Chair)

Mark Kosters, ARIN (co-Chair)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr, ALAC

Matt Larson, VeriSign
Jaques Latour, .ca
John Levine, ALAC
Bill Manning, Expert
Takayasu Matsuura, .jp
Rossella Mattioli, NCSG
Scott McCormick, CBUC
Mike O'Connor, CBUC (co-Chair)
Ondrej Philip, .cz
Carlos Martinez, LACNIC
Subramanian Moonesamy, AFRINIC
Forest Rosen, RrSG
Roy Arends, .uk
Katrina Sataki, .lv
Arturo Servin, LACNIC
Jörg Schweiger, .de (co-Chair)
Andre Thompson, ALAC

ICANN Staff:

Bart Boswinkel
Patrick Jones
Julie Hedlund
Kristina Nordström

Apologies:

Patrick Fältström, Cisco (SSAC Chair)
Mohamed El Bashir, ALAC
Rafik Dammak, NCSG
Eric Brunner, ALAC
Rick Wilhelm, RrSG

Wim Degezelle, CENTR

Matt Serlin, RrSG

Sean Copeland, .vi

Coordinator: And please go ahead. The conference is now being recorded.

Kristina Nordstrom: Thank you very much. Okay hello everyone and welcome to this first call for the DSSA working group today on the 24th of May. There are plenty of new people for me here so please let me know if I mispronounce any of your names or forget anybody.

On the call so far we have Andre Thompson, Mike O'Connor, Takayasu Matsuura, Rossella Mattioli, Jacques Latour, Byron Ellacott, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Mark Kusters, Greg Aaron, Katrina Sasaki, Mark Elkins, Jim Galvin, Jörg Schweiger, David Conrad. And from staff we have Julie Hedlund and Kristina Nordstrom.

And apologies we have from Patrick Fältström, Mohamed El Bashir, Rafik Dammak, Eric Brunner, Richard Wilhelm and Wim Degezelle. And may I also please remind you to state your names before speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you and over to the chair.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Kristina. Actually I'm one of the co-chairs but I am going to lead today's meeting. This is Mikey. Kristina, I also have apologies from Matt Serlin.

Kristina Nordstrom: Okay. I'll...

Mikey O'Connor: So you can add him to the apologies list. Welcome all. This call is going to be pretty much one-way communication unfortunately but I

think we have to get this out of the way. And so there won't be a lot of dialogue on this call and the agenda is up in front of you for those of you who are on the Adobe room.

The main focus of today's call is to review sort of an annotated highlighted version of our charter which is what the five of us co-chairs have been working on for the last several months. And we have a draft of our work plan - very tentative - that we've also just circulated to you that will - we won't go through today we just want to introduce it today.

So this is an exciting moment. This is the culmination of an awful lot of work by an awful lot of people and the formal start of the DSSA working group so welcome all. And we'll take a pause as we always will on these calls to see if anybody needs to update their statement of interest. This is a practice that's coming out of the GNSO but it seemed like a good idea to do that.

So if your circumstance that you described in your statement of interest has changed since you wrote it simply indicate that it has and then circulate an updated copy of your SOI to the list. We won't actually have you describe it. So just take a moment and anybody who has an update that they need to tell us about on their statement of interest this is the time.

Okay we'll do this every time and it's just to keep sort of transparency and accountability all straight.

All right so onto the charter and here we go. I'm going to go very fast through this. I've looked at the number of slides and divided by the amount of time and I really only have about two minutes per slide so

this is going to go very quickly. And I have several requests for those of you on the call: let's hold questions until the end; we really don't have time for much discussion but please write your questions down and if nothing else circulate them to the list.

And on a special request to those of you who worked on this charter if you sense that we've gotten something wrong in our interpretation as the co-chairs take a special note of that and let us know. It's very important that we get this right. And so the purpose of the - going through it in detail today is primarily just to force us all to take a look at some of the key points in the charter and make sure that we're in agreement on those.

So on the background section of the charter there's really quite a small sentence right there in the middle that's defining what we're about and that is the need for better understanding of the security and stability of the global domain name system.

And that's a phrase that we have parsed very intensely amongst the co-chairs. And as you'll see in the work plan we've slightly rewritten it as a mission statement. And on our next call especially we'll be very interested in hearing your reactions to our mission statement to make sure that we've got that right.

The other thing that I want to highlight on this page is the notion that this is a collaborative effort between a number of organizations that don't routinely collaborate. We all tend to live in our respective silos.

I know an awful lot about how the GNSO works but this is really my first experience working with this cross-constituency SO kind of thing

and so part of the reason that it took us a while to get to this stage is that there's a lot of new ground that we're covering.

And if you encounter something that we're doing wrong from your perspective please let us know because we're intensely learning as we do this and by no means do we have all the answers. So those are sort of the two points that we wanted to make on that page.

Then another page that we've parsed pretty intensely is the objectives and goals. And there are really three major ones with an optional fourth one which are highlighted there.

The three are the actual level, frequency and severity of threats to the DNS, the current efforts and activities to mitigate those threats and gaps, if any, in the current security response to DNS issues.

With a fourth one that may or may not happen if we determine that there are additional mitigation activities that need - that might assist in closing those gaps that we've identified.

And let me remind people to mute. We're getting a little bit of background noise on the call.

Up at the top another thing that we wanted to highlight is that this is an exercise in drawing on collective expertise. And one of the things that we are intensely interested in is figuring out good ways to do that.

And again this is a learning exercise; we are not in any way feeling like we have all the answers here and are very interested in your ideas

especially around the expert input and advice and we're going to talk a little bit more about that in a minute so I'm going to gloss over that.

Another very important thing to discuss are the limits of scope. And the charterers clearly spent a lot of time working on this. And we want to amplify that which is we are focused on the root and top level domains. We are constrained by the boundaries of ICANN's role as defined in its mission and bylaws.

And in our mission statement and some of the other stuff in the work plan you'll see that we've started to flesh this out. But again we want to make sure that we're all on the same page when it comes to scope.

Another point that the charterers made very prominent was the notion that we should be coordinating with existing activity outside of - no, inside and outside of ICANN.

And the final point that we focused on in the co-chair's group was the relative flexibility that the charterers had presented us in terms of how we go about our work. The charterers spent a lot of time figuring out where they want us to go but they left us a lot of latitude in terms of how we get there.

And so our work plan is our first attempt at charting that course but again we're very interested in your ideas and this will probably change a bit as we go partly because this is sort of a first-time thing for a lot of us.

Okay so back to the participation and input theme. There's a lot of focus in the charter on encouraging participation not just from our

working group but others who are interested or have a contribution to make to our work.

And we've got some ideas that we're going to share with you in a bit about how we'll go about that. But needless to say it's not done and we'd be interested in hearing other ideas from you.

Another important thing is this notion of regular feedback. And you'll see that we've already started a weekly status reporting cycle that's posted to the Ops-DSSA email list which is an email list that's subscribed all the co-chairs and the staff and the liaisons but is visible to the rest of you.

We didn't want to burden the main list with all the process stuff but we also wanted to make it available for anybody who was interested. And the status reports are being posted there and we'll start routinely transmitting those to the chairs of the ACs and SOs from now on.

On the other hand you as individual members are encouraged to go ahead and keep your respective constituencies updated and become channels for feedback back to the group. By no means is this coordinating feedback role restricted to the co-chairs and it should not be.

The final point that the charterers made is that they'd left us a little bit of room to maneuver if we run into things that fall outside of this charter that we feel should be addressed. And they've laid out the path for that in this charter and that is back through the SOs and ACs. We can't make scope changes on our own.

Now the type gets a little bit smaller and I apologize the next two slides are a little bit hard to read. They're a bit more mechanical. They're very interesting to people like me who are interested in sort of routes and schedules and process kinds of stuff.

The point I really want to highlight is the notion of the schedule which is as yet undetermined. And the charterers left us some time to figure that out and some flexibility in that regard.

I'm hesitant personally to predict a schedule because of the cross-constituency AC/SO nature of this. I think it's going to take us some time to settle into some work processes. And so I'm very reluctant to predict a schedule yet.

But I'm also going to take another personal editorial detour and say that I think that the co-chair group has really hit its stride and we're doing quite well and so I'm expecting that after a kind of initial shakedown period that the large group - the group of all of us will do the same.

Bit long discussion about membership. And since we've arrived already at an established working group I'm not going to spend much time on this page except to highlight that notion that we are not a fixed membership yet.

If you work your way down the page there is this notion that we can approach technical and security communities, other DNS experts, certs, to seek their participation. And we may invite or appoint other people to the group.

And so I call on all of you to think about this and if we are missing either a whole category of expertise or a whole community of people that could contribute to our work the co-chairs are really interested in hearing about that.

Which feeds into the next topic and the charterers were clearly thinking about this when they wrote this document. One of the things that the co-chairs have discussed a lot is how on earth are we going to create an environment where people feel comfortable sharing secret information with us especially in an environment where some of those folks are competitors?

And so we won't go into a lot of detail about that today but the co-chairs have been thinking about this and we have some ideas. Again we're very interested in your ideas.

Clearly if we don't get this right we will dramatically reduce the effectiveness of the working group because it's that difficult to share somewhat embarrassing information that is in fact the kind of information that's important to really understanding the current state of security and stability.

And so I'm not going to go into a lot of detail about that on this call but it's clearly a topic that we need to address as a working group and we absolutely need to get it right.

There's a little bit of language that's I think based largely on language that exists in the way that the GNSO operates that talks about how we handle certain kinds of disruption of the working group. And there are

fairly well-established rules in the GNSO that have been, for the most part, ported over into this document.

I think the main point of this page is that the rights and responsibilities flow two directions. We as a working group have the right to proceed with our work without being disrupted by a very small minority.

On the other hand people who have very strong views and feel that they are being ignored or overridden by the majority also have rights to have their opinions heard and if they don't feel that they've been heard to appeal those decisions.

And so this part of the charter is clearly trying to lay that out so that we know the rules of the road. So there's this page and then another eye-chart - I'm sorry, this is very small but I couldn't fit this stuff on without making it small.

There's a methodology that has evolved in the GNSO that essentially puts the chairs in a role of designating - and I underline that word on this page - designating the state of consensus around positions.

It's really not the job of the co-chairs to drive the group to consensus. It's our job to make sure that the process is fair and that everybody is heard. And then at the end of the day to determine where the group appears to be in terms of consensus.

And those four states of consensus are listed on the page. They're full consensus where everybody agrees. Clearly that's a very desirable outcome and makes a very powerful statement to the community if we can walk unanimous and say we all agree to this point.

But consensus is not full consensus; consensus is a situation where there is a small minority that disagree but they've been heard. And as long as they've been heard and their minority view has been documented that is actually the standard for consensus not unanimity. And that's an important distinction to make.

There is - the next tier is no consensus but strong support or a recommendation that has significant opposition. And then the final tier is that there is in fact divergence; there isn't consensus and that would be where one or several - well two or more positions are pretty much evenly held by the whole - across the group and there isn't a consensus.

And that is a fine outcome. You know, there is no pejorative or negative connotation to that word and in fact in many cases that is the situation and it's important to understand that we may encounter that in this group and that is not necessarily a bad thing.

I would encourage you to spin through the other highlighted parts on that page. There's a lot of stuff that I highlighted here that I don't want to go through in a lot of detail but I want to draw your attention to.

Again back to the - in addition to the individual appeal process there's also a process to appeal the decisions of the co-chairs when they designate consensus. Hopefully we will do a fine job and this will never have to be invoked.

But in a case where a minority group feels that their designation is - that the designation of the co-chairs is incorrect there is a path to challenge that and that's what's laid out in this page.

And so again just as an individual should feel that they have rights that flow both directions so should minority - people who hold the minority view. And again this is largely taken from GNSO practice but I want to highlight this for the rest of you who are perhaps not as familiar with it.

And there's quite a lot about that that I'm basically going to put on the page and let you just read for a minute but I'm not going to go through in a whole lot of detail.

There is also - let's see - I'm not sure that I want to go into a whole lot of detail on this. The next two sections are back to the changing of scope and gives the - primarily the co-chairs but the whole group as well a mechanism to modify the charter.

The charterers I think were wise in making this process pretty difficult because in order for a change to our charter to be made it has to be ratified by all of the participating SOs and ACs. And so this would be a fairly substantial amount of work.

And so I think we are gently being encouraged by our chartering team not to make changes to the charter lightly however if we run into something that is really seriously wrong with the charter we do have a mechanism to get it changed.

And then finally the way that we will end is when the chairs of the respective SOs and ACs have notified us that they have accepted our

report. So my guess is that we are going to be at this for a while. My - I'm still not ready to throw a date out in any way but I think that this is a long project.

And for those of you who have concerns about being able to contribute to a project that lasts certainly a year and perhaps two you should know that this is not one that we're going to get done by Senegal.

That's it for the charter. How am I doing on time? Oh I'm actually a little bit ahead of time, that's good. That's covering an awful lot of material in a big hurry but because I got done a little bit faster than I was planning let's pause for a second and see if there are any questions.

And if there are please use the Adobe chat room to raise your hand. It will make managing the queue a lot easier. And if you're not on the Adobe room as Cheryl is not feel free to just shout out that you'd like to get in the queue and I'll manage a queue. But where there any questions that people had that maybe we can take just a few minutes to clarify before I go onto the next?

That's either really good news that I did a great job on summarizing the charter or really bad news and there you go. Ah, John Levine, go ahead John.

John Levine: Hi, actually the - I think the charter is fine. I hope we don't have to use the complicated dispute resolution stuff. And for your question about how to share confidential data - when this has come up before I think the least bad option is to identify a small subset of the group members who everybody agrees is trustworthy and ask them to be the

custodians of the confidential stuff and produce the redacted summaries that we can publish.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, John. That's precisely the direction that we're headed as the co-chairs although what we've arrived at is the possibility that we may have multiple small groups like that partly because we may have a bunch of different topics of sensitive information and partly to reduce the difficulties that arise when competitors are in that group. But you're absolutely on the flight path that the co-chairs are on.

John Levine: Yeah, I mean, so long as people agree that it's worth producing the results. I mean, I'm on a private group related to the email service bureau security breaches...

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

John Levine: And I've been pleasantly surprised that if you're specifically focused about here's the data we need to correlate, you know, and here are people you all know that aren't going to fool around with it that getting cooperation is not all that hard.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah that's our hope. And I'm really glad to hear that, John, because I think that that maybe for all of you is a really good example. If we could post examples like that to the list so that we, the co-chairs, can sort of mine those experiences and use them to build our model that's exactly what we're - that's exactly what we're looking for. Thanks, John.

Cheryl, you're at home. Welcome to Adobe. Go ahead, Cheryl, I think you're muted though.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Am I muted? Oh.

Mikey O'Connor: There; now you're muted. It's all good now.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: All right, thanks Mikey. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I just wanted to remind everybody that of course part of the charter did outline that confidentiality agreements and requirements were until we - we expected could be put in place if that was necessary.

But I would think that an accepted agreement amongst all of the work group members for the highest level of confidentiality and the necessary courtesies around that will and truly into the commercial confidence zone in general should be a good working and operational procedure.

But, yes, we certainly as - those of us who stepped around and ruminated over the charter did expect some small closed-room discussions to facilitate trust and engender appropriately open conversations to happen. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Cheryl. I was - I'm sorry to drive you all crazy with this; I will stop doing this because it's not fair. But, you know, one of the things that struck me in the charter was that the charter actually says that confidentiality agreements to participate in the working group are not required and that they may be used to protect confidential information but that they are not a requirement for participation in the whole working group.

And that surprised me a bit because of course at least on the GNSO side I think we all signed a confidentiality agreement per the appendix. So that's the kind of granular detail that we're still trying to hammer out amongst the co-chairs. And we're really interested in hearing from people on practical approaches to that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If I may, Mikey, I think whilst - Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record here. Whilst the charter does not demand it there is no reason why as a best practice as many as is reasonably possible in the work group could not in fact do that.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: There were - we were looking at a rare beast when we had a (4 by) chartering organization.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes indeed and you did a darn fine job. Okay...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...be delighted to see everyone sign up for a confidentiality agreement.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. Well and it may be that we all have. I should actually run that down. Kristina, can you take an action for me to follow up on the number...

Kristina Nordstrom: Sure.

Mikey O'Connor: ...of folks that have actually signed? Because it could be that we have 100%. I think even if that's the case - let's presume that that's the case, Cheryl, I think...

Julie Hedlund: Mikey, this is Julie Hedlund. I'm sorry to interrupt. But actually I was involved in developing the charter as well and my understanding from the charter was that along the lines of what Cheryl had noted as well that the confidentiality agreement is not necessary to, you know, to participate in the group but would be something that would come into force, you know, if there is a need for it but of course it is a good best practice.

But because it wasn't a requirement I had not asked the SSAC members to sign the confidentiality agreement up front. Of course I can now go ahead and do that but that was the reason I did not do that so we are not at 100%.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. And just carrying on in that vein one of the discussions we've had in the working group is - and this circles back to the point that John made - I'm sorry, in the co-chair group - was the notion for in some cases a smaller group to see the raw information and present a redacted version to the larger group.

And at least I for one would - there's absolutely no reason for me to know most of the highly confidential information. And I would actually prefer to only have access to the redacted version. So that's the kind of conversation that we are still in the midst of and very open to comment about.

And now I'm going to get to my very patient co-chair, Olivier, and let him talk for a while. Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks very much, Mikey. Olivier Crépin-Leblond here. In fact, Mikey, thanks for pulling the carpet from right under my feet. I was just about to say that.

Certainly when John mentioned the reporting part I don't think the working group is in the business of pointing the finger at any specific vendor. And certainly if a sub-working group would be looking at a specific detail from data based on a specific supplier, vendor or name who that could be this data could be (anonymized) of course when it gets shared to the rest of the group especially if there are competing interests within the group. Thanks very much.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Olivier. John, I'm assuming that's a hand left up from before but I'll just circle back and check.

John Levine: Oh yeah, I'll see if I can put it down.

Mikey O'Connor: You just click it again.

John Levine: There we go.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, cool. Okay hang on a minute I'm getting paged by my boss, Kristina, here. No, Kristina, we're all good so there we go. Okay.

Let's see here. Okay. So now onto some of the sort of nuts and bolts. We have two mailing lists right now. We are probably going to need

some more because these are both public lists. But I wanted to just highlight the kind of relationship between them.

The main working group list is one that you're all subscribed to, you can all post to, it's archived and it's visible to the world. And the other one that we have right now is one to which the leader group is subscribed but is also archived, visible to the world and includes links to the recordings of our leadership group calls so that if anybody is interested in the dry toast of what we discuss you're more than welcome to follow the list.

And if you see something coming up on that list that you feel strongly about by all means yank that conversation out of that list and put it on the main list. It's our intent with that list just to keep the traffic on the main list as focused on content as we can.

But if for any reason there is something that we're discussing that you feel is important to the larger group or that you have opinions about there is - we just want to make it clear to all of you that you should just pull it over into the main conversation and we'll carry on with it there.

We have a Webpage; it's on the new version of the ICANN wiki. And it's a little sparse at the moment but I think as we get into the swing of things that will start to flesh out. And again everybody is encouraged to post to it, to modify it, to add useful information.

Periodically I or Kristina or somebody will probably go through and sort of tidy up the organization but you don't have to feel like you have to get that perfect. It's a lot more important to get the content on that page than it is to have it looking absolutely pristine.

And then as I mentioned before we have weekly status reports that have been posted to the ops list for now and I think we'll probably switch that over to the main list from now on.

We didn't want to throw those out on the main list as the only communication from us because they're pretty boring I guess is the best way to describe them. But, you know, now that the conversation is going to pick up we'll move those over.

Finally there's a bit of - have I already introduced the work plan? How did I get through that so quickly? I - oh there it is. I missed a page. Sorry, consistency is the hobgoblin of small minds; sorry about that.

So what we've done with the work plan so far is included in this document as Appendix 1. And I just wanted to take a moment to talk a bit about what we've been doing for those of you who are wondering what on earth has been going on for two months not exactly behind closed doors but certainly not on the list of the main group.

A lot of this has been, quite frankly, getting to know each other and getting to understanding where we are coming from and how to work well together. And if I could take a moment to pat the co-chairs on the back a bit I think we've done a really good job of that.

You could tell a little bit by the byplay between me and Olivier a moment ago that it's a fairly informal conversation and we are emerging as pretty good friends from this. And we're looking forward to meeting each other face to face and you face to face in Singapore.

And let me take another detour; we're planning two events in Singapore. We have a formal face to face gathering scheduled for 11:00 Singapore time on Thursday of the ICANN meetings. And I'm going to go ahead and announce that now. I meant to do it a week or so ago and hopefully this isn't too late to completely screw up your travel plans.

But then the other thing that we are interested in trying to do earlier in the week is some sort of informal face to face gathering over adult beverages of one sort or another just to get to know each other.

There are a bunch of people on this working group; we come from different parts of the ICANN organization. And although it's partly in the enjoyment category to get to know people face to face it's also important for the effectiveness of the group that we quickly build trust and understanding not just amongst the co-chairs but amongst all of us so that we can really work effectively as a team to get this work done.

So stand by for more details on that. We haven't exactly figured out how we're going to engineer that but there will be some sort of informal gatherings earlier in the week to which you'll all be invited as well.

We then spent a fair amount of time - even though it's a very short sentence - that mission statement has been chewed on a bit and we'll talk a bit more about that next week.

As you can tell confidential information gathering is an important topic and we've thought about it a good deal. And we've also then started to slide into the how we're going to do the work. And again we'll elaborate

a lot on that next week but the slide deck that we'll be sharing with you is the second half of this document, it's in Appendix 1.

Okay so then final part of the agenda is a little series of action items for all of us. And the first is to kind of break the ice and get the conversation started on the list. We would really like all of us to post a little introduction about yourselves to the list.

We have the statements of interest but those are pretty formal and this is intended to be a bit less formal. And also a bit of a chance for each of us to brag a little bit about what we're good at and what we want to work on in the group.

At least here in Minnesota in the United States we're punished pretty regularly for bragging. It's not a behavior that's approved of here. But I'm going to encourage us a lot overcome that tendency and really jump in with some information about what you're interested in, what kind of capabilities you bring to the group and really what you want to work on because we're going to have a lot of simultaneous work going on and it's going to be very helpful for us all to know about the rest of us as we form these little teams.

Imagine in a way that we're in school and the professors, the co-chairs, are going to stand up and say well we have the following tasks that need to get done, break into teams to do them. This is the way to find out who you would like to have on your team and which teams you'd like to be a part of. So this isn't just social; this is really actually part of the work of the group.

We debated doing this on this call and realized that it would be - it would take too much time so we're relegating it to the list but please do do this between now and the next week's call.

Also please take a look at the charter and the work plan, this document, and post comments either from the call or from your review of the document to the list because again the co-chairs are really in information gathering mode still and we're really interested in your views.

And then finally this is a note that I stuck in as a result of the vertical integration working group which generated something over 3500 emails in the course of about three months much of it very dense, very legalistic, very difficult to read email that was very hard for people who were working outside their primary language to digest. And so I just want to highlight that short posts with clear language will be much appreciated by all of us.

I think that that's it for today's call. So we're a bit head of schedule. We have time for any other business until the top of the hour. So I'll put my feet up on the desk and throw the floor open to comments by any and all on any topic that you'd like to talk about. And if there aren't any then we'll wrap up a little early. Cheryl, go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Mikey. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Mikey, when you referred to the 1100 hours local time on the Thursday meeting plans that was Thursday the 23rd?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Right. Olivier, that's the exact same time slot that the Board JAS working group and GAC meeting is planned for.

Mikey O'Connor: Sigh. I think - this is Mikey again. Olivier, you want to go ahead?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks Mikey. Well I was just going to say the same thing. Sigh. Things just happen like this. We'll have to work something out.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And perhaps I might have to spend some time at the DSSA working group and then move over to the Board GAC JAS discussion.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey again. I think that another observation that I would throw in is that given the amount of work that we're going to be doing and the very short time both for these calls and that's available for face to face meetings we're probably going to have to do most of our work on the list on this one and use the face to face opportunities for some of the softer things either reporting out complex ideas or getting to know each other.

And it does reaffirm that we need to schedule at least one and maybe several opportunities for us to informally gather earlier in the week so that we - I think that the - we missed an opportunity in San Francisco to do this and so I really want to make sure that we don't miss it again. This relationship-building, trust-building I think is crucial. But sigh, that's too bad that it's right on top of that tone.

Jörg Schweiger: Yeah this is Jörg Schweiger. I just want to mention that we knew that it's going to be really hard to get everybody to the face to face meeting

that's why we not only planned to have a face to face meeting on Thursday which is the more or less after the ICANN week is done but that we want to meet each other when it's possible prior to the ICANN meeting and that will be just some informal get together.

So I just want to make a hint that is going to be something setup beside the formal meeting which was planned on Thursday.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Jörg. This is Mikey again. Another thing that I was thinking about and I guess I'll broach this to the group is I was thinking I have a whole bunch of little round green stickers leftover from another conference that I went to that I thought I would bring with me and hand out to anybody who wants to identify themselves as a member of this group to put on your badge.

And maybe another way to get to know each other is just scan people's badges during the week and when you spot a green sticker on it stick out your hand and strike up a conversation with that person. Does anybody react violently negative to that idea? Otherwise I'll - right after this call I'll go dig those stickers out of my desk drawer and put them in my backpack so I don't forget them.

And, you know, I think one conversation for the list is any and all ideas that we can come up with to take advantage of our time together in Singapore to get to know each other better is something that we really want to pursue.

Other points? It's about eight minutes to the hour. Going once, going twice. All right, I think we'll call it a day. We have one more call scheduled before Singapore, the exact time and date escapes me. Oh

yes they're plain stickers, Cheryl although we could come up with a symbol.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm sure you could it's just Olivier was concerned that we might be confused with supporting .green in a new gTLD context.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh that's a good point.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But the .green ones actually say .green and if yours are plain I'm not quite so concerned.

Mikey O'Connor: You know, they're unbelievably inexpensive; maybe I'll go wild and go find me another color. I hadn't thought of that. That's a really good...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Purple - purple, I don't know who has .purple.

Mikey O'Connor: Purple is good. Nobody's going to do that. Yeah perfect, perfect. Thanks for the heads up on that. Totally escaped me. Besides I'm really cheap and I have these stupid green stickers that I want to get rid of.

Look at that, consensus already; I love that. I think we're on a roll, maybe we should quit while we're ahead and...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, and we'll convene again in a week.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: And carry on with the work plan. Thanks all for joining us and we'll look forward to seeing you on the list. That's it for me.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye, thanks Mikey.

John Levine: Thank you very much Mikey.

Man: Thanks.

END