

Transcript
DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group (DSSA WG)
31 May 2012 at 13:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group (DSSA WG) teleconference on 31 May 2012 at 13:00 UTC.

Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-dssa-20123105-en.mp3>

on page

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

Attendees on the call:

At Large Members

- . Cheryl Langdon-Orr (ALAC)
- . Olivier Crépin-Leblond (ALAC) (co-chair)
- . Andre Thompson (At-Large)
- . Julie Hammer (ALAC)

ccNSO Members

- . Takayasu Matsuura, .jp
- . Jörg Schweiger, .de (co-chair)
- . Jacques Latour, .ca (CIRA)
- . Katrina Sasaki, .lv
- . Wim Degezelle, CENTR
- . Rick Koeller, .ca (CIRA)

GNSO Members

- . Mikey O'Connor - (CBUC) (co-chair)
- . Rosella Mattioli (NCSG)

NRO Members:

Mark Kosters (ARIN); (co-chair)

SSAC members:

Warren Kumari (SSAC)

Expert:
Scott Algeier (expert)

ICANN Staff:
Julie Hedlund
Nathalie Peregrine
Bart Boswinkel

Apologies:
Don Blumenthal – (RySG)
Arturo Servin (LACNIC)
George Asare-Sakyi - (NCSG)
Jim Galvin (SSAC)
Greg Aaron (RySG)

Coordinator: Thank you. Please go ahead. This afternoon's conference call is now being recorded.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Tim). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the DSSA call on the 31st of May, 2012. On the call today we have Mikey O'Connor, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crépin-LeBlond, Andre Thompson, Rosella Mattioli, Julie Hammer, Wim de Gazelle, Warren Kumari, Takayasu Matsuura, Jacques Latour, Scott Algeier, Katrina Sasaki and Jörg Schweiger.

From staff we have Bart Boswinkel, Julie Hedlund and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. And we have apologies from Arturo Servin, Don Blumenthal, Jim Galvin and George Asare-Sakyi.

I would like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Nathalie and, (Tim), as always doing the complicated stuff. Oh, Nathalie, remind me to share with you a brainstorm I had about hooking up the conference after the call. I had a great idea.

Nathalie Peregrine: Okay, perfect.

Mikey O'Connor: Welcome, everybody. We are underway on this the 31st of May call of the DSSA. First up is a quick look at the agenda and anybody who wants to update their statement of interest. The agenda is really simple again it's just we're going to work through the report draft.

And I think we might be at the substantive agreement about the report phase. I may check with us at the end and see what people think. But we might be able to put this out on the list this week and see if we've got consensus on it which would be darn nifty.

Anything that people would like to add to the agenda or let us know about a statement of interest change before we start?

Julie Hammer: Mikey, Julie Hammer here. There's just something that I'd like to raise briefly and any other business if I may?

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Julie Hammer: Just to do with referencing something in the report.

Mikey O'Connor: Right, okay. If we get to like five minutes before the hour and I've lost track of time feel free to barge in and...

Julie Hammer: Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: ...let me know. Okay on we go. I'm going to do this in two waves because we've got stuff that got driven into the report that I published on Sunday that I want to get resolved. And then Julie has pushed along a version of the report that is completely nifty and I want to review those changes with you. And if - I expect them to be accepted by acclimation but we should run through those

real quick and then presuming that everything is good with that we'll slam that together.

And I may be a day late publishing this version because I'm going to get off of this call and go play rock and roll music for four days straight and I may not be in any condition to write anything until Monday.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Certainly nothing that would make any sense to most people.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, yeah, except, you know, ooh-bop-a-loop-bop-boom-bang...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Va-va-va-voom.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, right. That's about all I'm going to be good for. So - but look for the new version maybe Monday instead of Sunday.

So diving right in on my screen this is looking just barely readable. I'm hoping that you can read it. I just want to step through a couple of things that I left open for comment. Jörg suggested that we add the word 'permanent' to this better understanding of the security and stability of the DNS. And I hesitated about that for a couple of reasons.

One is the paragraph is right out of our charter. And I'm very cautious about changing the language in the charter. And the other is that it - it's the beginning of a decision that I'm not sure is really ours to make. And so I wanted to check, Jörg, are you on the call? Do you want - do you feel strongly about this or would you be okay if I didn't put this one in? I'll give him a minute to come on.

Jörg Schweiger: So I'm off mute now, okay. I'm not feeling extremely strong about it. But I think that something in the (unintelligible) changed and according to that this working group has been set up so if something had changed out there this might happen again. And what I think what we should be able to deliver or

what really substantial result of such a working group would be that at any given time we are able to not only understand but to give state of the health sort to say of the DNS.

And if we would want to do so what we should deliver is something that is applicable not only once but many times. And this - and I think this operation should be performed once in a while so that we are able to use our methods whenever we want them to, yeah, analyze what the current state at the time - at the point in time given actually is.

And I understand what you're saying, Mikey, because this might be an amendment to the charter but nevertheless I think it might be useful.

Mikey O'Connor: I get that. Well I think that we can - we can and in fact do make that case deeper in the report when we talk about sort of the rest - the go-deep phase where we focus on sort of reusable methods that can be, you know, that this whole focus on shortening the time cycle.

So let's drop it here and take a look when we get to that part of the report and see whether we need to beef up the ongoing stuff in there. Olivier, go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thanks, Mikey. It's Olivier for the transcript. I certainly agree that - I think it's too late now to change the charter itself. And certainly inserting the word 'permanent' in there would not make this come from the DSSA charter anymore.

However I do believe that we need to have a strong word and certainly convey the thought that one of our strong recommendations is to have this as an ongoing effort. It's great to understand it once; it's even better to continue understanding where it's going. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Got it. Okay let me add those to the notes and see if either on the call we can beef that up a little bit or if not I'll certainly write it down now so that it survives

the complete memory erasure that's going to happen for me over the next four days.

Let's see, so I think everybody is kind of in agreement. Let's not tinker with the charter but at the same time let's drive this idea - make sure that this idea is in the recommendations. I think that's a fair summary.

Okay. Let me roll down a little further. Warren suggested a change to the language - come on little screen. Why isn't the - that's interesting. I don't see my screen updating. Too many monitors. Yeah, Jacques, you're right. That's the first time this has happened. I don't understand. Can everybody else see the change in my screen so that I've rolled down and am now looking at Warren's comments about the mission and its bylaws or are you still looking...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: You're seeing that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay well then I think it's just an artifact.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You have a latency problem and you haven't even gone off yet.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh dear, well I'll tell you what I'll just not worry about that. Let me just...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, all right. Well I'm going to presume that you can see what I - what I usually do is I preview this on the screen so that I'm making sure that what you're seeing is what I'm talking about. But that seems to be broken today.

So anyway Warren was talking a little bit about the awkwardness of our charter. And again for the same reason, i.e. a hesitancy to tinker with the charter, I'm not going to change it. I do acknowledge that it probably should have said its mission as stated in its bylaws.

But I sort of treat the charter as this scary document that I don't want to touch because officially what we're supposed to do is go back to all five ACs and SOs and get approval for that. So I'm mostly just noting that; I'm not even going to ask your permission on that one.

That's not substantive just sort of a cleaning up change. Oh here's the next interesting one. So Jörg suggested that we add the SSRRT and the DNRMF to our list of players in this ecology. And I don't have a strong view on this except to note that everything else on this list are, you know, all these things are actual permanent...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: ...organizations of one sort or another. And the SSRRT and DNRMF are not. And so I am perfectly cheerful about going either way on this. Any strong views one way or the other? Cheryl, go ahead.

Julie Hammer: Mikey, Julie here. I think they could be represented at this point in time because the DSSA isn't a permanent entity either.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh perfect. Yeah, I hadn't thought of that. Perfect. Okay that makes sense. Cheryl, go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, with respect to what Julie says, yeah, I see that and I agree. But I think the easiest way would be to - because we actually have SSRRT and DNRMF - it's hard to say that at this end of my day I can tell you - on a third column in the report. We could list those as influencers as opposed to...

Mikey O'Connor: As what?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...actual references.

Mikey O'Connor: Insolences - what's an...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Influencers - yeah, I'm big on influencers at the moment. Sort of a buzzword in my world.

Mikey O'Connor: Wow, I've never - can you type that word into the chat? I'm going to have to look that up in my dictionary.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I speak Australian so it may not actually be an English word but I'll try.

Mikey O'Connor: Insolencers, that's a new one. Anybody else want to weigh in on this one? Influencer - ah, influencers. She...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Andre, you're much faster than I am on the typing. Well done, dear, absolutely correct.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: ...here we are. Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: (Unintelligible) got it, right. Okay got it. Okay I think I'll leave it in. I think it's fine. I'm going on here. Oh just a quick check. Warren had trouble reading some of the words in this graphic. And since I didn't I wanted to check if that

was just an artifact of the combination of computer and software that Warren's using or - oh my God, Warren is busy in the chat.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. And I have to respect Terry Pratchett - one of my favorite authors - but okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, yeah. Okay just checking.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Mikey, Cheryl here.

Mikey O'Connor: Going once, going twice.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I mean, I'm reading all of this unlike (unintelligible) - like a nine inch - Netbook. And, sure, I would have to do a Ctrl-plus to look at the text under what I'm thinking of is a cloud in terms of the scope cloud. But so what? I get the drift. And if I want to drill down I can.

Mikey O'Connor: No, no I think the issues that Warren...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, go ahead, Warren.

Warren Kumari: ...it looked as though (unintelligible) or something in the file. And I was just getting random gibberish.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Gibberish, oh, okay, no, no I'm not getting gibberish.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Warren Kumari: But it's not happening in this view so it's all good.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It might a fruit-based issue.

Mikey O'Connor: Well except this file was built on fruit-based...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: ...computing. You know, so I'm not buying the fruit-based problem. Okay I'm going to pass on that. Let's see is a little blah, blah, blah, minor change, no big deal. I think that - oh Jörg raised the really important point and so I did make a substantive change here. You'll see it first in this graphic where the last three of our topic lists used to read, blah, blah, blah, brings down the root, period. It now says brings down the root or a major TLD.

And I took that as a friendly amendment but I wanted to highlight that for you. And it caused a lot of graphics to have to get rebuilt but I think that that's an important thing. And I just note that it's missing here so I'll put it in. I wonder if it's missing all the way through. Oh gracious.

Anybody got a problem with this because I'm assuming you don't. I'm going to put them in while I...

((Crosstalk))

Jacques Latour: Hi, it's Jacques here.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, Jacques, go ahead.

Jacques Latour: The copy I have in Word here is like random fonts and stuff.

Mikey O'Connor: Random fonts; that's cool. Is the - is it the graphics or is it all of the text?

Jacques Latour: The graphic.

Mikey O'Connor: That's too bad.

Jacques Latour: That's the one I downloaded from the confluence or whatever. But when...

Mikey O'Connor: Oh okay.

Jacques Latour: ...when you paste the image into Word it should paste as a .gif file or something.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I pasted them in as PDFs; that's part of the reason why I'm dismayed about the font problem.

Jacques Latour: Yeah, if you paste as a .gif file it won't do this.

Mikey O'Connor: The problem with .gif files in Word is that they then become very blurry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Jacques Latour: Yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: And they're hard to read. But random fonts or blurry; there's a choice.

Warren Kumari: (Unintelligible) in Word it seems to be happier rendering .pngs instead of .gifs because it's...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh I'll try that. I'll see what the .pngs do because .gifs are nasty; I don't like them a lot. Oh Minnesotan - you're hurting me now.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: You know, I could do the rest of this call in Minnesotan; it would drive you crazy, you know. Cheryl could go wild in Australian and...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I could.

Mikey O'Connor: ...you know, we just - okay. So...

Warren Kumari: And of course this comment provided by someone with no accent at all so it's all cool.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, yeah, we're not going there. I've been trying to figure out where that accent is from, South Africa? Is that where you grew up?

Warren Kumari: Yes, that's it.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, yeah, yeah. I love accents. Okay onto another substantive deal. This is one that Jöerg again suggested and that is these topics outline the shape of the analysis that can be viewed as the preliminary topic list that the DSSA will use to guide its work as it goes deep. And then the big deal is into at least one topic during the next phase of the work.

And I kind of like it because it gives me a way to bail out if it turns out that we get stuck again. But I wanted to bring this to your attention in case anybody said, no, no, no we have to do all five before we're done and see if anybody feels really strongly about that. Because I'm okay putting this in but it gives us

some scope wiggle room that some people may not approve of so any thoughts on that one way or the other?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I like wiggle room. Cheryl for the transcript record.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Because, you know, it does give us a way out of a death march that lasts the rest of our lives...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: ...if we get stuck.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's a delimiter without being restrictive.

Mikey O'Connor: Right okay. Going once, going twice. All right. Let me roll onto - oh, Mark, you're on the call. Help me out again and remind me of (Vix)'s email address because it went into the chat and I didn't - I didn't copy and paste it.

Mark Kusters: Sure. It's Paul@vix - V-I-X- .com.

Mikey O'Connor: What a tough...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...vix.com.

Mikey O'Connor: I am so jealous. On the other hand I'm fu@bar.com. The only problem is that I get a lot of spam on that address.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Fubar indeed.

Mikey O'Connor: So but Paul@vix.com - that's a pretty excellent email address.

Mark Kusters: Yes it is.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay onward we go. Let's see - oh I renumbered - I moved the recommendations into numeric sequence. Very proud of that. Oh I took out a defensive bit. This was the defensive bit that I took out - whining about the way the methods were selected and constrained by budget and...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: ...blah, blah, blah. I was with Jöerg on that - too defensive.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: I think we did fine...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It was one of those get over it moments.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I think that's right. Okay let's see, then we have very tiny little type going by. I can't remember if there are any more - oh I'm sorry to bother your screens with all this. Oh, yeah, there was another defensive one...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: ...where we were talking about the work product that we prefer to spend less time on, blah, blah, blah. It's like nah, get over it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, wise move.

Mikey O'Connor: We got over that. I think that's it. Okay. So that's it on the draft that I pushed out on Sunday. And now let me switch to the draft that Julie sent me - I think only, right, Julie? You just sent it to me and not the list?

Julie Hammer: That's right, yeah, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. So I like these changes a lot but I just want to highlight some of them for you. The formatting ones I won't spend any time on. But Julie pushed some stuff - she dramatically reworked the analysis section and pulled some stuff up into it that I think makes the report read a lot more smoothly. And so she did a major rewording of the introduction because she - so let me get rid of - let me just show you the view of the final without the - so that you...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, no, without the markups.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, it's easier to read there. Oh. Help me - what happened? My goodness, computer, you didn't need to change my place so dramatically. Hold on. Sorry to roll your eyeballs here.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We're getting used to it, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, yeah. And let me see if I can get up to 250. Dagnabbit. There.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yay.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay so I think we just need to read this, make sure that it reads well. I think it does.

Julie Hammer: Well what I was doing just to summarize for everyone was pulling the discussion of the approach and the methodology that was embedded in the findings back up in and integrating it with this area so that it was more about the approach.

Mikey O'Connor: Right. And what I was doing is treating the methodology as a deliverable and so that's why I put it in the findings.

Julie Hammer: Yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: I don't think that that's a big deal. And it certainly fits better up here. I think the report reads better and will just let people know that by the way - and Julie captures that I think with this phrase...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: ...this intermediate work product. So I think this is...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And the use in future development, etcetera, etcetera, yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. So I think this is fine. And then what happens from here is that a lot of things that were in the findings section just pull up into this area.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: So I think that's - now I'm going to go back to the...

Julie Hammer: The other section that I pulled up into that was also where you are now, Mikey, on the approach to confidential information.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, yeah. And again I was treating that as a deliverable rather than as an intermediate but I think it makes a lot more sense so that people who are interested in process stuff, you know, well how did you do this work - have one place to read instead of two so I think that's a good change.

Now the other thing was that some of the - oh I know, the other thing that Julie did was - oh wait a minute.

Julie Hammer: The tables that we worked up together, Mikey, had been included both in the text and in the appendix. That was with the tables that had been extracted from the Excel spreadsheet.

Mikey O'Connor: Right.

Julie Hammer: And my suggestion was that that probably only needs to appear in one place and that was that's probably in the appendix to keep the flow of the report a bit smoother.

But, you know, if everybody feels that they're better in the report as well as in the appendix then, you know, it's not something that, you know, I would worry arguing about.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I think the one - let me go back and see. Sorry folks. The trick that happens is that when we take those pictures out this is - yes, this is essentially the findings.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's not full enough.

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

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I don't think it's flushed out enough without the imaging.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. I think we need to leave those in.

Julie Hammer: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Because that's the substance of the report basically. That's the finding. Unlike the methods to arrive at I think those graphics need to stay.

Julie Hammer: Okay. Fair enough.

Mikey O'Connor: And the advantage to them over my first try is that they're much more dense. They only add about three pages to the report. As opposed to writing them all out the way they are in the appendix which adds about ten or 15. So I think that thing we might want to reconsider...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Oh Jöerg. Jöerg's got his hand up. Go ahead Jöerg. Sorry, I wasn't paying attention to one of the 90 screens I now have in front of me.

Jöerg Schweiger: No worries at all, so Jöerg for the transcript.

I do have to go back a little bit to the point you've been tackling before. And now as we do agree that picking of the methodology and customizing the methodology is kind of a major deliverable that we have been delivering or that we are going to provide.

I was about to ask if or not in the Paragraph 5.21 you change the wording and the observations because the wording that you picked there in the first draft to my point of view had been very, very defensive.

So the wording was we picked the method extremely ad hoc and the team was under time pressure and so forth. And everything sounded so defensive as we are not sticking to our result. And I think we should.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. I think I took that one out.

Jöerg Schweiger: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I thought that went.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. I think that went. Let's go back. One of the tricks to this document is that they - I just realized that the numbering changed pretty dramatically. So here's the 5.2.1. And...

Jöerg Schweiger: It does look different.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes it's - well I'll tell you what.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's just line Mikey. It's not a problem.

Mikey O'Connor: Mikey. No, the numbering system that Word uses makes make crazy. So the numbering in Julie's document I went - I'm back at the other draft right now.

Jörg this is the section that you're talking about.

Jörg Schweiger: Yes. It's just a little bit above 522 so...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes and I took that out.

Jörg Schweiger: Does that roll up a bit?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. No it's - oh this one. You mean this one? No that one's not...

Jörg Schweiger: It was the very first paragraph under Observations in Paragraph 5.21.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes and that's gone.

Jörg Schweiger: Okay brilliant.

Mikey O'Connor: That's this deletion here.

Jörg Schweiger: Good.

Mikey O'Connor: There's the paragraph...

Jörg Schweiger: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: ...that I took out.

Jörg Schweiger: All right.

Mikey O'Connor: And I agree. I think that is a bit on the defensive side.

Now let's circle back. I'm starting to have second thoughts about Julie's change. Let's have another conversation about fact that I agree that the methodology and I think the work we did on confidential information are in fact deliverables that we want to highlight as such.

And so as I've - I hadn't thought this through but I'm starting to come back around to the notion that I had originally which is that if somebody says well what are your findings I would say well we've got a bunch of risks scenarios and we've got a methodology.

And we've got an approach to handling confidential information. And all of those are in fact findings rather than pulling them up into approach because of what Jörg was saying earlier about permanency, Part of what we are delivering is a bunch of risks scenarios which is what we were asked to deliver.

But we are also delivering the basis for an ongoing process to keep that assessment up to date, that whole permanent discussion that we had earlier in the call.

And I am starting to drift back towards leaving all that stuff down in the findings. Julie, do you have a real strong...

Julie Hammer: No, no that's...

Mikey O'Connor: (Unintelligible)?

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hammer: ...fine Mikey if you think that that's important to highlight that it is...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes it is (unintelligible). I think in a way that may be the more important deliverable in the long run than the risks scenarios themselves that when we look back in ten years at the DSSA and say well what did they do I think that they - there are really three things that they did.

They came up with those scenarios but they also came up with the first round of the ongoing process that ten years later is still being done by the community and that that may in fact be the more enduring...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: ...legacy of the work.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, yes.

Mikey O'Connor: So I'm kind of teetering back that way if that's okay with you Julie and everybody else.

Julie Hammer: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hammer: ...(unintelligible) somebody.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay I think that - with that I believe we are done taking a look at this document.

So at this stage it's 20 minutes to the top of the hour. Let's step back from the very detailed stuff that we've been doing and have a conversation about the document as a whole.

This might be a good time to circle back to Jöerg's point about permanence. One of the sections that I deleted may have to - let me go back to the prior version of the report because maybe I got a little carried away.

Let me go back to the like here. See if - there's a section that I put at the end talking about the next, talking about the future of the DSSA.

Let's see here. I hope I went far enough back. No I didn't, sorry. Your eyeballs are going to have to just put up with this for a minute.

You know - you all know what I'm talking about. It's the future looking part. Oh my goodness. I went a little too far back in time.

Oh my. There. Now I can - no I can't. Oh for heaven sakes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Should I make the usual mumble references at this point?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. This is a good time for that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's a weekly thing and I don't feel fulfilled unless I do so.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, yes. Yes. No it's just...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: ...Mikey didn't think about this until now. And as you can see I have a lot of files in my ICANN folder. There it is. Maybe I'll go all the way back to D5, see if that one's got it.

Well this has got all that text. Gracious, we've certainly done a - yes, yes, yes. This report's a lot better than Z5.

Okay here we go. Here's this whole section. This is this section that I took out called Ongoing Stuff. And maybe what we should do is put this back in.

I'm not sure if this is the right - this is a little too detailed. I think there's one - okay so that's not really - that's too detailed. That's very prescriptive. I'm not going to go there.

But I think that one of the things that we'll do in the comments on this one is I'll build up a paragraph and find a - maybe it's down there. Maybe it's higher in the findings.

Actually I think it is because I think that we do want to include this in the findings that this thing that we did once should continue.

Now I think that it's safe to say that the board committee, Bill Graham's committee will conclude the same thing. But I think it's important for us too.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We need to tie it up. That's right.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. We need to get that out there so that they can point to it as did the SSRRT.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: So I'll build a little paragraph and stick that in somewhere and highlight it for you in the next draft.

Other than that if we stepped back from this report and held it out at arm's length and thought about it is there anything else that needs to change before we publish it? This is essentially the first consensus call.

Presuming that I've got a good job of the - of this new paragraph in there, with the exception of that is there essentially at this stage could we say we're at consensus.

We could push it out to the list and say this is our first round consensus. We'll visit it again on the next call for final consensus. Are we there yet? Because if we are then I think we all get to yell yeah that a boy.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah and (yup).

Mikey O'Connor: Jörg go ahead.

Jörg Schweiger: Yes just one remark. I think it's perfectly fine with me concerning the report itself. I think a little bit of work has to be applied to dependencies.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, you're very kind.

Jörg Schweiger: I don't know whether or not you're aware of the fact that I've been walking my way through the appendices as well and sent you some remarks. I don't know whether or not you've been able to take a look at to them.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I looked at them and couldn't agree more. The appendix stuff is still very rough...

Jörg Schweiger: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: ...and does need work. And what we - what I'd like to do is get to consensus on the report since that's going to be the focus of all the - you know, I've got to whip up the one pager and the slide deck for the updates and all that stuff.

And if I can solidify the report the appendices can tag along a bit later. There's whole sections of these appendix that haven't even been done yet like the background material and on and on. There's a lot of work that's got to

get done on the Appendix so and I didn't see your comments. I think they're good.

Now the trick to - some of the comments you made Jöerg just off to the side is that the text in there that we had in the example scenarios came right out of people's scenario. So, you know, I'm not the author of those.

And so for those of you who wrote scenarios you as individual authors need to take a look at Jöerg's comments to what you wrote and see if you agree.

And if you and Jöerg agree then I'm fine. But I didn't want to make those changes without the author's involvement. So I did see that Jöerg.

And for the rest of you who have paragraphs that you wrote in your risk scenarios you just need to go take a look at Jöerg's stuff and see if you're comfortable with what he's saying.

Jöerg Schweiger: Fine with me. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay going once, going twice on consensus on the report? We're starting to get little trickle of consensus.

I know what we could do. We could use our little green check marks in the Adobe chat room. It's always neat to see a whole bunch of those check marks showing up. It's like the hum moment in an ITF meeting and sort of that affirmation of yes, we did it.

So the way you do that is the same way you raise your hand except you click the little down arrow next to that button up there on top and you get a green check mark and look at those green check marks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh.

Mikey O'Connor: That's great. That's great. Cheryl's raised her hand.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, no. I was actually trying to take my checkmark away before you called for the checkmarks to go up. And now it's a latency issue. I'm...

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, okay. Really? So I'm seeing this stuff way later than you. That's - oh well, poor old Internet connection, yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well I am in the antiquities of course remember.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. And your country has way better Internet connectivity than mine just in general.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, yes right. Not where I live.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes that's true. You do kind of leave out in the middle of nowhere like me.

Okay well that's lovely. I'm really pleased that we brought this one in. And well - oh, maybe before we get off this Julie, did you have...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: She had some IRB.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes she had an AOB. Does it bear on the report? Do we need to drive something from the report?

Julie Hammer: In a way. What I wanted to ask you Mikey and the group as a whole that you would have seen that Patrick Jones has put out for community comment a draft statement on SSI role and remit. Has everyone seen that? That's been posted for comment.

Mikey O'Connor: I certainly have and have an action item in my constituency to write some comments about it.

Julie Hammer: Well I have the same action item for ALAC. And I've actually drafted some comments to trigger ALAC input.

And one of the - and I've shared that through a couple - a few hours ago with Olivier. And what I've said in my comment is in relation to Patrick Jones' specific request for - he says it would be helpful to receive community feedback on ICANN's SSI relationships and a few more words there.

What I felt was is that the work that this group has done in putting together the whole risk assessment framework where you've - your pie chart diagram Mikey that talks about risk assessment, risk planning, standard (sorts) and techniques, the audit and compliance, that defines a whole lot of functional areas in the security management space.

And that, you know, we talked about it being a useful approach to think about where the various groups within ICANN fit in that space.

And what I want to say in the comments that we're putting together to feed back into that report is that the DSSA is doing some very useful work in that area and that they've defined this security management framework and that while the graphical representation is not yet finalized that we recommend that this might be looked to as a way of representing that data and providing further detail on that issue.

So what - I didn't want to go ahead and make those sorts of references to the work of the DSSA without having the agreement of the group. But I do think that there's are some very valuable work that's been done here that could feed into that document.

Mikey O'Connor: Thoughts from others on that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well Cheryl here.

Mikey O'Connor: Cheryl...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I typed in excellent Julie into the chat. But my actual response is (hell yes).

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Well I'm fine with that. I think one of the cautionary notes is that this framework is really in the charter of the DNRMF.

And so I think it's fine to refer to it. But I think the one caveat that I would add is that close to referring to this document and these results that you also note that the board has the committee that's working on that exact topic as well and that we are just a little bit ahead of them in terms of time.

Woman: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: You know, I need to tiptoe. You know, and this really wasn't our charter. We just had to do it in order to get our work done.

Woman: Yes. Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: So that's the only cautionary note that I would put. But other than that I'm fine. Of course, you know, the more that this...

Julie Hammer: Well I'm happy to just run the words that are - had drafted by you to make sure that you're comfortable with them on behalf of the group if that would - if you'd like me to.

Mikey O'Connor: Either way is fine. You know, the group is now at consensus on this report or at least tentatively there. And so don't view me as a gatekeeper on that because this is now done and out. I mean it's not officially published yet but effectively it is.

And the only cautionary note is just it's probably a good idea to acknowledge that, you know, while we did all this cool stuff it wasn't really our brief and that the real brief for that lives with the board committee.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Which didn't exist when we were chartered...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...can I just remind you of.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible) and it's also trying to follow cards.

Mikey O'Connor: Right and they're only just barely getting underway so...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes indeed.

Mikey O'Connor: So...

Julie Hammer: But it was this group that came up with the pie chart not the board group was it not?

Mikey O'Connor: Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, yes, absolutely.

Julie Hammer: So look Mikey I'll just send it to you to - it's only a two pager just to make sure that you're comfortable comparable with the wording. Olivier has had a look at it. Oh sorry, Olivier wants to speak.

Mikey O'Connor: Go ahead Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thanks Mikey. It's Olivier for the transcript. I just wanted to add the aim of the ALAC statement is as most of the other times trying to break down those silos that appear to always happen in ICANN where the wheel gets reinvented when you go from room to room.

If we can make sure this doesn't happen then that's already a winner.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Groundhog Day anyone?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes well that's one of the advantages of being this kind of cross constituency cross ACSO thing.

I'm battling another issue in the GNSO that's pretty similar and would really be if good cross constituency thing.

But boy getting those things started is tough. So I'm all for using this as broadly as we can. I think it's great thought.

Okay, anything else? We're coming right up on the top of the hour. I love all those green check marks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: All good for me.

Mikey O'Connor: So there. We're kind of at the end of a big piece of work. I'll put the word out on the list that a release candidate is coming and try to get that release

candidate out soon but not probably before Monday. Because when I hang up this phone I'm going to go get crazy for four days.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You won't be able to get it out before Wednesday's so why try?

Mikey O'Connor: I'll try. I'll try. But I am going into Minnesota accent, you know.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, yes. A four-day rock 'n roll event and you think you're going to get stuff out two days later. Come on.

Mikey O'Connor: No. I'm going to get it out Sunday night. You watch. Now you've made me mad.

Okay folks, terrific. Thanks all for the help. We'll see you in a week. (Natalie) I think we can wrap this one up and thank you for your help.

And then why don't you stay on the bridge for just a second. And (Tim) if you could stay on the bridge too for just a second I've got an idea that I want to try out on you...

END