

Transcript
DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group (DSSA WG)
04 August 2011 at 13:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group (DSSA WG) teleconference on 04 August 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-20110804-en.mp3>

Attendees on today's call:

At Large Members

- Olivier Crépin-Leblond
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr (only on Adobe Connect)

ccNSO Members

- Sean Copeland, .vi
- Ondrej Filip, .cz
- Takayasu Matsuura, .jp
- Jörg Schweiger, .de (co-chair)
- Wim Degezelle, CENTR
- Katrina Sasaki, .lv

GNSO Members

- Greg Aaron – (RySG)
- Don Blumenthal – (RySG)
- Rossella Mattioli – (NCSG)
- Mikey O'Connor – (CBUC)
- Rafik Dammak, GNSO

NRO Members

- Mark Kesters (ARIN)

SSAC

- Jim Galvin, SSAC

ICANN Staff:
Patrick Jones
Gisella Gruber

Apologies:
Sean Copeland, .vi
Julie Hedlund
Bart Boswinkel

Coordinator: The call is now recorded. Please go ahead.

Gisella Gruber-White: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. On today's DSSA Working Group call on Thursday the 4th of August we have Rafik Dammak, Mike O'Connor, Katrina Sataki, Takayasu Matsuura - sorry about that - Don Blumenthal, Ondrej Phillip, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Jorg Schweiger. From staff we have Patrick Jones and myself, Gisella Gruber.

Apologies noted today from Julie Hedlund, Sean Copland and Cheryl Langdon-Orr. But Cheryl is actually with us on the Adobe Connect room. If I can please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. And we also have Rosella Mattioli who is on the Adobe Connect as well as Wim Degezelle who has just joined us on the phone bridge.

Thank you, over to you, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Gisella. Welcome everybody. I imagine people will continue to trickle in a bit. I see Jim Galvin just joined the Adobe room. So maybe towards the end of the call, Gisella, you can update the attendees.

Very quickly just want to take a moment to see if anybody has an update to their statement of interest. Okey dokey. With that we're going to dive right in to the discussion that we started last time about criteria.

I hope everybody can see on your screens a little diagram. If it gets to be too small let me know, sort of a tradeoff between me being able to navigate and you being able to read. It's more important that you be able to read.

I thought what we would do is just pick up the conversation where we left off last week. Where we were last week was that we combined the results of the meeting in Singapore into a single structure. And in that structure we basically have four or five big topics. Let me just get those so that you can see them all.

I thought what we would do is just work our way around this today to see if there are things that are in the wrong place that maybe belong in a different place or whether we need another big chunk at the top level like this.

And so I thought I would just start in this one - in the perspective one. And since our main topic is criteria I thought I would start with these and just see if there aren't some that at least need to be moved. This is primarily Katrina's work.

And to remind you this is the picture that she drew. I'm going to collapse it because it takes up an awful lot of screen real estate. But just for the reminder there's the graphic.

And as I was looking at this it seems to me that the punch line here is that - I guess we have to have that because otherwise the numbers don't make sense - is that there are at least four points of view - and maybe more - that we need to think about.

And I'm going to consider this just like in the last one I'm going to consider this a dimension but that then all of the detail underneath this is really criteria. So I just want to make sure that we've got, for example, their group mentioned availability of DNS as a service. And if you see way down on the bottom of the screen we've got an availability one.

So I'm going to just start consolidating. And as you see me doing things that make you crazy either throw your hand up in the chat or just break in on me because I'm keeping my eyes on an awful lot of things at the same time.

When I get to this one I need to circle back to Katrina and the group and ask if maybe you could expand on this a little bit so that we can figure out where it goes.

When you all were talking about data consistency what were you thinking about? Do you remember, Katrina or anybody?

Katrina Sataki: Hardly. Yeah, I think we were talking about the data that we have regarding domain names of course, yeah. But the data that the registry has and the registrars and registrars pass to the registry.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay so if I take that slightly expanded one and look down here it sure looks like it goes there. In fact it may be that I already pulled it down there so let me get that in there. Clearly availability is one that is ready.

Then there's data accuracy in there. Data integrity is in there. Process integrity, we've got that. Where do we think process integrity ought to go? At this point I don't want to take anything out; we'll have arguments later about whether or not a given criteria is right. I just want to make sure that we've got them all.

So if we were to take a look at the criteria for a minute where do we think process integrity fits in this hierarchy? Does anybody have a sense of that? Is that a security one like data consistency or is it stability or something else? Thoughts?

Katrina Sataki: Well I think it's more like something else because in process we can have processes related to security, processes would be used to ensure that data

are accurate. Processes to ensure stability - I think it's something on another level.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay so up at the higher level so where I put it here?

Katrina Sataki: Yes and it - yeah and it relates to many other levels.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Katrina Sataki: Well process integrity was introduced by Jacques who unfortunately is not here today. And we discussed it in these terms.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Well we can expand it too. All right so we've got data integrity, process and then system integrity. Is that a similarly top level one sort of at that level, same sort of thing? We'll put it there for now anyway.

Having done that I think what we've done now is we've scraped all of the criteria out of this and we've - I think what I will do - an action for myself to (unintelligible) the perspective. That makes sense to me; it doesn't to you but it will later so that when we collapse the picture we don't just have numbers, you know, we'll have registrar and so on and so forth.

So that's kind of it for that one. Now the next one that I wanted to move into criteria is this physical security one; is that another one that belongs at this level in the criteria for now? That was sort of an orphan left over from the initial conversation. But it seemed like it certainly belongs in there.

Now it could be at that level or it could be inside of security. I'm curious if anybody had any thoughts on that. Olivier, go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Mikey. Olivier here. I was going to say put it down under security since it is a subset of the security part of things.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, two, right? Now if we take a look at - to metrics conversation it's - again let me know if people can't read this but got my hopes up.

Greg Aaron: Hey, Mikey, it's Greg Aaron. Can somebody let me into Adobe Connect?

Mikey O'Connor: No you can't come in. We don't like you.

Greg Aaron: Please? Please?

Mikey O'Connor: There you go.

Greg Aaron: Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Sorry about that.

Greg Aaron: No problem.

Mikey O'Connor: When we take a look at the metrics conversation are the metrics and criteria the same thing or different things? If they're similar enough can we pull some of the metrics out of the metrics one and put it in the criteria pile so that we unified this?

For example, you know, there was a sort of infrastructure-esque thing. And wasn't sure whether these might be things that we could move into criteria or whether we want to leave a separate pile for metrics.

Olivier, is that an old hand or a new one?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: It's actually a new hand, Mikey. Olivier here. I was going to comment on something that you mentioned a bit earlier with regards to process integrity and system integrity. Would this not be part of the table subset? Because that also has works and continues to work in a highly

predictable way. And I would have thought that process integrity - or that's a system integrity, sorry. And consistency seems to be part of integrity.

Maybe the other parts like works and continues to work in a highly predictable way then needs to be a subset of the system integrity. And then consistency needs to be a subset of system integrity.

Mikey O'Connor: Kind of like that, right?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yeah. I don't know if anyone agrees or maybe I'm totally wrong; I might be way off but...

Mikey O'Connor: But we're still sort of in brainstorming mode.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: The nice thing about is it's always really easy to rearrange it...

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: ...and it's also really helpful to sort of compress this a bit to make it a little easier to understand and manage. So I think these are good - good stuff.

Now if we were to talk about uptime in a way that's a stability component. We could put that in that junk or we could at least put it in as just a criteria. What do people think about that? I'm going to do it unless somebody screams. I might put it at this fairly high level for now. Now actually uptime does seem like a really stability metric to me. We'll put it in stability.

Infrastructure one I think this might have been the one where we were hoping that - different thing - different. Ok so what do we think about infrastructure in terms of our criteria? Is that primarily again a stability, you know, our primary choice is - goes all the way back to the title of our working group and that's

things that we want to look at that affect security and things that affect stability.

And at least in my view it seems to me that infrastructure is more of a stability thing than a security thing. Clearly it impinges on both but the list that clarifies this one seemed more like stability. So again unless nobody screams put it in the stability pile.

And that - oops - take it out of the other one. And that leaves content which is like it feels like it splits because there's configuration content then there's submission - does anybody from this group want to leap forward and help me put these in the right spots over on the right side of the screen?

Jorg, go ahead. Oh you may be muted, Jorg, you maybe muted. Still muted.

Jorg Schweiger: Okay. So this is Jorg for the record. Mikey, thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: You bet.

Jorg Schweiger: I would like to go back to infrastructure. And I think that there is more to infrastructure than just stability. So what I think might be involved with talking about infrastructure is - and that is according to the sub points that you would also deal with a minimum bandwidth with a minimum connectivity and minimum latency and so forth.

So it does not only depend whether or not something is stable but that you do have certain other criteria as well. So I might want to move it to someplace else. But I'm not sure where to.

Mikey O'Connor: Well we could just pull that, you know, for now let's pull it up a layer.

Jorg Schweiger: Better for me.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay, that works. That's fine. And then I think we want to get the word minimums in there. Oops, sorry about that. Well I think that's important distinction to make.

Meanwhile back at content - I think these have to go one at a time. When we talk about configuration that to me kind of goes with this one - sure put all these together or not plump like that.

Capacity one - that one belongs down in the infrastructure part like that. Again I'm just buzzing along but feel free to scream if something is wrong. Look at data integrity and transit together. That kind of - I wouldn't have put those two together so somebody from the group do you want to jump in and clarify this a bit?

Data integrity makes perfect sense to me; transit makes perfect sense but I wouldn't have put those two in the same sentence necessarily. So maybe what we'll do is for now we'll split them unless somebody's got a way to tie those together?

Transit goes close to anyway connection. Data integrity could go close to configuration. They all seem to be kind of closely related. Okay.

The last - well no we got two more to go. This enablers chunk was from one group. And so if you were a member of that group feel free to chime in a lot here. Oh, Jorg, you've got your hand up again. Sorry I missed it, go ahead.

Jorg Schweiger: Yeah, thanks Mikey. Jorg for the record. I was wondering whether we could substitute data consistency by data integrity. I'm not so sure whether Katrina had the same thing in mind while she was explaining data consistency. But for me data integrity it seems to be just a little bit more than consistency. So we might want to substitute the ones - those too.

Mikey O'Connor: So put the word data integrity in there instead of consistency? Is that your thought?

Jorg Schweiger: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: What do you think of that?

Katrina Sataki: Yes I agree with Jorg. That's a good idea.

Mikey O'Connor: Integrity. And then having done that do all these configuration ones really kind of belong in there too? Should that go down there like that? Those all seem to be related.

Then we have this one which also seems to go kind of in there like that. A lot of it, you know, I can compress out the duplications; that's not a problem. Again it's sort of a - this is sort of a - an exercise in pulling things together. Oh, let's see, Olivier, I think you're next unless, Jorg, that's a new hand? Yeah, Olivier, go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Mikey. Olivier here. It's actually been put in the chat there is - integrity is on two sides. We've got data integrity but of course then we've also got the stability with process integrity and system integrity on the other subset.

And I just wonder does data integrity have to be under security or is that data security and then is data integrity under stable - under the stable criteria? That's a question.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh. That could go down like that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: It could but maybe it couldn't so...

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: ...so...

Mikey O'Connor: I always do those things and then I await for, you know, I wait for screams then when I hear screams I go, oops, that wasn't such a good idea. The other thing is, you know, we may find that it winds up in both places. Clearly I can see where data integrity could affect security as well as stability. We can always come back and add that back.

Jim.

Jim Galvin: Yeah, Mikey, could you scroll down a bit for me there under criteria just for a moment? What's past infrastructure?

Mikey O'Connor: Just timely...

Jim Galvin: Timely response is where it ends, right, okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Jim Galvin: Data integrity, I mean, is normally considered a security service. But, you know, that doesn't mean that that's how we have to organize it, I mean, if we want to put it under stability I'd think that that's fine too. What's more important is that our overall structure, you know, tell a story that makes sense to us.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. Well and as I said, you know, I think we could wind up with it in two places or at least, you know, have some of the data integrity stuff in the stability part and some of it in security.

If we looked at the whole pile of data integrity right now - that junk - I can do that without - remind, but anyway that's the area I'm interested in. Is some of this stuff better placed in security or is there a kind of data that's really important for security?

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim. I mean, I'm wondering what the distinction is under this data integrity quite honestly. You know, integrity of data, data regarding domain names, registrars and registries I'm not quite sure I can even create in my own mind the difference between those three things.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah...

Jim Galvin: I mean, I don't know if we want to spend some time talking about that at the moment and looking for collapsing but...

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Jim Galvin: ...I'll just put that out there as a question.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, maybe that's the thing to do. And then maybe in the collapsing we'll find some things that really belong up in security. Let me get through the queue and then see sort of where we wind up. Jorg, go ahead.

Jorg Schweiger: Yeah, thanks Mikey. Jorg for the record. I was wondering whether or not the criteria calls availability wouldn't be quite the same thing or it shouldn't be somewhere under stable or stability? To me it seems to be quite similar. If you could scroll up a bit?

Mikey O'Connor: That one you mean?

Jorg Schweiger: Yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: Put it in...

Jorg Schweiger: Yeah, make it...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Let's see how your eyes are. Can you all see this if I go that small?

Jorg Schweiger: Fine with me.

Mikey O'Connor: All right then I'll stay a little bit smaller and we'll pull it down in there like that, right? Is that what you're thinking?

Jorg Schweiger: Yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. I'm going to go - I'm going to hold onto Jim's thought of trying to collapse some of this but I'll go to Olivier first and then come back to that, Jim, if we haven't gotten to that. Olivier, go ahead. And by the way...

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you...

Mikey O'Connor: ...this is not supposed to be a conversation between the co-chairs so don't feel like you have to be shy on this call. We the co-chairs are acutely conscious of the problem of these conversations becoming mostly a small group of people talking and not liking that. So some of you quiet ones should feel free to jump into this conversation. That said, Olivier, go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Mikey. I think we should probably come up with some outrageous ideas and then someone will finally jump on...

((Crosstalk))

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: ...this is ridiculous. But maybe what I'm going to say might be ridiculous, I don't know. Under configuration, data integrity, submission

registration that would probably be - have to do with security because submission and registration probably has a security element too.

So it would probably be, yeah, because it's also under its own little data integrity - see configuration, data integrity, submission registration so maybe you can move the little data integrity part - not only submission registration but the little (unintelligible) and then submission registration under it. Because that (surely) involves some security mechanisms I guess for that.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I think that's right. Okay there we've got it in both places; that's a good thing. I'm going to take that out, that's an extra. Let's go back to Jim's challenge of compressing this little zone. This is really a scope statement. Data regarding domain names, etcetera, certainly is a duplicate. Take that out, I think that's implied by the other things. Don, new voice, go ahead.

Don Blumenthal: You just did what I was about to suggest.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh.

Don Blumenthal: Now you know why I haven't said much; you've got such a good handle on this.

Mikey O'Connor: I hate to steal the chance for somebody new to talk though, drat, sorry about that. All right okay put a - types and can put this one so that if there's other kinds of information besides configuration - just go in there, we can add it.

Jim, does that tidy that section up a little bit and compress out some of the duplication?

Jim Galvin: It does. I'm - still don't know what scope registrars and registries means but I guess we're going to get to a lot of that later so it's fine.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I think the main point that was being made there is that it's not just registry data it's registrar and registry data. What about that? What if I expand that thing just registry data. Okay, Don, go ahead.

Don Blumenthal: Yeah, I'm running a few steps behind here today in general so I'd like to jump back to you were talking about availability a little bit ago.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Don Blumenthal: That has different meanings in different contexts. Are we defining it as a system being up and running as opposed to questions of data openness?

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, I think that's an important distinction. So we have availability of DNS as a service and we have availability of the system. Is that the distinction that you wanted to make? Should - could one of these...

Don Blumenthal: No I'm more thinking - and the reason I'm struggling here is I'm not sure this other meaning is a security or stability issue as much as a - well I don't know if it is. I'm thinking more somebody - the Who is type issues where it's there but who can get to it and for what purpose.

I mean, I've heard availability used in that sense too. Are we considering that meaning as well as just making sure the system is up and running and the necessary elements can be accessed.

Mikey O'Connor: Sorry.

Don Blumenthal: I should say necessary parts of functioning; maybe that's a better way to put it.

Mikey O'Connor: So that's more this one. Well it's really these two. And the ones that I think you're adding...

Don Blumenthal: Yeah, that's correct.

Mikey O'Connor: ...are the ones that say can somebody get to it.

Don Blumenthal: Right.

Mikey O'Connor: Is that right?

Don Blumenthal: And again I...

Mikey O'Connor: Well I think that...

Don Blumenthal: Yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: ...it's an important distinction. Maybe what we need to do is come up with a different word so that we don't use availability for two different things. So would reachability be a substitute for availability to capture your thoughts, Don or is there a better word?

Don Blumenthal: Yes but I'm not sure what it is.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. I'm going to give you an action item.

Don Blumenthal: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Don gets to figure out a better word. Okay.

Don Blumenthal: It's going to be more than - can it be two words?

Mikey O'Connor: It can be any number of words you want; I give you a complete blank check on word budget.

Don Blumenthal: Fair enough.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Olivier, go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Mikey. Olivier for the record. It might well be that Don doesn't find a replacement word after spending the whole weekend raking his mind in which case you really are torturing him. But I was going to suggest perhaps that because availability does mean two such different things.

One of the two availability - specifically the one thing availability to end user being put under process integrity as a subset of process integrity because the availability to the end user is actually part of the process.

Mikey O'Connor: That makes sense. Don, do you take that as a friendly amendment?

Don Blumenthal: It's a good start.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. It's all easily changed. There's no budget on the number of times I move boxes around on this screen, I'll tell you that.

Don Blumenthal: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: So let's tentatively put it there.

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim, question.

Mikey O'Connor: Go ahead.

Jim Galvin: So maybe somebody could say a little more about what process integrity really is. I mean, the way that Olivier is suggesting moving availability under there it seems to me that it means protocol integrity. And I guess - I don't know if that's the same thing or it's something different. And if it's something different then what was really meant by process integrity? Maybe somebody from that group could say a word or two?

Mikey O'Connor: Olivier, go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Mikey. Responding to Jim's question I think that protocol integrity has a technical sound to it. Process integrity doesn't normally contain the technical side but also the political side and the governance side inside it. In other words it would be a policy for X, Y or Zed information to be available and not only as something to do with the actual protocols or protocols for each change or information.

Jim Galvin: Okay so - Jim again. Thank you. We'll go with that for now. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. We're going to have to expand that - the one I highlighted - a bit. So let's put an action out there. And okay. Well this is good, you know, we're doing pretty well.

So let's go back to the enablers one and sort of take a moment. Can - I've forgotten whose group did this. Is anybody from this group on the call and can let me know who you are? Because otherwise I'm going to try and summarize your work and that's not going to be pretty.

Andre Phillip: It's Andre Phillip (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Did somebody want to speak? I was trying to sort of figure out how to move these into our criteria discussion and got stuck. So why don't all of you smart folks who are helping me move stuff around and other folks who haven't spoken yet that, nudge, nudge, help me try and figure out how we want to integrate this section into our criteria discussion.

In a way a word to substitute here could be capabilities. Most of these are operational in that if I were to look at an organization I would be saying you would probably be better able to deliver secure and stable DNS if you had

these things. And conversely if you did not have these things you would be less able to do that.

And if we were to think of it that way then is it essentially - well I'm going to start throwing out - start throwing out possible names here; operational abilities - this is almost like the sort of checklist that you might get if you were being audited back when I ran data centers. I could easily see an auditor coming in and saying do you have these sorts of things.

Olivier, go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Mikey, can I raise my hand for later?

Mikey O'Connor: Sure.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Let a few other people talk and then I'll have my hand up for...

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: ...afterwards because I've got my idea of where most of these things have to go on the other side but I'd like to see others to come up with things. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Come on you others. Don't just sit and listen to us co-chairs talk to each other; that's not a good plan. Don gets a gold star today for breaking the ice but there are an awful lot of smart people on this call who've been silent. Love to hear from you.

Don't all raise your hand at the same time. I think you're on Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Mikey. Olivier for the record. I was going to look at each one of these enablers the first one being diversity where you have operator then infrastructure. This all looks like process integrity to me

because we're dealing here with humans and designing the system for everything to integrate one way or the other although the infrastructure (unintelligible) location would probably be under system integrity.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And then the expertise, DNS security networking, that would probably be under process integrity as well.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And then the technology DNS sec now this actually gets split but obviously the DNS sec part I would think would go under the security. But there is also incidence response in there that I believe would probably have to go under the process integrity as well.

Mikey O'Connor: That takes care of the - technology. How about procedures, process?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: Still, sign and operation. Want to put that one, Olivier? I'm going to leave you on the hook.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: It's probably process as well because the (skill) is people.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah and actually we've got expertise...

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Next to it, yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, those are a bit close for me on there.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So there might be bits under DNS sec that also need to be split and moving elsewhere.

Mikey O'Connor: This - oh there's the incident...

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: The incident management and good network operations that needs to go into process and threat warnings as well.

Mikey O'Connor: Drag them in there for a minute.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And that's all I had to say, thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Olivier. Took care of that one. It's a little ragged but it'll get better. Once we've got them into the same piles then we can tune them up a bit. Let's see, one more to go. It looks like process - two process ones belong - kind of going in Olivier's there. Okay.

Third party service - suppliers of services and service level agreements. Process integrity again? System integrity? It could be either; it could be - again anybody from this group feel free to chime in. Oh, Olivier, is your hand up again? I'm sorry.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Mikey. Olivier here. Still looking on the right hand side the incidence response can now come with the threat warning and recommendations of mitigation based on the warning. These can be mixed together. I guess we'll probably have to streamline that...

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: ...once we've added everything together a bit. You can see things are starting to emerge.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, well that was the hope just that they'd start to compress into a tidier...

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So third party suppliers of service and that necessarily would probably be a mix of system and process I guess. It really is a structure at that point.

Mikey O'Connor: Put it in system for now sort of my initial guess. Operational criteria it could be - depends on what it means. Leave that one for now; that one's so broad that it could go almost anywhere.

Institutional confidence seems to go in - where was that political one? The trouble with this is after a while it gets so busy that you can't remember. So it's in process integrity. Put it right (unintelligible). I would put accountability and transparency in there too.

Okay - oh my goodness it's 10 minutes to the hour; we have to stop. Okay we're going to take a snapshot right here and stop at this point. And I'll publish this one to the list so that you can look at it and see it again. Sorry, I lost track of time. I mean to shut us off a little earlier on this.

I want to circle us back around to the confidential information draft. I want to show you sort of the latest version of the picture and the - and Katrina submitted a new picture which kind of added to this. And I'll publish this again.

But I want your eyes on this just a little bit today. Unfortunately we're not going to be able to discuss it a whole lot. But especially on some comments that Rick made last time I've changed a really important thing in this and I want you all to at least think about it and see if it's all right with you.

Basically what I did is I amplified the role of the submitter of confidential information. So let's say that a person has put in some Type 1 information so it's attributed to the source and it's confidential; it's sensitive.

The process that I'm envisioning in that first slide with that arrow is that - it - the confidential information goes to the subgroup where the subgroup decides whether or not to sanitize it. If they decide to remove the attribution it then moves to being Type 2 information.

And again the subgroup decides whether the now sanitized information is sanitized enough that it can be published to the public. And that's the right turn that the arrow takes where if the subgroup decides to - they publish it to the world, to the working group and thus the world.

And the step that I put in as a result of especially what Rick was talking about was right in the middle of that page you see where it says information provider authorizes release. So if a person submits confidential information they have the final say after the subgroup has sanitized it that they are confident that their trade secrets or confidential information are not at risk.

And I want to highlight that because that's a big change to the way I drew the picture the first time and want to get a sense as to whether anybody is opposed to that idea. I think the goal that I have in making that change is to raise the confidence of the people and organizations that are sharing confidential information that they can share it safely.

And it seems to me that's an important safeguard that they get to have in order to feel comfortable in doing that.

Mark Kusters: So, Mikey, this is Mark. One of the things I think is very important that if you actually sanitize - you say sanitize with info - oh you have it in there, I'm sorry, authorized as release, that's okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Mark Kusters: Never mind.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, that's the change that I made.

Mark Kusters: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: The person who submitted it gets to look at the draft of the sanitized information and say, yeah, this is sanitized enough that my secrets are safe. And if it's not they get a veto; they get to say no this is not ready for release yet.

What I didn't want to get to was a situation where a person submits information and then loses control of it and finds that the subgroup didn't do a good enough job and their secret is in fact accidentally revealed. And that seemed like the way to do that to me.

So there we are. It's three minutes to the hour. I promise we'll take a longer look at this in the next call but we're flat out of time today. But please do - I'll publish both of these to the list as always probably today or tomorrow and I'll remind people to take a look at this again.

And also take a look at Katrina's version of the use cases which I thought was pretty cool - and see if that's useful. So thanks, Katrina, and sorry we didn't give you - we'll give you more time to talk about it on the next call.

I think with that unless there's any other business that's urgent we'll wrap this call up. It's two minutes to the hour. I thank you all. I think we've again made some good progress. And there we go. That's it. End of call. See you in a week. See you co-chairs in a few days. That's it for me.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks. Bye.

((Crosstalk))

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you, everyone.

END