

**Transcript**  
**DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group (DSSA WG)**  
**02 August 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 02 August 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-20120802-en.mp3>

on page

<http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#aug>

**Attendees on the call:**

**At Large Members**

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

**ccNSO Members**

- . Takayasu Matsuura, .jp
- . Rick Koeller, .ca (CIRA)
- . Katrina Sasaki.lv
- . Luis Espinoza.cr

**GNSO Members**

- . Mikey O'Connor - (CBUC) (co-chair)
- . Don Blumenthal – (RySG)
- . Rosella Mattioli (NCSG)
- . George Asare-Sakyi (NCSG)

**SSAC members:**

- . Jim Galvin (SSAC)

**ICANN Staff:**

- . Bart Boswinkel
- . Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies:

- . Rafik Dammak
- . Mark Kusters
- . Don Blumenthal
- . Warren Kumari
- . Jacques Latour
- . Julie Hedlund
- . Patrick Jones

Coordinator: ...recorded.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Tim). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the DSSA call on the 2nd of August, 2012. On the call today we have Andre Thompson, Mikey O'Connor, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Julie Hammer, Olivier Crépin-LeBlond, George Asare-Sakyi, Luis Espinoza, Takayasu Matsuura and Rick Koeller.

We have apologies from Mark Kusters, Don Blumenthal, Warren Kumari, Rafik Dammak, Jacques Latour, Patrick Jones and Julie Hedlund. And from staff we have Bart Boswinkel and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

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

Oh and Jim Galvin has just joined the call. Hello, Jim.

Jim Galvin: Hello.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, hi, Jim.

Jim Galvin: Hi, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Are you going to be able to join the Adobe room too?

Jim Galvin: Should be there now waiting for a response.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh dear, I'm not seeing it. Are you seeing it, Nathalie? I may have horked up my screen so bad that...

Nathalie Peregrine: No I haven't - oh he's just turned up now.

Mikey O'Connor: There's Jim. Yeah, there he is. Oh good.

Okay well welcome to the call. It's pretty lightly attended today partly due to holidays and partly due to conflicting meetings so we'll see how we do. I really only have one thing on the agenda which is to keep working on the way forward. So unless there's something else I think that's what we'll work on.

Anything that people want to add to the agenda before we do the statements of interest business? Okay and then any changes to statements of interest that people want to tell us about?

All right well I will not keep you in suspense anymore. We had a - I thought - a really productive call on the Ops call on Monday. And after that I drew a picture - that's my way to think things through. And before I flip to the picture I need to do the standard disclaimer, which is that this is Mikey picture not a Ops group picture. Nobody's seen this except me and so you're all on the same footing; there's no - this will be an equal surprise to everybody on the call.

But what I did is I drew a picture of sort of the timeline and tried to integrate sort of a bunch of things. And just to give you the thrilling animation there are three versions of this picture: one that you see on the screen right now where it's sort of the kickoff the assessment right away approach.

Another would be the kickoff the assessment after a while approach. And it could either be after Toronto or it could be after Beijing; it's hard to predict that right now.

And then the third is essentially hand off the assessment process to the other parts of the community that may be better equipped to do it. And I haven't figured out a way to represent that very well on the picture. So if anybody can come up with an idea on that let me know. But anyway those are the three pictures. And I'm going to go back to this one just because everything is a little bit bigger.

I think that the sense of all of us is that there's pretty wide agreement that there's some stuff that we need to do. You know, we need to do this sort of refining, consolidating stuff, you know, get the report out for public comment, refine the methods a bit, at a minimum get the scale to some sort of log scale instead of absolute so that the numbers aren't so crazy when they get big.

Fold those revisions into the report and get endorsement from our respective sponsors. And then this one where we do need to sort out these overlaps and gaps a bit partly, you know, with the Board stuff but, you know, in a broader sense as well.

Meanwhile the Board is, you know, the Board committee has got a risk management framework project underway. And if they stay on schedule they should have a first draft of the framework done by Toronto which would be very helpful. It won't have gone through all of the review and public comment cycle yet. But we should have a pretty good sketch of what's coming out of that project.

And then, you know, I think their work plan is to go ahead and complete that framework after Toronto with the goal of being really done, done by Beijing which, as several people have noted, is a pretty aggressive schedule so it may slip.

But it would be nice if they had at least a first cut at that framework done by Toronto because I think one of the things that would be very helpful to do in Toronto is see how well those two, you know, documents are risk assessment approach and the Board committee's risk management framework align. And then to the extent that we can at least get started aligning those two things.

I think skipping around this document that way there's pretty broad agreement that, you know, these are things that need to happen between now and Toronto. I think where the conversation has focused is on the risk assessment puzzler.

And I think there are a couple of - oh somebody's got their speakers on I think. Got a little background noise there.

I think the puzzler is in the risk assessment and what to do with that. And one of the themes that came up on the call on Monday is that we may not have the right people to do a risk assessment depending on the topic.

And it's partly because some people have - who are in the group - have sort of dropped off because they're...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: ...other commitments or because they're not interested in what we've been doing but plan to return when we get to stuff that they are interested in. And so I think there's sort of that issue.

Another issue is sort of the when to start. And I'll just toggle back and forth a little bit to give you - this is the - by the way - the thrilling animation part of the presentation. That's it.

But I think there's a reasonable case to be made that kicking it off right away like this we may be getting ahead of the work that's being done in the Board's risk framework committee. And, you know, I think there's a reasonable case to be made to at least wait a while, you know, at least until after Toronto and maybe even a bit longer than that before we kick it off.

And so, you know, that's, I think, another dimension - sort of the who should be involved doing it and whether we're really - whether we really have the right group of people to do it and then the when discussion.

And then I think that the final conversational aspect is whether to do it at all or whether to essentially hand this risk assessment job off to other folks. And I think that's connected to the issue about whether we've got the right people in the group to do it, you know, so that's sort of the sequence that I - run through those things.

So that's kind of the story that I drew between Monday and now. Olivier and Jim, since you were on that call and before I open it up to everybody else, is there anything you want to add to that story that I've either missed or have sort of misrepresented? Jim.

Jim Galvin: Yeah, so this is Jim Galvin. I actually raised my hand before you were clearly going to offer me the opportunity to speak. The only clarification that I wanted to add is I would say that it's not a question of whether to do the work at all; it's just a question of whether this group, as currently constituted, should do the actual risk assessment.

I would expect that, you know, of your three choices, you know, the first one you sort of start now, let's just keep moving along and dig in. You know, the second one is we'll just delay a little bit starting and digging in so that we can get a better look at what the Board committee is going to be doing and make sure that we're aligned with that.

And the third option is really that this group would recommend, you know, quite strongly that the risk assessment should be done but the chartering SOs and ACs should pick that up with a new working group; that this group should finish off its process and procedures and then a new group should be kicked off, scoped out and made to go forward and do the work.

And that, I think, you know, gives us all of the advantages of the timing that you've been talking about. So it does put it out a little bit, gives us time to close down this group and finish up the work that we're doing. It also gives us time to, you know, get a good look at what the Board committee is doing and the activities that go on there.

The downside of doing that, of course, is this group is really a new and different kind of thing. It's a joint, you know, cross-working group activity. A lot of effort went into chartering and constituting this group. So there is a certain concern about the process that would be involved in reconstituting this group.

So perhaps other kinds of procedures or processes should be investigated, you know, I mean, maybe a rechartering or something maybe just a proactive reconstitution of the participants would be appropriate. I mean, in all of this you have in the background the idea that participation really is waning when you consider how many people are officially part of this working group. So we need a way to reenergize this group.

You know, and the two obvious ways to do that are to end this group and start another one, which has the overhead of process. Or, you know, maybe we do finish the work that we're doing and then we seek just to revisit the charter and expressly and proactively try to reengage a different set of participants.

So I just wanted to shape a little bit the options that we have in front of us.  
Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: That's lovely. I thank you, Jim. Did I - I was sort of typing a new arrow into the Option 3 so now we've got Option 1, dig in right away; Option 2, start later with - and, you know, I would even - I would even take, as a friendly amendment to this, something like this. I kind of like that reconstitute the group thing.

And at that point we start to get pretty - so then this one would be - so let me...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...an arrow.

Mikey O'Connor: You know, these are now the same. So I want to make this - so this one - I don't know, maybe that's - let me just stop, Jim, and see what you think of that phrase that I've typed in there. Is that - it doesn't quite get to the - in the DSSA and start a new one. So I suppose that's the third...

Jim Galvin: Yeah, I mean, so this is Jim again. I mean, that kind of is the real difference. And it really is, I think, important to highlight that particular distinction.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Jim Galvin: You know, I mean, there's a real difference between shutting down a group and starting a new one versus just recreating the participants or the resources that are part of it.

Mikey O'Connor: Right.

Jim Galvin: So I would still keep the two versions apart although, as you're now showing, they are intended, at least from my point of view and the way I would present this is they're intended to be the same.

Let me just call out that Olivier has got his hand up there too.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I know. I see that. I just wanted to kind of nail this one down before we got to that. So then what we've got is the - reconstitute ourselves, Option 2. Because I think that's a good word; I like that. And then the one that essentially creates a separate pair of groups.

Olivier, go ahead. Thanks for waiting.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thanks, Mikey. It's Olivier for the record. My point of view is different to that of Jim's specifically because I - my personal belief is the working group has not actually achieved the - what it said it was going to do in the charter. It's on its way to do it but it's not actually completed the work in the charter.

And I usually would be more inclined to say that a working group could shut down once it's actually done what it was intended to do. If it stops halfway then it either has to consider itself to be incompetent in the matter of what it's doing or that things have changed and the answer has already been achieved elsewhere.

Now I don't see the answer so far being achieved elsewhere. I see that there is work that is about to take place; that is top down, Board-led with staff and with several consultants that we'll be involved in with no guarantee whatsoever is that a better result will be achieved or not. And of course we can't guarantee that obviously at this very point in time.

And so my point of view would be to have the working group - initially I was looking at Part A which was let's plow on with our work. Perhaps the discussions that we had last Monday and also last week softened my stance into saying well we can - we've been around this work for a long time.

We can wait for a few months to see what is going on with the Board and the Board's risk management framework that they're developing with their consultant. Bearing in mind of course that they should take into account the work that has been done here and not start reinventing the wheel from scratch.

Except of course if the consultant finds that the work that we have done is completely off track and has to be put into (bed) in which case that actually provides us with our answer. At that point I would say we tried, we failed, thanks. We can close it down. So that's the point here.

The other thing that I had mentioned on Monday and I'd like to share here is perhaps we should ask the original people that signed the original charter to find out if this working group is going in the right direction. And perhaps they should have a say in this as well as to how far do you think this working group has gone. So that's primarily my point of view at the moment. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Olivier. Cheryl, go ahead. And everybody else; I just wanted to give Jim and Olivier a chance to tidy up my diagram. So open season now.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Mikey. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. As one of those which have a - I guess parental and (unintelligible) interest in this workgroup - seeing as it was under my watch that the three prime movers, the two SOs, then the GNSO and the ccNSO and the ALAC came together to make this little baby happen in the first place I just want to weigh in and agree totally with the observations that both Olivier and Julie have (noted) in particular.

Olivier in terms of the requirements and she was writ for what this workgroup needed to achieve have not hit the mark as yet. And that does need to be addressed in my totally biased opinion.

How that's addressed I think is the - or how it can be addressed has been - has been raised with a couple of options under what Jim has put together for us today and obviously you, as the leadership group, have all been discussing before. And I've made some of my personal thoughts known in the chat here today on possibly something somewhere between Option 2 and a reconstitution as needs be to get the necessary talent pool for doing the RA, the risk assessment done. But I do think we have to do - we, as in this current DSSA - cross community unique beast that it is - workgroup - has to address that in some way, shape or form.

And finally agree absolutely with the observation Julie made in terms of the purpose of the Board workgroup. It has a particular focus which I think is distinct from the one that was intended in terms of our analysis of actual risk as opposed to assumptions, hearsay, un-understood, misunderstood or deliberately unable to be misdirected type statistics.

And I'm going to say it for the record - total bullshit use - of statistics that we were finding ourselves in a couple of years back. We still haven't addressed that. So some form of RA does need to be done.

The time of which I think certainly we need to look at. And the integration with the activities of the - of any consultant's work and/or the work of the Board workgroup obviously has to be looked at as well. And in terms of post-Toronto and exactly when to start I think that - and I think, sure, we both have the talent or access to the talent that we need to do the RA - is something that we do need to address.

I'll get off my soapbox and stop ranting. But I'm happy to rant further if needs be.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Cheryl. Olivier, is that a new hand?

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: It is, Mikey. It's Olivier here. I just wanted to add one more thing. The concern that I do have at the moment if we do decide to shut the group down and go back to the chartering organizations and ask whether they want to charter a new group I have a real concern at the moment that some parts of ICANN - and namely the GNSO and GNSO Council - having so much on their plate - and this has been said many, many times over - this will fall as a very low priority item that is likely not to resurface for five years or so.

Especially in light of the fact that the GNSO Council is about to go - or the whole GNSO is about to go through this huge transformation with the arriving of a lot of people that are absolutely not interested at the moment in any of the work that is done here.

They're more likely to be interested in trying to make their money back as their primary interest and trying to defend their brand as their primary interest. And certainly stability and DNS analysis that's something which they leave to the techies. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Olivier. I'm kind of catching up on the chat. The queue is clear. You know, one way that we could do this is we can really amplify the need to refresh the group in order to get, you know, to make sure that we've got the right people involved and if not to reach out and recruit some more people.

Another thing I'd point out is that in a way if we eliminate this one, the dive right in option, we do have some time to make this choice. We don't have to make this choice now. What we could do is focus on the stuff that's in the refine and consolidate pile which is a pretty substantial amount of work, by the way.

And leave this decision for a little while and revisit it, you know - and in fact we might, as we dive in especially to the gaps and overlaps discussion - we might come up with some information that would inform this choice a little bit.

And so one way to approach this is to say well let's eliminate this option - the start right away option because by doing that we give ourselves a pretty clear charter as to what we need to do in the next three months or so. And by doing that we might find out some stuff that would help us make that choice.

Oh, Julie's got her hand up. Sorry. Go ahead, Julie.

Julie Hammer: No that's fine, Mikey. It really follows on - well, from what you were just saying because one thing that also occurred to me was that by Toronto the Board working group may well be in the position to have discussions with us that will help make that decision more clear as well because the decision might be usefully informed by the outcome of their work.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, and I think that's one of the really appealing things for me anyway in waiting a bit on the risk assessment part is that, you know, it's kind of letting the Board initiative catch up with us a bit. And so what do people think about - is there anybody that's really keen to start this right away? Let's put it that way because maybe what we could do is bump one of these out.

Let's see, I'm reading chat. Anybody want to speak while I read chat?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Mikey, Cheryl here for the record and for the record I agree. I don't think we're actually in a position to start, in inverted commas, right away. There is stuff we've got to do. And I'm perfectly comfortable with post-Toronto activity plan.

Mikey O'Connor: Cool. Well maybe that...

Julie Hammer: Mikey, Julie Hammer here again.

Mikey O'Connor: Go ahead.

Julie Hammer: So also it might be that at Toronto some further discussion with the SOs and ACs on the work of the working group might generate some enthusiasm that would lead to the reconstitution and people putting up their hand to be on the working group. So that will be a good opportunity to drum up some enthusiasm.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Mikey, Cheryl here again. Just following on from what Julie said that's an absolute perfect opportunity because of course the lineup changes in the AC and SOs as well at that time. I think it's a good opportunity for a resell and a re-socialization of what we do particularly listening to I think the very valid points that Olivier made.

I mean, we designed this particular beast to be so damned equitable with every component part being able to put a valid sheer of sitting at the table together. And to pick up on the point Jim's made, if we look at the list of people that are, in inverted commas, on this workgroup versus them of us that is actually active there's a huge gap.

Which means we've got seats available that can be, you know, repopulated or total number of seats modified or, you know, carve off parts of the table if needs be. All of which I think takes us to stuff that we can do both at Toronto and in the beginning phases next part of work in a post-Toronto environment. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Cheryl. The chat is getting lively. Julie said the skill see could - would be dictated by the five risk scenarios. That's an important point as some of these scenarios are quite different than each other.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: And Rick is saying, "I think if we are missing skills we need to identify our gaps in time for Toronto in order to recruit..." - at least get a shopping list by Toronto so that we can go to Toronto and say here's the kind of work that's

coming. I'm now not quoting Rick by the way, I'm turning Mikey blather on - expanding it.

You know, I think that idea of identifying which skills we need is a great one because we could put it in the conversations that we're going to have in Toronto. Let's see oh, Olivier has got his hand up. Go ahead, Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thanks, Mikey. It's Olivier here. Totally agree with the identification of the skills gap, very good idea.

Not too concerned - following on what Cheryl has said - I'm not too concerned about the fact that if only a very small subset of the current DSSA working group has taken part in the regular calls and meetings and discussions that when you look at the skill set and the range of people that are on this working group you find that many of them are in this only for specific purposes and specific reasons as information providers, as people who are linked to the root servers, to the industry, to the actual data.

So far the majority of our work has been one of developing a method which is not the sort of thing I think that is palatable to everyone. It's only a small subset of those - those real process freaks...

((Crosstalk))

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: ...enjoy this sort of thing. And I'm hoping that now going on for the next suggested thing, which was to actually validate the model by performing a run over of the whole thing to see if it actually works - I was hoping that those people that are currently not taking part will be brought in or at least will feel warmer about taking part because that's where their skill set will come in.

That said the group was not built in a way to identify skill sets and say we need someone with language experience, one with accounting experience, one with DNS experience. It was more done on a SO/AC/SG community-wide

thing and identifying these gaps in the skill set is an excellent idea. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Olivier. In a minute, Jim, I'm going to put you on the spot so give you fair warning. You know, I think one of the questions that I'd like you to ponder is whether what we are tinkering with here is something that - it seems to me that the one thing that we - we can't do in the basket of - in this third option - is the - sort of end DSSA; start something new.

You know, that seems to be the divergence at this point. Except for that it seems to me that the points that you made about tuning up our skill set and making sure that we've got the right people has certainly resonated with the rest of us.

And I also think that the -start right now is dead on arrival. I don't think there's any appetite for that. And I think the third thing is that by structuring it this way I think we've got some wiggle room to change our minds up through Toronto and, you know, based on some of the information that we need to develop between now and Toronto.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: What do you mean, "change our mind," Mikey? Says Cheryl for the transcript record.

Mikey O'Connor: Well I'm essentially back to my - defer the decision notion, you know, that says this is where we're headed but we give ourselves a little room - oh I like Julie's comment, "Allow our decisions to be better informed..."

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Absolutely, that's okay but this changing of mind, hmm.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh okay. Well I accept Julie's comment in the chat as a friendly amendment.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: How very wise of you, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh yeah, that's the wisdom of a man confronting an avalanche. Yeah, sure I'm going to stand in the way of that. No way.

Jim, how are you feeling about the direction that we're headed? Is this okay? Is this still of concern? I think, you know, and the reason that I'm picking on Jim is that it's very rare when Jim raises a concern. And every time in the past that he's done it it's been really important to make sure that we've got it right.

So I'm partly picking on you but I'm partly really genuinely interested in what you think about this. So now it's your turn, Jim.

Jim Galvin: Sounds like you're also just setting me up there.

Mikey O'Connor: Well I'm sorry to do that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, oh yeah, he is doing that too, Jim, yes.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: I'm not denying it; I'm just saying I'm sorry I'm doing it.

Jim Galvin: No, it's all right. You know, I'm certainly not here as - to drive this group as an individual. I mean, I had a concern and I've expressed myself. I'm sitting here in an open minded way listening to everything that's going on.

You know, my concerns are not (unintelligible) in any significant way. On the other hand I'm all for being better informed. I, you know, I think that's great. And so, you know, just being open minded and letting the group, you know, decide where it wants to go I think that's really the key thing here.

If we finish the work that we're doing and, you know, we continue to have this conversation and maybe it's a principle agenda item come Toronto that sounds fine to me. You know, I'm all for getting more information.

And I guess it was Rick who asked in the chat room one of the things that we should put in our discussions here leading up to Toronto is a hard look at ourselves as to whether or not we have the right resources to pick up the risk assessment.

So we should consider what's the best way for us to answer that question. Again just as a continuation of informing ourselves when it comes time to make the hard decision. So I don't feel urgency in making a hard decision. And I like the idea of more information. So that's where I am. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: Great, thanks, Jim. So what I would be inclined to do, having heard all this, is go to work and build us a work plan of this refine and consolidate phase that we've described on the sort of upper left quadrant.

And by the way I think there's plenty to do in there.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh yeah. And...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: This is not take a holiday and meeting in after Toronto.

Mikey O'Connor: No, I don't think so. I think there's plenty of work to do. The public comment cycle - this is one of those we've never done this before because we've never done a cross AC/SO project so just figuring out how to do that and getting that done is going to be an interesting puzzle.

Hopefully getting it done in time that we can then fold it back into the report I think is pretty urgent. Although by the - by the time just before Toronto all this

law suit stuff that I'm doing right now will have evaporated so I can go back into crazy Mikey mode on that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And we can mention frac and sand in the same sentence after Toronto.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah and I won't go freaking crazy on you. Because if you say that now I tend to get a little white all the way around my eyes. Although we did have a huge win last week so the momentum is shifting which has given us all a lot of energy.

Anyway why don't we - does that seem like a reasonable approach to go ahead and, you know, let me bash out some details on those four arrows in the upper left quadrant and circle back to the group, probably run it through the Ops group one time and then get back to you all in a week. That seems like a reasonable approach to me.

Cheryl's in. Julie's in. This is a good chance for people to go crazy and say no it's a bad idea. If not I think that's what we'll do. And I'll work on refining these words and phrases a little bit to sort of tidy up what we said on the call.

Is there anything on the page in terms of those words and phrases that you individually see that you'd like to change right now? You know, is there anything...

Julie Hammer: Julie here, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Go ahead, Julie.

Julie Hammer: Just a couple of points - not so much to do with the arrows but with the where you've got Board can I suggest you actually specifically put Board DNS Risk Management Framework Working Group, I mean, and whatever acronym is the most suitable.

But otherwise it's perhaps a little bit misleading to people who aren't as familiar with what's going on.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: True.

Julie Hammer: And the other thing that I think might be worth clarifying where we've got - where we're referring to ICANN the community and ICANN the organization that's not so much to do with the constitution of those groups but with the focus of the risk assessment that the groups are chartered to do.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Internal and the wider landscape you mean, Julie. Sorry, that was Cheryl asking...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...a clarifying question.

Julie Hammer: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks. Yeah, okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I get that. It's rough on the screen but I'll tidy that up.

Julie Hammer: Yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: You're the victim...

Julie Hammer: Okay thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: ...of note taking at this point so.

Julie Hammer: Yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay good one. Any other tweaks that we want to do is there? Oh, Julie...

Julie Hammer: Sorry.

Mikey O'Connor: ...no that's an old hand.

Julie Hammer: Oh I didn't mean to raise my hand. I was trying to turn off my agree.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, yeah. I think there's a...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, Mikey, you may not have noticed it but you had almost near perfect row of green ticks before.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh good.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You know...

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, this new computer I still haven't quite got the layout right so I can't see as well as I used to. This new computer has set me back a bit so thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: In more ways than one I suspect, Mikey. But...

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...I just wanted you to note that you had a sea of green before.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh good. Well cool. I'm glad we've got there. I'll go to work and get this tidied up for the Ops crew and then let them hammer on it a bit and then bring it back to you in a week. And we'll see how it looks and get underway. I think that's enough for today.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: I don't have anything else on the agenda.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Unless there's something people want to bring up I think we'll call it quits.

Julie Hammer: No worries.

Mikey O'Connor: No worries. All right. Well have a great week. We'll see you in a week. And...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I can watch 10 more minutes of Olympics - woo hoo.

Mikey O'Connor: Woo hoo. Way to go. All right. Thanks, gang...

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Yippie.

Mikey O'Connor: ...for all the help.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Bye-bye.

Julie Hammer: Thanks, Mikey.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thanks much.

Julie Hammer: Bye.

Mikey O'Connor: Tim, Nathalie, I think we're done with the recording. We can wrap all that up. I thank you both as always...

END