

Transcript
DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group (DSSA WG)
24 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 24 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-20120824-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)

ccNSO Members

- . Wim Degezelle, (CENTR)
- . Takayasu Matsuura. Jp
- . Katrina Sataki.lv
- . Jacques Latour.ca
- .Joerg Schweiger (cCNSO co-chair)

GNSO Members

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

NRO Members

Mark Kusters (ARIN)

SSAC members:

- . Jim Galvin (SSAC Vice Chair)
- . Warren Kumari

ICANN Staff:
. Julie Hedlund
. Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies:
. Rick Koeller, .ca (CIRA)

Coordinator: Please go ahead.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much Sabah. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the DSFA call on the 23rd of August, 2012.

On the call today we have Mikey O'Connor, George Asare Sakyi, (Alexa Benadrone), (Sara Long Lenor),(Andy Gazelle), Takayasu Matsuura, (Julie Hammer), Katrina Sataki, Don Blumenthal, Jim Galvin, Jacques Latour, (Warren Camari), Mark Kusters, and (Yoric Schieger), we have an apology from (Mike Keller) and from staff we Julie Hedland and myself Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind all participants to please say their names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks very much Nathalie and welcome call.

Let's see, first up. The agenda's really short today. We're just going to work on our roles, responsibilities, gaps, overlaps stuff like we did last time and so first a momentary pause. If there's anything somebody would like to put on the agenda this would be a good time to do that. And then also if anybody's got any changes to their statements of interest we'll do that pause. Cool.

Well let me replay the bidding a little bit from the last call. Eventually what we started working on is our first big chunk of work between now and Toronto which is to fill out that diagram; this is the diagram that we started with in the report.

And what we've concluded is the thing to do now is populate this diagram with organizations that do this kind of stuff, figure out who's out there doing these things. And at one point I came up with a really terrible idea which was to do a poll but (Bart) straightened me out on that one.

And so our current scheme is to essentially flesh out this diagram until we're happy with it or at least happier with than we were and then do some desk research to sort of figure out on our own who fits where on this diagram. And once we've built that as a first try, contact all the people that we've placed on the diagram and ask them whether we did this right, let them correct it.

So what we did last week is we started working on improving this diagram because (Julie Hammer) started us off on this and pointed out there's a diagram, the orangey stuff or the hexagonal stuff and then there's a table. And those don't really align. So (Julie) did the first pass on this and pointed out the different parts that are on each of the two things and said see these things don't quite line up so we started working on that.

And I went ahead after our meeting between last time and this time and drew a new version of the diagram and I've made a bunch of changes. So let me walk you quickly through those to let you know what I did so that you can start taking aim and offering course correction.

First of all what I did is I've gotten rid of the stupid hexagonal stuff because when you start adding more stuff around the edge you start getting into drawing incredibly complicated geometric shapes. It took me the better part of two hours to draw a ten-sided version of the hexagon and I decided that was not a good plan because if somebody added one more than I'd to draw an 11-sided diagram. So we are now to circles which gives us the opportunity to put as many things around the outside as well which I think is pretty cool.

Taking advantage of that I took the things that were in the little orangey table that weren't in the diagram and started arraying them around the edge. And

so what you're seeing is more stuff, more kinds of activities, more functions, the array around the edge of the diagram for us to think about.

So over on the right are the sort of things that we started with like risk planning, risk assessment, compliance monitoring, event monitoring. That's sort of the same as the right side of the hexagonal diagram but there's a little more granularity in there.

One of the things that I split apart was compliance monitoring and event monitoring. And part of the reason I did that is because of the - I think I sent this to the whole list. The questions and answers from the DNS RMF project included a reference to something like COBIT one of the big sort of security audit frameworks and I thought oh it would be probably good to introduce the idea of compliance monitoring versus event monitoring. So I split those monitoring things apart.

Then I took, you know, on the old diagram I sort of had everything that was actually doing stuff clumped into one, like frontline mitigation, actually technology stuff, operational practices, incident response. So all this stuff over here was kind of clumped into one bucket and so I split those apart a bit. And then I also sort of split research and analysis out a little bit as another more granular thing to think about. So that's another change that I made.

And then last change that I made is I added a whole new set of descriptions to the edge glue core thing just to sort of make the distinctions clearer to what's going on. And part of the reason I did that was because of sort of a theme that's begun to emerge on the Ops call that I wanted to pull into this conversation which is especially in the area of kind of coordination and sharing.

There was a pretty strong theme in the comments on the DNS cert idea that ICANN brought up. There was pretty strong negative reaction to ICANN doing a DNS cert. But when people wrote those comments a lot of times they talked

about how helpful it would be for some more vehicles to coordinate and share ideas and so on and so forth. And so I kind of wanted to pull that distinction into this drawing.

Now I need to stop at this point and make the standard disclaimer which is to say under no circumstances should somebody think that ICANN is getting ready to do all this stuff. This is really our attempt to map security, stability, resiliency ecosystem and figure out who lives where in this ecosystem so that we can figure out if there are any gaps and overlaps. So that's kind of the story.

I think I'll stop at this point and just see if there are any questions, comments. Oh (Yoric)'s got a question in the chat. I'll start with that. That will give the rest of you time to think of questions.

(Yoric) asks, "How do you define compliance monitoring in our context?" And here's my try at an answer (Yoric). You have to understand that I'm making this up as we go so this could be a really bad answer but let me give it a try and see what you think.

I was thinking about a lot of these things that we might see if you think of our sort of segments on the pie, we might see a lot of dots in the delivery edge organization part of this and so my guess would be that for the most part individual organizations would do their own compliance monitoring.

I think we get into really interesting territory if we were to try to put together a proposal where there was some single or central organization that was responsible for compliance monitoring across the whole ecosystem. That's just my view.

We could certainly change that but at the same time I think what had reminded me of this is that if indeed a model like COBIT comes through in a DNS RMF project, we need to at least acknowledge that a lot of those

security management models include compliance monitoring. So better to put it in here now and have a conversation about the appropriate place and the appropriate people then leave it out.

Jim's in there with, "Isn't the public an important part of compliance monitoring?" Jim do you want to expand that a little bit? That's an interesting idea. Jump on the call and speak up.

Jim Galvin: No I was just making an observation that I don't think that you can monitor everything from a department point of view if you will. Right? I mean sometimes someone is supposed to be serving the public and you can't really monitor that because you're not actually - as a monitoring organization you're not actually executing on those services so you depend at least in part on getting complaints, getting reports and analyzing that and assessing that you've got a pattern and then you have reach out and do something about it.

So I'm just putting that out there as being a part of what a compliance monitoring process includes.

Mikey O'Connor: That's really tasty. I'm just going to screw up your screen for a minute because I've got to over and yank my notes out from underneath...

(Yoric Schieger): While you're fiddling around with the computer screen Mikey may I interrupt you?

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: This is (Yoric).

(Yoric Schieger): I still am not really - I'm not buying it. I think I know what compliance means and I think probably even COBIT would refer to compliance in a way that political compliances meant the compliance of behavior of the management has meant.

Well most of associations with respect to compliance, but compliance in the context of security well I'm still trying to figure out what that could mean and I wasn't too satisfied with your answer. Would you want to give it a second try or anybody else?

Mikey O'Connor: Well let me first do the textbook answer. So in a traditional -- and Don and some of you other guys who are actually knowledgeable about this feel free to chime in -- but in a security context one of the things that generally happens is that I'll go back to the higher education context that I built a lot of this stuff in.

There are standards and so on that are expected in terms of controls, et cetera, et cetera and in our 50-campus university context there were minimum standards that the universities themselves agree needed to be in place. And then they also agreed that they would essentially conduct periodic audits to make sure that those controls indeed was in place.

And that's compliance monitoring. It's compliance to an external standard. Well right and there's Jacques saying for enterprise you can have payment card industry, credit card or SOX -- Sarbanes-Oxley compliance with defined controls and actions or events. You can comply with internal security policies. You would need a security policy to comply with in order to have compliance. But once you have one -- now it's Mikey speaking again -- once you have one then it's fairly common to have a compliance function that goes and checks to make sure that that stuff is in place.

(Warren Camari): Sorry. So this is (Warren Camari):. I guess it comes down to what it is that you hope to accomplish from these audits? I mean for many of the audits or compliance functions they exist to move or to indemnify various people who is going to be viable or not.

I mean I've gone through SOX PTI like two of the ISO things and did all the compliance stuff and I don't think in any way they were useful from a security standpoint. They were useful because now we have a piece of paper that says that we've done them and they're useful because now we have something that says you can continue processing credit cards. But I don't think they actually changed anything in any of the organizations I've worked for from a security standpoint.

I mean if your security is poor enough that the PTI is going to find something, your security is horribly broken. Sorry I've got to add a wrench there. It's just I think a number of times it's a number of auditing organizations. And the only thing I can ever see that came out of that that was useful was if something bad happened we now had somebody that we could point at and say but we did the compliance functions, look we at least tried. Sorry big wrench in there.

Mikey O'Connor: No, no it's a not uncommon conversation in my life. I've spent a lot of time in this world and I'm not sure that I actually want to solve this discussion today.

(Warren Camari): Fair enough.

Mikey O'Connor: I do want to acknowledge though that some of the organizations that we're going to identify, for example the registries, most of the big registries... Have we got - who's on the call today? Do we have any...?

Man: Jim Galvin.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Jim you guys probably are subjected to a bunch of these PCI and so on and so forth. Don't you guys have to do...? And what I was thinking is that an organization like Afiliis would be a good example of a dot at the itch where Afiliis probably does compliance monitoring already.

And I'm not in any way saying that it should go at the core, I'm just saying that it does happen in some organizations primarily usually because of

requirements imposed by customers who say in order for you to be my vendor you have to be SOX compliant or ISO 9000 compliant. And in order to be compliant you have to have monitoring to ensure compliance.

(Warren Camari): And to identify yourself from a number of people you need to have gone through the compliances. I think it's potentially worth us acknowledging on the call, probably not in public, but on the call that it doesn't actually accomplish a huge amount and if it does accomplish a huge amount then you should officially agree that you shouldn't be doing it. I can stop talking. It's just one of my personal pet rats.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh wow. That's a Zen discussion. That's all about beer and late at night, maybe two or three beers before we get to that one.

But one of the - it's always kind of a third-rail topic, one of the beauties of being a retired guy with nothing in day cares is I can throw the third rail stuff out without having to worry about electrocution because I'm not grounded. But it is one of the pieces of the pie and not a bad idea to at least acknowledge.

The queue is building. Jim go ahead.

Jim Galvin: Yes so this is Jim Galvin. With respect to compliance monitoring and whether or not we affiliates do it and I would imagine this kind of applies to others, I think there's an important distinction to make here. I mean we have a compliance officer. Yes they do pay attention to whether or not we as a service provider are meeting the requirements that ICANN policies and procedures have placed on us.

In addition insofar as we're the operator and well we're the service provider, there's a registry operator for example, we're going to have a contractual relationship with that operator too as well as with ICANN and we're going to

have a contractual review there to make sure that we're complying with whatever terms we have in that contract.

I'm trying to phrase this carefully enough to observe that although we call it compliance it's really more of a QA function than it is compliance monitoring I think in the sense that you mean here because it's an internal function not an external one. I mean when I see compliance monitoring here in this circle I think, and maybe this is a point of discussion here, that you want to know - that's sort of an external view of compliance.

There are third parties who want to know if we're compliant and that's a different kind of monitoring. It's a different kind of looking at whether or not we're doing what we need to do. I mean the compliance monitoring that we do is internal only; no one would ever see that. You know, it's not visible unless you are an external touch point of some sort. You know? ICANN would do compliance monitoring on us. They want to make sure they're getting the reports they're supposed to get from us, that kind of thing.

So when you were suggesting that we have a view on compliance monitoring I want to make that distinction. Our view on it is more of an internal one. It's more of a QA function than it is what I think this says. So maybe that's a question.

Mikey O'Connor: I think just to take a first cut at it that you're right, these are two different things and I think in the next generation there probably ought to be too little blobs because they are two different things. I'll make a little room so that I remember to do that.

Because for example at least in the payment card industry I think that those are largely done by external audits and at the same time internal to an organization there's often a group that is like the one that Jim is describing that's doing assessments and monitoring in the more QA proactive sense. And I think each of them - I really don't want to get into the value statement

as to whether they're good or bad. I think if done well they're very helpful. If done badly they become an exercise in filling out checklists and then become subject to (Warren Camari):'s rant.

But in terms of what we're doing right now which is just to figure who's doing what, I'm not sure I want to get to the bottom of that discussion because that's a deep, long conversation.

Let's see. The queue magically cleared.

Okay anything - I thought that was a very helpful conversation and so if there are other things to add. There's (Yoric). Go ahead (Yoric).

(Yoric Schieger): Yes I stepped down because you mentioned that you do not want to clarify in detail at this very call and I think this is okay. So actually I wanted to make a statement to go a little bit deep further down in clarification. But I'm going to be satisfied if I know that we still keep on working to make - to sort this problem out because I think compliance in this context may be misleading. And the only thing I'm calling for is just to make sure that we define it in a way that we really understand what's meant by it and we can do that offline. No worries.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I'd love it. Actually one of the things that I think would be helpful to do offline and maybe try to do it on the list between now and next week's call is to sort of come up with definitions of all of these things so that we know that we're all talking about the same thing and so I think that would be really helpful. I think doing it on the call gets tricky; we could, we could pick off like three or four of these at a time and bash through them on the call but that would take quite a while. And so if we can figure out a way to flesh these out offline I think that would be...

Other thoughts? Is this going in the right direction, the wrong direction, craziness, is Mikey off in the weeds as he often gets? I'm hoping that the

silence is no it's okay rather than he's so far in the weeds we don't know how to get him back to the planet.

Man: Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes sir go ahead.

Man: So of the bullets that you have on outside the circles like risk planning, risk assessment some of those apply to the core but not all of them apply to all of the different areas is that right?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes that's right. And you're actually - I'll send you your \$50 later. Here's where I was headed with this.

Man: Traveler's check eh? Don't forget.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes traveler's check probably in Canadian rather than in US. I think Canadian is a better currency now.

What I was thinking is once we've sort of got this figured out that then what we do is populate some sort of table where this table gets really big because now there are a whole bunch of organizations listed in each of these cells.

So the cells will have to get a lot bigger this table can't be this size. But my idea was that almost all of these things are likely to be present in...a registry organization.

For example because they're going to have to do their own they're going to have to probably do all of this stuff. But then there are other organizations that aren't delivering the DNS that might have a role on this chart.

So my and this is totally a guess is that we'd see registries showing up throughout this column because, you know, I would guess they'd have to do all these things.

But they but some of the other entities that we've identified like...oh I don't know...DNS OARC for example wouldn't show up throughout the whole diagram they would just show up in various places.

And they might tend to show up more at the sharing and core level. And I think that that's the puzzle we're about solving which is figuring out all these organizations and figuring out where on this diagram they said.

Does that get to what you were headed for...Jacques?

You've gotten very silent are you muted? Or just in shock? And maybe in shock is anybody on the call maybe I've been dropped off the call.

(Warren Camari):: I'm still here.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh good (Warren Camari):'s here. Oh there we go.

So Jacques was that where you were headed this rant that I did or is...or not? Where's Jacques? Wonder what happened...

((Crosstalk))

Jacques Latour: I'm here. I'm not (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Not sure?

Jacques Latour: No.

Mikey O'Connor: Well that's okay. We're early yet. This is the beginning of something but I'll..., you know, I mean...

Jacques Latour: Are you supposed to have something on the screen?

Mikey O'Connor: Oh it's the oh my screen share fell down hold on a minute. I get it. I don't know how I did that. Now it should be there. Is it there now?

Jacques Latour: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Yes okay. I so and so this is the table I was talking about. Did you guys see this before I fell down?

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Probably not.

(Warren Camari):: And then it did crash when you were switching to it.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh okay. So I'll keep an eye on that. I wasn't paying attention. So Jacques what I was thinking is that the registries would tend to show up in this column on this table the edge column because they have to do all this stuff.

But OARC just to pick on them they might only show up in a few of these columns.

Jacques Latour: Okay well that makes sense.

Mikey O'Connor: And then..., you know, and so the edge tends to be really populated with people who do work. Whereas the glue sharing collaboration layer there

might be people who are really interested in doing that like DSN OARC and they might tend to show up more in that layer.

And then at the core it might be a very small group of people. And I think that the interesting puzzle is to sort of figure out who lives where on this chart. But I think a table like that might be the way to do it.

And so now you got the full animation effect. Sorry about the dropping on that.

Jacques Latour: Yes the answer is yes.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay, cool. Because I think that the table if I go back to that is the desk research. I think, you know, once we've got the first, you know, once we've got this list figured out, you know, what are the things that we want to put in the table.

And once we've got good definitions for those things or at least definitions that don't drive people crazy then I think it's time to put people in these cells at least as a first try.

And then go to them and say, this is our table what do you think? Is this an accurate depiction of where you and your organization sit or are we completely crazy?

(Warren Camari):: Well sorry.

Mikey O'Connor: Go ahead (Warren Camari):.

(Warren Camari):: It's (Warren Camari): again. There is some risk with opting people if it's the way you said. Because a lot of people are going to probably overestimate their reports within the community or what the displace.

And also overestimate how wide their reach of impact is. So I think that...often people self classify they might their students more of what they liked to (unintelligible) therefore they think they can do but is what they actually are accomplishing.

I (unintelligible) that way to that really corny.

Mikey O'Connor: Well I think there is a whole series of questions. I think one question is have we depicted what you do correctly? And then sometimes the answer will be, yes that's good. And sometimes it'll be, no we do more things. And sometimes it will be, no we do less things.

(Warren Camari):: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Then there will be another question which is what do you want to do on this chart? And again I think the answer's maybe sometimes, we want to do more things. And other times the answer will be, well we'd really prefer to do less things.

So this is a kind of...

(Warren Camari):: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: ...back and forth conversation I think between people. And I think it's perfectly okay for an organization or a representative of an organization to say, well we do all these things and for some of the rest of to say, really?

You really think you do blah blah? We've never been aware of that. Or...

(Warren Camari):: (Unintelligible) we believe that we can or that somebody will be able to say yes I don't really believe that you are (unintelligible) person on the Internet.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh yes that's well yes except for me. The nice thing about me is that I firmly
I...

((Crosstalk))

(Warren Camari):: ...the least important job so I...I got my role all figured out. But yes I mean I
think that there and I think that that's one of the really useful things of a
conversation like this is to have a place to have a conversation about roles
and responsibilities.

Oh (Donton) is Don's in a queue. Go ahead Don.

Don Blumenthal: Hi. Where I at least I've gotten a little off track here is I guess roles with
respect to what? I looked at your table there and I see a lot of items where a
company's rightly going to say, we do that for ourselves.

Mikey O'Connor: Right.

Don Blumenthal: But the question is making clear that we're talking about do you do it with
respect to the (unintelligible), you know, with respect to your position in the
Internet?

(Would) something...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Somebody's got a phone ringing.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Is that your phone Don?

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: A giant tone that's coming through. Oh it stopped oh good. Don's the tone totally obliterated the last half of what you were saying.

Don Blumenthal: Okay. I guess it's important to make the distinction on this list when you're talk many possible responding there is. Does do the items apply to what the company does for its shelves as opposed as to what the company does...

Mikey O'Connor: For others.

Don Blumenthal: ...with respect to arch your roles meaning Internet security...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Right. Well and I think that at least in this iteration of the chart...the premise is that if you're at the edge that's part of the reason I added all those words at the bottom of the circles is that if you're at the edge you're doing things.

So you are a PR you are doing incident response for PIR. And so that's why I'm expecting to see the registries pretty much all the way around the edge because, you know, I think they have to do this in order in some form or another they probably have to do all of these things.

I think there are other organizations that do these things for themselves as well. And...they can live on the edge too.

For example I would say that one of the things that OARC DNS OARC just to pick on them does is they do a research and analysis, you know, that's part of their mission.

And so they're doing jobs their edge job is research and analysis. So I would expect them to get a dot at the edge for research and analysis because it's their mission.

Then the next order of business is okay how about sharing that stuff. Now in the case of OARC again that's sort of their mission is to share that research and analysis that they do with other people but let's go back to PIR.

One of the delicate subjects, you know, this was part of the confidential information discussion was well how much of that incident response stuff that you do...do you share with others in the ecosystem and how do you do it?

And, you know, are there good mechanisms for you to do it? So but go ahead Don.

Don Blumenthal: It's part of what I sorry. Part of what I'm getting at is being clear on what we're talking about in the different roles in the company.

Sure PIR is interested in, you know, the (unintelligible) is an example. Yes we're concerned about incidence response but do we need to share that if the incident response is related to our personnel system as opposed to a problem with the registry system.

Mikey O'Connor: Ah.

Don Blumenthal: And I guess I should more accurately say should we be concerned that affiliate deals we got because they do all the important stuff anyway we can just say that.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes no I get that. And I think that we do have to always apply that giant in quote dud DNS cookie cutter to this. Unless I mean I think the one time that you might hop out of the DNS is let's say that you had a really cool idea to do incident response and you happen to be using that idea on your personnel system.

And you wanted to share that idea you don't want to share the data you don't want to share the incidents because they're completely irrelevant to the DNS.

But you've got a neat gizmo that you've built that might be helpful for other people doing incident response stuff and you want to share that idea.

That might go into the glue layer. You might say, hey now here's the best practice. We're using it in personnel so we haven't gotten any data that we could show you but it's a neat gizmo.

Don Blumenthal: No I agree right but I extend the line here this and I guess and they suggesting if we could add that I know we're on the same page when the item comes and you need to make those distinctions then we start asking questions.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes well and I think that what I'm hearing on this call is that I think this is a call I have to go through the transcript on because there's no way to take notes on what's being said it's too subtle.

But, you know, one of the things I'm really hearing is that the framework isn't too bad but there's a lot of texture that doesn't come through yet that needs to be there.

Partly so we don't confuse people and partly so that we don't light incendiary discussions needlessly...because..., you know, this is kind of new ground and I I'm quite cheerful to go ahead and grasp the third rails of the electric trolley firmly in my...bottom of the process rule.

Because if I get electrocuted it doesn't hurt my (unintelligible) at all I just have more time to climb the radio tower. But I think that if we can have this conversation it might be very helpful for the ecosystem to sort of figure out what to expect of each other and what not to expect of each other.

And that kind of gets back to (Warren Camari):'s comment, you know, of roles.

Jacques Latour: My (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Jacques go ahead.

Jacques Latour: So the way I see this is that incident to responses like compliance you have internal incidence response for your organization how you deal with stuff internally.

And you have external incident interest ones. External is important because if...what you have here is that you have multiple edge you have multiple glue...slash region and you have one core right?

So it should you need to show let's say somebody from a different continent is attacking (unintelligible). So we're going to have an internal response plan to address that.

And then at one point or another we need to go out of our edge and then to reach the regional glue like we're going to go out to the Canadian sea cert and tell them we're being attacked by so and so.

These guys the glue is going to reach a core to say, who's where is so-and-so and how do we reach the edge for that region and then you come in to go into the core out the core and there's multiple entities.

And that's today we don't have the core incident response external incidence response bucket. That's what's missing.

Mikey O'Connor: Wow that's a good...that's a great comment and I'm going to have to walk a couple of times around the farm before I figure out how to represent it on this thing.

Because I think that in a way, you know, now we're skirting dangerously close to the cert third rail. You know, that's the function that a lot of people were looking for and ICANN sort of marched in and said, well we'll do a cert and that did not fly. But at the same time...

((Crosstalk))

Jacques Latour: So there's...

Mikey O'Connor: ...that would be a really useful thing to have right?

Jacques Latour: But today you notice the day we go we show this to first is a group of some countries that are twisted but it's not all of them right?

Mikey O'Connor: Right.

Jacques Latour: So we have a fragmented core and somehow we need to show that for two edge in different continents for two edge that are not trusted or don't trust each other or want to reach the others are complicated because we have a fragmented core.

(Warren Camari):: (Mike).

Mikey O'Connor: (Warren Camari): I bet go ahead.

(Warren Camari):: Yes that's well done. So I wasn't going to mention this earlier because it might all be semantics. But you mentioned textural on (unintelligible).

And many of the cases you've been saying things like you think the registry will be around the outside or the registry will be this sort of which you would do that.

In the new regime I think there is going to be a very large number of the registry does very little as the registry backend. But before because, you know, a lot of registries and the outsourcing there's stuff and I think that's going to become more (cost).

So I think we might need to represent (unintelligible). So and obviously the registry backend provider the shell has contracted with the actual registry and so there's going to be a lot of what (unintelligible) talk about what I can share and that the registries are not going to have any visibility.

And so I think this greatly accepted (unintelligible) vibrations. So I think that they need to be sort of more (unintelligible) affected how does the registry backend interact with incident response spoke keeping in mind that they're we are contractual obligations and that we already represent etcetera.

And I think this is going to end up getting tricky very fast.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes and I think that one of the ways that we handle the distinction between registry and registry backend is simply by the way we populate this table. Because I think that even I've got too many windows open to do this but I think in the report we make the distinction between registries and registry backend operators already.

But if we don't we should.

((Crosstalk))

(Warren Camari):: Yes I mean I think that we might mention it but...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

(Warren Camari):: ...when it actually when the rubber meets the road I think that there's going to be a lot of, you know, I believe that you have bad (unintelligible). Maybe I do but I can't talk about it because I'm contractually stuck...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

(Warren Camari):: ...like (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Right. Jacques is that a new hand? You want to jump back in? Or is that the old hand that you started this conversation with?

Jacques Latour: It's an old one.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. What I'd want to do if it's okay with you all we're getting pretty close to the top of the hour so this is maybe a reasonable time to sort of begin drawing this to a close is continue to focus on the list of functions right now to make sure that we've got...at least a roughly close to right list.

And then once we've got the list of buckets right...I think that the kinds of conversations like the one that we just had with Jacques and (Warren Camari): are the ones that we have when we're trying to populate the list and we can sort of, you know, if (Warren Camari):'s little bit right there was a perfect example of well okay who will we put in which bucket in our desk research.

And then once that's done we can go out to the people that we've put into these buckets and say, have we got that right? And I think that the answers going to come back that some of us do and some of us don't, you know.

So some registries do these things and some of them don't. Some registry backend operators do these things some of them don't.

I think Jacques's point about the fragmented core is a sort of a fascinating one. But I think that what this at least highlights for me is that this is very useful conversation for the ecology to have.

And...I think it's pretty reasonable for to set the expectation that we won't necessarily present something that's done we'll just present something that's well started and say, well here's a first try and here are a lot of really interesting questions that have fallen out of it.

And keep the conversation going. That's kind of where I'm thinking we're going to wind up anyway.

Is the screen blank again? Or is that an old one (Julie)?

(Julie): (Unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: That's the old one okay. Well anything else we got a few minutes left but we could end just a few minutes early too.

If this is close enough I think what I'm going to try and do is listen to this transcript listen to the mp3 and drive some of these points into drawings...for next time.

In the meantime what would be helpful is if...maybe I'll pick on folks like Don.

Don do you feel like this list that's on in the table in front of us are there like textbook one paragraph definitions of these that you could just go copy and paste into an email to the rest of us?

Is that asking too much? If not I'll take an action to also try and write a paragraph about each one of these. Because what the part of the confusion

that came...is, you know, these are sort of the definitions I was using 10 or 15 years ago.

And...I can probably take a lot of this stuff and sort of weave it into a paragraph or two about each of these things to begin to give us a platform to sort of keep this up until it's in shape that we feel comfortable with.

But if there's a set of preexisting wheels out there that I don't need to reinvent that would be even better because then we could say, well here are the definitions according to blah whatever the source would be and that would be a little bit more credibility I think than...me just doing it on my own.

So that's the puzzle I'll leave with your folks between now and next week's call.

Along with, you know, thoughts on the list about things to add things to combine we've had it a couple where we've got this internal external dimension that's actually a dimension that probably applies to almost every single one of the things here.

There's internal standards tools and techniques. There's external ones there's internal training there's external etcetera.

So I may try to weave that into the diagram somehow in a different way. But this is at least for me been very helpful.

And so the audio isn't working. Is that still the case? Is the AC audio a problem or is that an old email that just rolled into me?

We might want to check that one too Nathalie.

Anyway thanks.

Jacques Latour: Oh sorry (Mike) I can't hear you.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh okay so my audio's going in and out.

Jacques Latour: Joking.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh sorry. It's too early in the morning Jacques. Don't do that to me. I haven't had any coffee yet he whines.

Anyway that's it folks thanks a lot. I'll see you in a week.

(Warren Camari):: Thanks (Mike).

Mikey O'Connor: All right bye.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Nathalie that was fabulous. Thanks a million.

((Crosstalk))

Nathalie Peregrine: (Unintelligible) and that's the recording.

END