Alejandro Pisanty:    So now we will officially start the meeting – you can all agree. This is a meeting of the Stability, Security and Resilience of the DNS Review Team of ICANN under the AOC.  This is a working meeting.  This meeting is open, though it doesn't have planned any public participation as it's an internal working meeting.

Anyone present is very welcome.  Just be warned that we don't have an open mic out there but in particular, Glen, we're honored – that's the background for your email, and I know your presence here means a lot more than that.

As you all know, we've been collecting inputs, elaborating on them – especially the Drafting Team has been doing a lot of work on creating a text that will be the report.  In particular, at the beginning of this week we focused on what would be the recommendations that we would make and we have hammered them out to some level, but we still need two things.

One of them is to find out whether we will have all the recommendations we will admit.  I'm sure we haven't gotten all of them yet – that's one of the reasons to meet.  The other thing that we have to do, of course, is to come to some level of agreement within the Review Team about the substance and text of the recommendations and the very important fact that each of these recommendations has to be backed by fact or informed opinion and reasoning so that they are easy to follow, easy to understand, easy

for people to understand when they become obsolete – for example in two days or two years – and where they would go for new ones if that happens.

To establish a metric, to make them compelling – as I said in the previous meeting, in the public input meeting – to make them compelling for everybody who reads them, in particular for ICANN staff – easy to follow and put metrics on ICANN staff or Board because some of them make it all the way to the Board – or may become actions for staff to be overseen by the Board.

The work has been exciting, has been very lively and interesting; it's been intensive.  I would start the meeting by being very thankful and proud of being in a team with people like you, and to thank in close quarters now Alice and Olof and Patrick and Denise and the people who have made this work at all possible by their constant vigilance and support.  It's been an amazing level of support.

The basic time management plan I have in mind for today is let's do a little bit of updates and brainstorming, then let's go into the recommendations – you have them in print in each of your places and we can go back to the text and see how it's done.

By the end of today – let's say at some time like 3:00 or 4:00 p.m., we should stop whatever work we're doing - understanding and hammering out recommendations and seeing where they have to come from - and use a short while to organize for further work.

We'll know better how to scope it and make a division of labor by then.

But what we have to achieve in the coming month or so is to actually have a complete draft with full text from what's been going on and I think it's going to be like a 40-page text plus an Executive Summary, plus maybe a Section with the recommendations alone – stuff like that.

So I'll leave it there and call on whoever of you wants to start by reporting what you've been doing and explaining to the group what you think is a way forward.  Let's have about half an hour brainstorm, and then that will give us a clear course of what to do. Simon, do you want to start?

Simon McCalla:          What I would suggest, if that's okay…

Alejandro Pisanty:      Pardon me.  Do we have any remote membership?

Olof Nordling:           For the time being we have no remote participation.

Simon McCalla:          What I'd suggest is, if it's okay, instead of spending half an hour, a really quick update on what we've planned, what we do.  I would suggest that those of us who have been involved in the work this

week just really briefly do that.  I think it would be great to get split into groups as quickly as we can, if that makes sense, if that's okay with people.  I think we can discuss and brainstorm in the groups and get going with the drafting.

Just very briefly, I amongst others, have been working on, as you know, there's a chunk of analysis that we did between Singapore and here – you've all seen that on the mailing list.  If you've read it, then great; if you haven't read it, feel free to read it.  I think the documents have been uploaded into the Wiki.  Alice, is that right?  Okay, they're on the mailing list anyway, so do feel free to comment.

We've taken sort of a lot of that work and we have taken the approach of putting together a draft report framework and an outline of all the issues and recommendations that we feel have come out in the analysis so far.  Some of us have met just about every day this week to craft that into a list of recommendations.

So it's kind of weird.  We're kind of starting with the end in mind with a set of recommendations with a view to then filling in the justification for those recommendations.  That would then form the basis of a draft report, view being that the draft report would be something that's probably only four to five weeks away if we take that approach.

We've had a lot of analysis, a lot of input from people, a lot of opinion which has been fantastic.  We've had some recent stuff coming in this week from Bill and from others which is great.  So

we've got a situation now.  We've got recommendations that are really well backed by some strong analysis, and we've got some recommendations that are backed by some really interesting insight.  And we got some recommendations that we think are right but we need to go and justify them as well, and I think our job as a team today and over the coming weeks is to start filling in those gaps so that we end up with a draft report.  Jeff, so I think you want to answer that.

Jeff Brueggeman:    I think you're right.  Maybe the first Sections of the report are probably the ones where analysis was done months ago and there's some draft writing and that can just be filled in, and then some of the risk management is newer thinking and I think have some proposed recommendations that kind of seem right, but need to be fleshed out.  And so I think that an important step coming out of the meeting is that everyone has clarity of specific tasks and achievable things that we can get done quickly.

Alejandro Pisanty:    Other inputs, reports?  Bill, do you want to report a bit in words about the work you've been doing besides the fantastic (inaudible) in the past few days?

Bill Manning:    Well, the output from the Washington, D.C. meeting – we created work packets for people to work on, and I ended up with three of

them, or being responsible for part of three of them, and I finally collected the interview pieces and other stuff and tried to summarize into something that was digestible for two of them.  I'm working on the third one now.  So hopefully those will be useful as the Drafting Team puts the report together.

Alejandro Pisanty:          Thanks, Bill.  Anders?

Anders Rafting:             I have been looking at ICANN's ability to handle state or civil (inaudible), to handle the risks towards the function or the part that they are responsible for, but also handle situations where the broader attack against the whole internet can impact on ICANN's way of working.

So I have compiled a set of eight questions regarding this and sent to the Board the SSAC Chair (inaudible) and the ICANN CU, the ICANN security officer.  I haven't so far got any responses from the Board members, but from the SSAC chair I have got good response and I also got response from some key individuals in Sweden from the Swedish internet community, so I'm working on compiling a report of all these answers.

And I did promise to get answers from Rod Beckstrom and Jeff Moss with the coming seven days.  And also Steve Crocker has promised to give a separate answer to me very soon, perhaps today.  Thank you.

Alejandro Pisanty:      Thank you, Anders.  Dave – maybe – do you want to report on your work?

David Cake:             I did an updated review of the SSAC; pretty much concluded that the SSAC had done a very good job of following their own review. There are one or two things where they've not, but it didn't seem to affect SSR at all – mostly just relationships between the Board and SSAC.  And, yes, I would basically say we should probably mention in the report that SSAC did a very good job following their review, and they should do it again and it improved the working of that body pretty significantly by the looks of that.

I've been also looking at this issue of exactly how the SSAC giving out the responsibility for the DNS Threat Landscape – risk landscape – and I think that became much clearer in the meeting with SSAC yesterday with their comments from Ram about the Board group which is essentially that the Board are building a new framework for that, so it's an interesting point.

We're reporting on something on a changing landscape very much. The Board have not yet decided what shape that process is going to take within ICANN which is, of course, absolutely crucial.  So I guess if we're going to say anything negative about it, it would be that there's a gap in between the responsibility being given up; being taken away from SSAC and between having a plan to replace it.

But in terms of what it will be replaced by - that's still very much in flux.  So that's going to be an awkward issue for us to report on.  We may have to kind of put some of that in at the end of the process as we track what the Board Working Group is doing if we are able to.


Alejandro Pisanty:        Denise asked to give us some feedback on that.


Denise Michel:        Just a quick note.  Actually SSAC was never doing that.  One of the reasons that they asked that that be removed from their mandate is because they never had the membership resources; staffing…


David Cake:        They felt they weren't effectively doing it in the first place.


Denise Michel:        No, they weren't.  They had never tried and they were never doing it.  And so after the SSAC review, they went through and they cleaned up and made sure that the bylaws and the published mandate for SSAC was aligned with what they actually could and would be doing.


David Cake:        That's really useful.

Alejandro Pisanty:          Martin, a quick update on your work.

Martin Hannigan:            I had three questions in the work packet and I've got responses from a few people.  I need to correlate those responses and return them to the group.  I've spent a fairly considerable amount of time integrating the responses that I have received into the current draft that we have along with the Drafting Team.

Alejandro Pisanty:          Thank you.  Anymore updates, questions from what you've heard?  So we should dip into the recommendations.

Simon McCalla:              I guess I want to be careful.  If we're going to go through all 30 or 35 recommendations on the list as a group, there's a danger that we're going to end up deep-diving into every one of them which could cost us a lot of time.  So if there's a way – I mean I open it to the floor whether there's a way if people want to go through this, whether we're better off splitting into smaller groups to go through them.  Just trying to think about time for everybody really and just trying to take my time and (inaudible).

Alejandro Pisanty:          In fact, the risk is that we will only get five done if we do them in a single group.  So I would beg you to read them.  I think it's easier

in your printouts and how do you want to split them?  I think that we should split back in the original structure or by Section numbers – 1, 2 and 3.  One of them, especially 3, is a lot less developed.  Two groups.  You're more for two groups, right?

Simon McCalla:    I think what we discovered this week – in fact we discovered over the last few weeks – is that 1 and 2, the sort of governance and implementations side of things – you can't easily just go into governance without looking at how that governance is implemented and so what we found is there's quite the overlap between my work and Jeff's work.

So the suggestion was… my suggestion would be we split into what was traditionally Teams 1 and 2 together to work on that side of the report, and then the separate team to look at the risk side of things which is perhaps slightly less developed anyway and look at risk, risk mitigation and so forth.  But it's just a suggestion.

Alejandro Pisanty:    For that also…

Jeff Brueggeman:    I was going to say also I don't think there's that much left to do in Section 1 other than the writing.  And so I think if we roughly break in between the Section 2 and Section 3, those are where the big work efforts are, I think.

Alejandro Pisanty:    So we will have you two – Jeff and Simon – lead on one of the subgroups for 1 and 2 during a couple of hours here – let's say from now to lunch, and I and if Martin wants to, we could be leading on the other one.  Just leading means mostly keeping time and note-taking.

We do have a lot of text to hammer out what we thought on planning the session is this is not a good day for actually go write extensive text.  The text I mean is, for example, in the extensive document you'll find were a couple of pages about root server system – how it operates and what the relationships of the RSAC are, which are only draft language.  It has to be fleshed out and sharpened.

But we'll have to look for the ccNSO, for the GAC, for a number of parts – SSAC, certainly; the SSA – parts of it are directly relevant to the SSR Review because one of the things that we are reviewing are the relationships of ICANN with these entities.

So I don't think it's in any way practical to try to do the text today.  What we need to do is start from the recommendations backwards and reverse-engineer the document and decide who is going to take the responsibility for those pages and it's going to be a bunch of pages in the end - the descriptive precedent Section that leads to the recommendations.

So I mean, it's not like there's not a lot of writing left, it's just I'm trying to interpret what it says.  In Section 1 there's not that much work left for writing down the recommendations.  Right?

Jeff Brueggeman:     Right, and there is at least a draft of the analysis and that has been pretty stable for a while as far as the issues and the recommendations, so yeah.  I do think the one other thing I would say as we're all working on these Sections is we've tried to put in placeholders for the data requested that either we understand are pending with the staff or we want to make – and I do think in the interest of time – the more we can come out today with kind of the list of "here's what we're looking for," the better.  We've gotten a bunch of information recently, but I think this is a good chance to try and crystallize the information requests as well.

Alejandro Pisanty:     Do you have a choice of teammates you want to make or do you want for people to volunteer?

Simon McCalla:     Just a suggestion actually from Alice now which I think may have some…  One other thing is we did go and observe the WHOIS Team going through their recommendations earlier on this week just to see how they were doing.  And just putting some ideas out on the floor so I'm shooting from the hip here, but rather than deep-dive into the recommendations, in order that the whole group

- particularly those that haven't seen the recommendations we've got – is there a way in which we can route through those 30 recommendations together as a group without discussing them, *i.e.*, everyone's kind of thumbs-up, thumbs-down; that seems like a good one, move on; that seems like a difficult one, great, we put that in the difficult pile.

So that we end up very quick establishing whether we as a group, we're all roughly in sync on those 30 recommendations.  And I'm talking about taking less than 15 minutes to root through the entire list.  So we don't deep-dive into any of them.  If there's a concern, we get right, flagged; move on.  Is that worthy?

Jeff Brueggeman:           Sounds like a good idea.

Alejandro Pisanty:          Let's test it for the first few and see if it works.  We'll see.

Male:                            Could be good background for the working groups, getting everyone up to speed too.

Alejandro Pisanty:          So the first one's on screen; you can actually read it on screen there.

| | |
|---|---|
| Simon McCalla: | Alejandro, do you want me to do the run through them?  Does that make sense? |
| | |
| Alejandro Pisanty: | One-by-one read them.  You read 1 and Jeff reads 2 and so forth. |
| | |
| Simon McCalla: | ICANN should retain the foundational Section of the SSR Framework and further refine its statement of its SSR remit and limited technical mission.  ICANN should elicit public comment on the proposed description and establish a consensus-based statement of its SSR remit and limited technical mission. |

So how do people feel – good, bad?  Guys, can we have a vote?  It would be great if everyone on their email on their laptop in order to make this process work.  So in order to make this work so we get through this, can we have a thumbs-up or a thumbs-down for each of the recommendations.

So I'll make a suggestion – could we just shut laptops; let's do that.  Everyone shut your laptops except for you cause you have to keep this up and let's just rattle through this and then we can go through it.

So first one – thumbs-up; thumbs-down on how we're feeling about that.  Guys?  We got a consensus?  So we've got one… Sorry, Alice, can you flip back up again.  How are we doing?  I think we got rough consensus with 1.  In fact let me record that.

Alejandro Pisanty:      Let's look for the ones where we really have to have a lot of discussion.  It doesn't mean they're getting ratings on; it only means that we are going to look for more difficult ones first.

Simon McCalla:          Okay, so I'm going to record on "consensus, but it needs a re-write."  Is everyone comfortable with that?  Great.

Jeff Brueggeman:        The second one is: Once ICANN issues a consensus-based statement of its SSR remit and limited technical mission, ICANN should utilize consistent terminology and descriptions of this statement in all materials.

Ondrej Filip:           ICANN should organize all projects and initiatives in its SSR Frameworks according to the categories of responsibilities identified in the Foundational Section.  ICANN also should link any other SSR-related activities back to the Foundational Section of the SSR Framework in order to avoid uncertainty about whether ICANN is adhering to its SSR remit and limited technical mission.

Alejandro Pisanty:      David.

**EN**

David Cake:                     ICANN's implementation of its SSR remit and limited technical mission shall be reviewed on a regular basis in order to maintain consensus and elicit feedback from the community.  This process should be repeated on a regular basis, perhaps in conjunction with the cycle of future SSR reviews.

Simon McCalla:                 So pass with a rewrite.

Alejandro Pisanty:             Martin, can you go next?  It's the one that starts with "ICANN should…"

Martin Hannigan:               I'm sorry.  We were just talking about a small typo.  We're on Section 1.3, correct?   1.3 – ICANN's Relationship with Other Operators of DNS Infrastructure – ICANN should continue to maintain and improve constructive relationships with other operators of DNS infrastructure, including root zone operators, ccTLD registries, gTLD registries and registrars and other relevant parties.  ICANN should establish clear processes with the goal of encouraging broad and active engagement.

Alejandro Pisanty:             To build a modem...

Jeff Brueggeman:    The other thing that I think might be better later is if you don't think it goes far enough or you write them in, so the question, sometimes maybe it's general, but I would like to say something more, you know?

Alejandro Pisanty:    Right now we're only looking for whether there is some real disputes.  Xiaodong, can you read the next one?

Xiaodong Lee:    ICANN should collaborate with other operations of DNS infrastructure to develop the conditions for increasing transparency and promoting mutual accountability in these relationships.

Alejandro Pisanty:    Bill.

Bill Manning:    The SSR Framework structure to first bullet - ICANN should build on its current SSR Framework by establishing a clear set of objectives and prioritizing its initiatives and activities in accordance with these objectives.  This process should be informed by a pragmatic cost benefit and risk analysis.  Sure.

Simon McCalla:    Do you want to get any more specific on that?

Bill Manning:          Do I want to get more specific on that?  I'm just reading the text.

Simon McCalla:          So we just capture that as "needs focus."  Yeah?  So it's one in this fashion might be worth working in threes.

Male:          .21 – Second bullet – ICANN should continue its outreach efforts to expand community participation and input into their SSR Framework development process.  ICANN also should establish a process for obtaining more systematic input from other ecosystem participants.

Alejandro Pisanty:          So it's now for me.  Now we go to the 2.2 Implementation – first bullet – ICANN should establish a process that allows the community to track the implementation of the SSR Framework. Information should be provided with enough clarity that the community can track ICANN's execution of its SSR responsibilities, while not harming ICANN's ability to operate effectively.    The dashboard process being used to track implementation of the ATRT recommendations serves as a good model.

Simon McCalla:          ICANN should establish a more structured internal process for showing how activities and initiatives relate to specific strategic

goals, objectives and priorities in the SSR Framework.  It also should establish metrics and milestones for implementation. Approved?

Jeff Brueggeman:    Last one in 2.2 - ICANN should conduct an annual review of its progress in implementing the SSR Framework and include this assessment as a component of the following year's SSR Framework.  We actually were able to get come instant reaction from Jeff Moss and he liked that idea actually, so…

Bill Manning:    There's a small issue with that which is what do you do with lingering issues that never get resolved.

David Cake:    The process helps identify them.  There's a limit to how much we can essentially micromanage anything.

Simon McCalla:    I think it's a good point by Bill and just keeping to our process, can we just flag that one just for consideration?

Alejandro Pisanty:    I have flagged and lost initiatives.  Ondrej?

Ondrej Filip:                    2.3 – ICANN's SSR Related Organization and Budget - ICANN should increase the transparency of information about organization and budget related to implementing the SSR Framework and performing SSR-related functions.  Information should be provided with enough clarity that the community can track ICANN's execution of its SSR responsibilities, while not harming ICANN's ability to operate efficiently.

David Cake:                    Generally positive, but you might want to give some idea about to what level the budget should be needs to be discussed.

Alejandro Pisanty:             Taking note.  I'm taking note of it.

Alice Jansen:                  So should I add specifics needed or…?  Okay.

Alejandro Pisanty:             To note the described level of detail required.  Dave, your turn to read.

David Cake:                    ICANN should establish a more structured internal process for showing how organization and budget decisions relate to the SSR Framework, including the underlying cost-benefit analysis.

Alejandro Pisanty:          Martin.  That one went down as approved.


Martin Hannigan:            ICANN should publish, monitor and update documentation on the organization and budget resources needed to manage SSR issues in conjunction with introduction of new gTLDs; in brackets: to be refined once we get additional information.


Alejandro Pisanty:          Was almost approved.


Xiaodong Lee:               ICANN should continue its efforts to step up contract compliance enforcement and provide adequate resources for this function. ICANN also should develop a more structured process for monitoring compliance issues and investigations.


Alejandro Pisanty:          I'm totally thumbs-up for this one, but I think that we should flag it for more work.  I find it good as it stands, but I think that we need to structure it.


Jeff Brueggeman:            Based on some of the feedback that we've received over the last few days, I think that it just needs to be strengthened up a little bit.

| | |
|---|---|
| Male: | And also reflect the work that we just heard is underway and it might just be to keep it going. |
| David Cake: | I was just about to say, given we just heard stuff about it in the last hour, we should probably… |
| Alejandro Pisanty: | That one's for today. |
| Male: | I believe we are in data requests.  Simon has requested additional analysis… |
| Alejandro Pisanty: | No, where there says analysis on that request on the printout on this document, it means that there's analysis work or data requests open for the recommendation. |
| Bill Manning: | So we are on 2.4?  Okay.  A comment before I jump into 2.4 is that all of the things that we've talked about thus far are kind of strategic and do not allow ICANN to rapidly respond in the event of an unexpected activity as part of SSR. |
| | 2.4 – First bullet - ICANN should continue to refine its Strategic Plan objectives, particularly the goal of maintaining and driving |

DNS availability.  It also should establish a direct linkage between the SSR Framework and the Strategic Plan.

Male:    And I would say just to flag for when a new draft of the 2012 – 2015 Strategic Plan was released just last week, so we have that as something that needs to be analyzed.  So I think that one will be refined as we take a look.  But I think they have made some refinements already to those goals.

Male:    2.4 – Second bullet – ICANN should implement a standards-based change control process for all changes to the root so there is documentation for tracking authorizations and compliance with the process; in brackets: to be refined as we get more information.

Male:    Why is it just rated to the root?  Why not some other DNS?

Alejandro Pisanty:    Just one by one.  You need this for some other part of the system just flag it "need additional paragraph for the rest."

Simon McCalla:    And this one came about from a discussion mid-way which suggested that we had some intelligence to say particularly changes being pushed through to IANA may sometimes not be done in as structured a way as possible.

Male:                              Quite surprised to learn.

Alejandro Pisanty:          Now we move to areas where - we have been doing ICANN direct operations.  Now these move to 2.5 – Areas Where ICANN Acts as a Coordinator, Collaborator and Facilitator.  First bullet there – ICANN should facilitate and support the development of SSR-related Best Current Practices for accredited registrars and initiate a process to promote the adoption of these practices, such as through incorporation into the registrar accreditation processes and/or registry-registrar agreements.   And we have also a paragraph there – one more language was for self-regulation within the registrars.  Practice for code of conduct.

David Cake:                     I think we need incorporation into the registrar accreditation and so on implies that sort of a… that will need to be encouraged rather than enforced and we need to have that.

Male:                              I think we should flag it for more discussion because it needs to be crystal clear and the intention of using the skin in the game is really what's important here, and I think that the way it's written is right now the scope is really wide and we want to tighten that up a little bit.

Bill Manning:          There is a plan to replace RC 2870 which is one of the ICANN documents they use for validating name servers from the new TLD applications.  That's going to get done before March so they are in fact – hopefully through the IATF, yes – but that's the intent and that's not coming out of ICANN; that's actually coming out of the root operator community.

Male:                 What's that number there?

Bill Manning:          2870.

Male:                 How will that affect the registrars?

Bill Manning:          When a new TLD comes online, one of the things that is required is a technical analysis of the underlying infrastructure including the name servers, and RC 2870 has been the standard in use for the last 12 years and it's woefully out of date.

Jeff Brueggeman:       But the reason why I thought we should flag this was not specifically related to driving anything in the RC process; it was also to set some operational excellence by example not necessarily related to the RC series.  For example, we made a recommendation

**EN**

with respect to standard space change control processes and what not.

But again, I think in keeping with Simon's wish that we just not deep-dive into these things, we should discuss it later.

Simon McCalla:    Okay, just an explanation on this next one.  This one is aimed at folks like Nominet where there's no direct contractual relationship, henceforth, the language is slightly different.  But it's the same intent which is - ICANN should encourage supporting organizations to develop and publish SSR-related Best Current Practices for their members.  Pass?

Male:    With more discussion I think.  Again, the operating words BCP – I think that's going to send people in different directions and I think…

Simon McCalla:    Fair enough.  We had that debate about that because techie folks use BCP as…

David Cake:    And do we want to be any more explicit about how we should encourage them?  I mean it's a bit…

Alejandro Pisanty:          Approved on flight so we'll work on it today.


Jeff Brueggeman:            …on Section 3 are a little less developed but I think the concepts are worth getting out there.  ICANN should continue the… so this is General Risk Management Process – ICANN should continue the ongoing process of forming a working group to establish a risk management framework.  This work should follow high standards of participation and transparency, be expedient, call in a well-balanced set of principles with expertise, privilege expertise and ability to deliver results and be given high priority and preference.

And then I think in some discussions this week we had talked about just clearly identifying the roles of the different organizations that are doing work in this area and how they're going to interrelate with each other.  But I think a lot of this comes down to the Board Working Group and getting that completed.


Alejandro Pisanty:          I'm moving to flag this one without even…  Well, some sort of flay, just some sort.  We need to flag it; we need to work on it today and we know that it will be inconclusive because we don't know what will come out from the Board tomorrow but let's make at least a plan for it, depending on the outcome.  And it's Ondrej's turn.

**EN**

| | |
|---|---|
| Ondrej Filip: | The risk-management framework ICANN adopts should be clear, comprehensive, able to evolve strategically and facilitating ICANN to respond tactically.  It should consider risk, cost, and benefit factors, delineate responsibilities clearly, create and manage incentives for all participants, and permeate all activities of ICANN "core" Board, staff, supporting organizations and advisory committees, and serve to call on other parties in a compelling way to induce their collaboration for the SSR of the DNS and further. |
| Simon McCalla: | I'd just like to call for a tighter wording around that.  It's kind of wordy.  It's kind of one of those, yeah. |
| Alejandro Pisanty: | Actually it will become an extensive recommendation I think so it's like… |
| Simon McCalla: | Or we're going to split into multiple recommendations. |
| Jeff Brueggeman: | Yeah, one thing that struck me is it created a question for me how much of this may overlap with our recommendation on the SSR Framework.  So are we talking more about risk management kind of process…? |

Alejandro Pisanty:          It's risk of redundancy.


Jeff Brueggeman:           Yes.


David Cake:                ICANN should include long-range strategic factors in its Risk Management Framework, obtaining information and insight from operational research, business and other sources.  As much as possible, ICANN would benefit from fostering open discussion of the evolution of risks while also maintaining confidential or reserve the information whose dissemination may harm the performance of the SSR function.  Since the open transparent environment of ICANN invites frequent inspection, the opportunities of increasing security through confidentiality are limited and ICANN should manage a very glass house environment.


Martin Hannigan:          Yeah, I think it needs a little bit of wordsmithing and I think that what we're seeing is the recommendation and the analysis in one paragraph and we just need to split some of the analysis out to make them a little bit more finite.


Alejandro Pisanty:          For the next one right here, try to really shorten it and bring it down.

Martin Hannigan:          ICANN should reconsider its decision to adopt or not compliance with standards with ISO 2700X, ITIL, COBIT, ISO 9000, etc.  On one hand these standards are burdensome and may actually lead ICANN away from the ability to perform its mission optimally.  On the other, they could add a measure of transparency and relieve ICANN from unnecessary audits.   The decision to follow compliance paths must privilege mission achievement.

I think we need to wordsmith a bit and I think there's some linkage here back to our recommendation with respect standards-based compliance with process that we should be clear if we mean standards of a much higher level in the organization or low level that we're talking about the root.  Again, we want to make sure that we're within the remit and that we're crystal clear.  So, mid-thumbs.

Alejandro Pisanty:        Needs work.  All the other ones in brackets need work.  So now, Simon, how do you want to go about the work?  Just flag them for work today or keep thumbing?

Simon McCalla:            We've only got a few more to go.  What I would propose we do is let's get down the rest of these – there's only about seven or eight more to go anyway – and then what would be really good – there's

going to be a whole chunk of stuff we probably haven't yet captured that needs capturing today.

And I would suggest that's when we split into groups and say, "Okay, what are we missing on here?  Now we've all been through it and we've got a feel for it, what are you feeling?  Is there a whole area that we've missed or is there…"   Does that make sense?  Rather than trying it as a group cause I think we'll end up deep-diving very quickly again.

Bill Manning:          So did we decide to wordsmith that last bullet, Martin, that you…?

Martin Hannigan:       I believe we did.

Bill Manning:          For me the lack of clarity there is are we talking about ICANN or are we talking about ICANN in its capacity as the IANA functions operator?

Martin Hannigan:       I guess we could talk about that while we're wordsmithing.

Simon McCalla:        Xiaodong, do you want to pick up the next one?  It says in italics "Recommend ICANN."

Xiaodong Lee:            I'm a little bit confused about this recommendation.


Simon McCalla:           Just read and ask the group, so…


Xiaodong Lee:            This means in the responsibility of the SSAC is not clear or…


Simon McCalla:           What this recommendation is referring to in specific to the incidents of the Root Serving Study where it was clear it was actually within RSAC's remit to do it but SSAC picked it up.  And there was some confusion about whether RSAC should have done it or SSAC should have done it.  But it's specifically asking for clarity around which issues SSAC should pick up and which issues should go to RSAC or any other supporting group actually, to be fair.


Male:                   So maybe it should be more establish a clear set of responsibilities for the SSAC and the RSAC instead of just focusing on one?


David Cake:              Yeah, if the intent is specifically about division of labor between SSAC and RSAC, then I think that's a good question.  But as it's

sort of stated there, it sort of implies that the SSAC charter is unclear or something, which I don't think is the case.

Simon McCalla:         Yeah, it's not meant to be that at all.  It's meant to be about just clarity of…  Exactly, yeah.

David Cake:            It is one of those things, I mean, the SSAC charter – you have to read it in knowing that RSAC exists and that introduce them.  If RSAC didn't exist, it would be interpreted differently.

Male:                  I think the intention of this is to clarify that.  We don't want to have double work but on the other hand, we don't want to miss something to be done in this area.

Bill Manning:          It's probably useful – maybe, I don't know.  I believe that ICANN actually has in its bylaws - because both SSAC and RSAC are now in ICANN's bylaws - what their responsibilities are from a high level and strategic point of view I think that that's reasonably clear.

What is unclear is when you get into tactical implementation of detail as to which committee should take the responsibility.  And for me, this gets into the issues about the SSR Plan and then sort of long-term sort of strategic focus and sort of the tactical issues on executing the strategic plan.

Simon McCalla:         Can I make a suggestion that this is one we need to deep-dive into in one of the groups and really explore and open up.  Would that be a good recommendation?  So this may end up being multiple recommendations or even scratched.  We should wait.  Is that okay that we…?  It's a biggie, yeah.

Bill Manning:          So I'm going to skip Analysis and I'm going to skip 3.2 because there's nothing there, and we'll do the first bullet in 3.3 – Incident Response Process.  Recommend clear process for notification of incidents both within ICANN and externally.   And I would wordsmith that to say "externally within ICANN's remit." Recommend clear process for notification of incidents both within ICANN and externally.  If you forget the bounding, the context of externally is undefined.

Simon McCalla:         I think this is another dive with that.  I don't know how deep this one is, but it's certainly another dive in.  Does that make sense?

Bill Manning:          I don't even think it needs particularly deep dive as long as we say within the purview of ICANN's limited technical scope and it's fine.  So in that case…

**EN**

Simon McCalla:         Is that a no?

Xiaodong Lee:          I don't think it even makes any sense, the recommendation. (inaudible)  So I don't know how many recommendations can be performed.

Male:                  Well, in that particular thing, I do not wish to burden ICANN with a general mailbox when somebody says, "I can't send an email, and would ICANN please help me de-bug my email problems." That's what I don't want to see happen.  So I want to make sure that the external thing is clearly within ICANN's limited scope. Otherwise, incident notification to ICANN – they're going to be flooded and that would be a huge, huge mistake.

Male:                  Do we really mean that kind of incident though?  Don't we mean something along the lines of the change management process was violated and there was an internal incident with respect to process and procedure?

Male:                  I'm not going to deep-dive with you now, but, yes.

| | |
|---|---|
| Male: | So we should wordsmith this one or kick it after we deep-dive it.  I mean, I agree with you on scope and having mailboxes for ridiculous things and bee-hags.  Right, exactly. |
| Male: | Okay, Incident Response Process Continued – Recommend that ICANN establish a working group to analyze redundancy issues and develop any recommendations.  Too much there; too many. |
| Alejandro Pisanty: | So now moving to Section 3.4 – Contingency Planning Process.  Bracketed statement says recommend process that ensures independence and ICANN programs and actions that aren't planned without first looking at SSR issues.  Work, right? |
| Simon McCalla: | Yeah, the background to this one was the intelligence we learned in our very first meeting at the SSAC when they said it was a suggestion that they may have felt pressured to come up with a yes to approve the gTLD Program from the root scaling without and felt they had to compromise on their answer in order to give that yes. |
| Alejandro Pisanty: | Work or discard? |

Simon McCalla:              Work.

Alejandro Pisanty:          Well, that's it.  We've been through the list; it's 11:30.  Most of the work – I don't think it's reasonable to split into two groups which one does only Sections 1 and 2 and the other one does 3, but on the other hand, our focus of each is quite different.

So maybe what will serve us better is to split along those lines from now to 1:00; see where we get; assess progress; we make a decision at lunchtime.  Do you agree?  You all agree?  So Jeff, Simon and teammates meet on this side of the table or the chairs if you want to.  How do you want to split the groups?  Do you want people to volunteer or do you want for the leaders to pick team members?  I would prefer to go for volunteering.

Simon McCalla:              Just a point of process –we're missing two members from the team at the moment.  We're missing Hartmut and Alice.  I wonder if we got any update on where they are.

Alejandro Pisanty:          Hartmut told me he had a meeting and he would be with us at 11:00, but it's already half an hour passed.  And from Alice, I have no…

Olof Nordling:     I have some information regarding Alice.  She hasn't been able to spend time on this.  She asked me if I could cover her part in the SSR Review Team, as least for the moment.

Alejandro Pisanty:     I think that the question and the answer have two parts; certainly the answer has two parts.  One is sharing workload and what can we do if she can't come.  If she trusts you, then it means she's signing off or you're telling on your work or you're reporting and then after reporting she can come and sign off on whatever you do. That's one way.

The other one is that she has a distinct responsibility because she is not designated as one more team member by one constituent group like you are by the GAC; she is designated as a representative of the GAC Chair which is a distinct position.  I mean, she has a responsibility.  With that I think there is a responsibility that's not flat.  In some way it's an oversight in reporting her responsibility, so I just have to say all this.

There is an accountability issue by each member not performing duties; it's not a team; maybe that's just bad team work or bad luck, but there's accountability to her Chair that you have to make sure you also have delegate.  I'm not going to go into the GAC and drag her out, but personally I think there's importance in having clarity in that her function is asymmetric.

| | |
|---|---|
| Olof Nordling: | The information I got from her was just between the two of us.  I don't think she has clarified that with Cheryl, with Heather Dryden. |
| Alejandro Pisanty: | Sir, this is within the GAC.  This is for the GAC to resolve. |
| Male: | Coincidentally I just received a note from her a few minutes ago saying that she's planning to join us later, but she needs to discuss something first with Heather, but she will hope to join us later. |
| Martin Hannigan: | Alejandro, my suggestion for the team was maybe to allow people to self-select based on the work that they've already been doing and there may be some people that are doing some work in both Sections.  So, regardless, people would like to capture for sure what has already been done.  So just because you're on one team doesn't mean if you looked at another issue that we don't want to get your input. |
| Alejandro Pisanty: | There's work enough in both.  There seems to be a lot of fresh thinking, analyzing and writing, and there's the last couple of pages.  Whereas, the other needs more… in some cases strictly wordsmithing; splitting stuff into parts is a larger part. |

EN

But anyway, again, my choice would be first volunteers and if people are undecided, then let's pick team members. But I would strongly recommend that each of you volunteer for either the parts 1 and 2 or part 3. And again, parts 1 and 2 is led by Simon and Jeff, and part 3 is led by Martin Hannigan and myself, at least during this meeting.

This doesn't mean ongoing responsibility after the meeting in case your workload doesn't allow it, but some of us work here. That's for today.

Simon McCalla:         Jeff, just one suggestion would be that doing a little bit of analysis for the Section 1 stuff and probably done the most deep-diving and documenting. I'll work with Jeff this morning on that group, but then I'll hop across into the other group if that makes sense because we're further along in that Section so that would add a bit more. Does that work for everybody?

Jeff Brueggeman:       Works for me.

Alejandro Pisanty:     I don't see a problem.

Martin Hannigan:       Jeff, since you're for the most part been kind of driving the format of the document, what do you think the most effective approach

with respect to the groups should be this morning?  Should we not get into the analysis, or should we focus just strictly on wordsmithing?  I mean, what makes sense?

Jeff Brueggeman:    I thought what we should focus on is I think the wordsmithing to me should happen a little bit later, after some more of the analysis is done so that the effort would be on organizing what needs to be analyzed, what's already been done that somebody just needs to write up and everybody walking out with a very clear understanding of what they're next steps are and deliverables are in the next couple of weeks.

Martin Hannigan:    Okay, also on Tuesday when we started to develop some of the recommendations for the document, we had basically – no pun intended – forward resolved the questions to the document, and do you think at some point it would be a recommendation that we reverse resolve these back to the remit and make sure then all the recommendations actually make sense so that if we have accidently fallen outside of that remit we can catch it before we publish anything?

Jeff Brueggeman:    Yeah, I think that's a great idea.

Simon McCalla:    As a point of principle, I wondered whether if we split it works against this document.  Alice, if you could send it around with your notes on it, that'd be brilliant.  And actually just tap some spaces in between each of the issues and then in the group just note down in terms of what other documentation needs to be captured, perhaps who's going to do that work and perhaps how long it's going to take.  So we really get down into the kind of a little sort of project management on each of these issues.

Cause then I think what we could do is come back to the group and say, "Right, we've worked out that the first 10 issues, there's probably about a week and a half's worth of work and we better get that into first draft status by…" whatever it is, middle of November.

Because I think that would work really well and if we could then start to assign, say actually we need to put more folks on recommendations 25 to 32 because they're really hairy and we need to get a lot of analysis done in there.  So I think it would give us a feeling very quickly on where the work effort is.  Do people feel comfortable with that if we did that?

Jeff Brueggeman:    So, Alejandro, we'll just break the document basically in two and we'll annotate the first two Sections with specifics about who's doing what and keep kind of a working log based on it.  That's a great idea.

EN

Alejandro Pisanty:    And after lunch we'll turn that into a…

Simon McCalla:    Again, a point of process – if we kind of break into groups, then we're all going to be on the mics.  So I'm guessing you're going to miss…

Alejandro Pisanty:    If you're participating remotely, only one group will have microphones and you'll decide whether you want to be in that one and the other one won't.  And it's likely to be the group 3 that will be on the mics.

Simon McCalla:    I'm just thinking – is that going to be workable cause if you're in the other group trying to concentrate.  I think there's going to have to be no mics for the remote participants.  Sorry for that, remote participants.

Alejandro Pisanty:    I have been letting this drag on a little so that people can make their choices, but now we do need to know what team you're going to continue during the rest of the day.  So, David, how do you feel? 1 and 2 or 3?  David says probably 3.  Ondrej, your preference?

Ondrej Filip:    I was thinking about 3, but in balance I can do 1 and 2.

Alejandro Pisanty:          Anders?

Anders:                     3.

Alejandro Pisanty:          3.  Bill?

Bill Manning:               Wherever you put me.

Alejandro Pisanty:          Xiaodong?

Xiaodong Lee:               I prefer 3.

Alejandro Pisanty:          That means we've got… Funny enough we don't get any explicit volunteers to work on 1 and 2.

Simon McCalla:              Is it my aftershave or something – is this what the problem is?

Male:                       So nobody volunteered for the first group?

Alejandro Pisanty:        Alice tells me there's right now no one on the bridge.  Martin?  I assumed you and I were doing 3.

Martin Hannigan:         I'd like to participate in the first group, if it's okay.  I think we have enough technical people in the room that can answer questions related to the differences between RSAC and SSAC and I'd like to learn a little bit more about what Simon and Jeff have been working on, so if that would be okay.

Alejandro Pisanty:        And Bill and Anders, do you want…?  So let's see.  For No. 3 the volunteers have been David, Ondrej, Anders and myself.  That's four.   So then it looks reasonable unless you have another preference for Bill and Xiaodong and Martin to be with Jeff and Simon on 1 and 2.  Okay.  How do we rearrange here?  Just take one end of the table?  Does anyone need an official break for five minutes?

Jeff Brueggeman:         Okay, so we went through the work items and assigned specific tasks and identified in some cases additional thoughts on the analysis on the data requests, and then also flagged a few specific areas where we wanted to be sure to refine the recommendation.

With respect to Section 1, it's really a question of that analysis is already written – 1.1 and 1.2 are already written. Simon's going to go back and take a look and check for additional summary and analysis that might want to add based on what he had already prepared, but I think we feel like… And then we'll deal with the wordsmithing the recommendation does need. But we didn't see any substantive issues there.

1.3 – I think Xiaodong and Martin had a…

Male:                        I know that at least on one of those bullets I had some… On 1.1, the second bullet – I had an issue with one of those things.

Jeff Brueggeman:      Yeah, I had a note that you had a concern about 1.2, the first bullet.

Male:                        So if we come back to that at some point, that will be fine.

Jeff Brueggeman:      Well, let's do it now.

Male:                        You want to do it now?

Jeff Brueggeman:      Yeah, cause then we can capture what your issue is.

Male:                     And you indicated it was on the first bullet or the second one?

Jeff Brueggeman:          Well, I had a note that it was the first one, but happy to…

Bill Manning:             You are so difficult, Alice.   Okay, the further refinement statements of the SSR remit and limited technical mission.  I don't think ICANN should do that.  I think the community should do that cause that's actually what happens inside ICANN these days is that ICANN does not independently stand up and say, "We think we should do this.  We think we should expand our technical remit to expand our technical mission into these areas."

                          They actually respond to community input and so I think the wording of that is inappropriate because it indicates that ICANN is doing this as opposed to ICANN is listening to community input to modify these things.

Male:                     But isn't the DNS-CERT an example where ICANN itself proposed something?

Bill Manning:             Right and it got shot down because the community said, "No, this isn't coming from the community.  You really need to redo this."

And so further refine its statements of SSR remit and limited technical mission – ICANN shouldn't do that independently; ICANN should do that only upon feedback from the community.

Simon McCalla:          I'm partially to blame for this because this came out of the analysis of… The very first question was, "What is the understanding of ICANN's limited technical mission and remit," blah, blah, blah. And what is interesting is that when you go through document, nowhere – the only clear and non-ambiguous statement is the AOC, is the Affirmation of Commitment's piece which is to preserve and protect the stability of the DNS or words to that effect.

I could not find at any point in any of the documentation a kind of clear outline of ICANN sees its SSR remit as the following – dink, dink, dink, dink, dink, dink, dink and therefore then pinned its strategy off that.

So what you have to kind of do is interpret and, in fact, if you look at my analysis, given a lack of defensive statement, we must therefore interpret that it probably means the following.  And I list it in a table and say, "Here's the areas they have direct control; here's the areas they have influence and all that stuff, but it's kind of a no-defensive statement.

EN

| | |
|---|---|
| Bill Manning: | Although in FY12 they now created this Foundational Section and they did list – "Here's some things we…"  You know what I mean?  I think they have refined it more this year than they did. |
| | |
| Simon McCalla: | Exactly, and that's definitely been in response to some of the early consultations we've had with Patrick in which we've really welcomed public fora as well which is good.  I think what would be really nice is a kind of one-page statement.  Actually I'm not that worried whether it gets derived entirely from within the community or ICANN just tries to clarify it, but a one-page statement that says, "This is what we do for SSR.  Debate." |
| | |
| Bill Manning: | I'm perfectly fine with that.  Where I have heartburn, it says, "and further refine its statement of SSR remit and limited technical mission."  What's left hanging there is in vacuum, they go in their ivory tower and decide what they're going to do, independent of what's happening in the community or are they listening to community input to drive that process?  And it's not clear there and in fact the way it's inferred is that ICANN is going into an ivory tower. |
| | |
| Jeff Brueggeman: | Two points – first, it's in the SSR Framework today so we have to deal with it and Simon was seeing inconsistencies in how they were describing it.  So what we're saying is be clear because |

they're already doing…    And then the second sentence of the recommendation is, "elicit public comment on the proposed description and establish a consensus-based statement."

So I agree with you, but I think we have to wrestle with the fact that we think that's a helpful part of the SSR Framework that they come up with something, but we also do think they should seek comment on it, although they kind of have been doing that on a regular basis.

Bill Manning:    The thing is that I don't want them to go into the ivory tower, create a plan and then say, "You comment on the plan and we don't necessarily have to listen to your comments."  I think that the plan should be created as a collaborative effort with the community, not as it says in the first sentence, ICANN doing this on its own.

Simon McCalla:    It does, to be fair, the statement actually says consensus-based and you can't have consensus if you do something on your own.

Bill Manning:    It doesn't say consensus-based.  The first sentence is, "ICANN should retain and further refine."  Period.  ICANN's doing that by itself.

**EN**

Simon McCalla:                 Sorry, I was looking at the wrong bullet.


Bill Manning:                  And that's my heartburn is that ICANN is presuming to itself the
                               ability to define its technical mission without input from the
                               community.


Jeff Brueggeman:               I think the implication of the second sentence, "ICANN should do
                               this by," blah, blah, blah.   But I think we can work on clearer
                               language.   The intent is what you are saying, but we don't want to
                               be unclear about that either.


Bill Manning:                  If nobody else thinks that that's an issue, then fine, I'll go with the
                               unanimous consent of the group, but I still have…


Jeff Brueggeman:               I'm going to add our comment there and we're going to work on
                               making sure it's absolutely clear.   Did you also have a concern
                               about 1.2, Bill?


Bill Manning:                  No.

**EN**

Alejandro Pisanty:    What I don't think what we should do is preclude ICANN from taking initiatives in this field.

Simon McCalla:    Another thing, interestingly, is if you go to the analysis I did, one of the things I think we say in there is that we feel that what ICANN is doing SSR-wise is consistent with its remit, with its limited technical mission, is a consistent and reasonable approach to the AOC commitment.

And if, presuming we agreed on that finding, and this really just about making that language clearer rather than ICANN somehow… the idea that Patrick and Jeff are just going to suddenly carve up a brand new set of responsibilities for the next year's plan I don't think is likely.  I think you're just going to clarify what we've got, right?

Jeff Brueggeman:    So if it's helpful at all and we publish this when we put out the FY12 Plan is that before that plan was published, we actually had consultation with our ccNSO, SSAC to say, "Here's what we're thinking about putting in the plan.  How does that sound to you?"

And we took feedback in before even publishing a document.  And I listed that in sort of it was more than just those three consultations.  It was actually a variety – law enforcement and others – and I think that's more collaborative than just publishing a document for comment first.

Simon McCalla:            I've been a commenter in a number of the groups and, again, I think – I don't whether it's just Bill's discomfort is just because he's not seen and been part of that process of commenting, but as you say, it's far from an ivory tower approach to SSR and I think that's going to be recognized as a reasonable and consistent approach.  This is really just around putting it in one place and setting in stone is what it was about.

Bill Manning:             I think it's totally fair to say it might have been that way in the first one, but it's definitely been the other way around since last year for certain.

Male:                     I think this is an example where I think he's raising a very good point about being clear on the one hand.  On the other hand, I think having the context of the analysis as you said and the history, will also help put the recommendation in the context of what's happening.  I think it will be more clear.

Alejandro Pisanty:        Let's leave us homework for smaller drafting teams after the meeting to get language that gets it right in that it's always preferred to see community initiated.  You don't preclude ICANN initiated when it's ICANN- initiated for consensus first if possible unless there's an emergency thing or something.

Simon McCalla:      I think also the other thing we've got to remember is that I completely agree with the community initiatives and it being… the community initiates as much as possible, but this is a commitment by ICANN to the USG in the AOC, right?  So this isn't about the community must initiate an SSR statement.  It's kind of saying, "ICANN, you've got to go do this."

So I think it is ICANN's responsibility to draft an SSR statement and then put it out for comment to the community which is exactly what has happened; rather than the community somehow hands it to ICANN on a plate and says, "Here's what we think you should do SSR-wise."  Does that make sense?  I think it should come from ICANN actually.

Bill Manning:       Could you say ICANN in consultation with?

Jeff Brueggeman:    Bill, when you stepped out, I said that very same thing – that we've done consultations and particularly with the FY12 version, we did talk to SSAC, At-Large ccNSO and a variety of others before publishing a document for comment.

Bill Manning:       So the speakers in the other room need to be turned on so I can hear them.

Olof Nordling:                This is Olof, Olof Nordling here.  Just to announce that we actually do have two remote participants online, so please stay close to the mics and use them.  Thanks.

Alejandro Pisanty:            Do we know if any of them is a team member?

Olof Nordling:                Well, only one now and his name is Albert Daniels – not a team member that I know of.

Alejandro Pisanty:            So the agreement here is that the necessary words meaning to capture the fact that we do not preclude ICANN from initiating things and we, of course, always encourage community initiation skills, community participation, consensus if ICANN (inaudible) this year.

Jeff Brueggeman:             Okay, so 1.3 is the relationship with other operators and I think Xiaodong and Martin brought up the very good point that distinguishing between the DNS itself and DNS infrastructure.  So on the one hand that raises a question of who is not listed here; on the other hand, that root zone operators are a different category.

And so I think we're going to make an effort to be more clear about that, both in the analysis and in the…  So one of the things that we have to do is that Martin is going to describe these ICANN relationships and then we'll draw this distinction and then we'll see how we refine the recommendation to reflect that there are different categories of DNS and DNS infrastructure that we're dealing with here.  I think it's adding a layer of precision to the discussion.

So moving on to Section 2, the SSR Framework Structure – We had already done a fair bit of work on this.  I think I'm going to be adding some more discussion of the FY12 Plan which Simon had focused a lot on FY11, but we can update it for FY12.  And then Simon had already done a lot of work summarizing the public comment and Outreach Process.

And, as we talked about this week, while there have been limited comments on the SSR Framework to some extent, we also know that the staff has been documenting other outreach activities and so we're kind of grouping those together in terms of comment and outreach and putting that as…  And then I think once we describe what we see there, we'll see if there's any recommendation that flows out of that.

Alejandro Pisanty:          Here's, if I may, my general comment.  What moves me to send this one for rework is that I think it's micromanagement to prescribe the format of the SSR Framework to this level.  Dividing

the planning to a framework and the plan has never been their… I mean, we now have one year of history with that.  So I would just like this to be phrased in a more general way.

Jeff Brueggeman:          Are you jumping back up to Section 1?

Alejandro Pisanty:        Yeah, my apologies.  I'm in the paragraph… Sorry.  And I'll come back to this one.  Let's agree to find a less prescriptive way to do this.  We did find it useful to have general principles and specific plans and go back go that now.

Jeff Brueggeman:          I'm thinking about it differently.   I think what we're saying is ICANN needs to maintain a definitive definition and has chosen to do so in the Foundational Section.  I'm not wedded to it being there, but since it's there we were saying you should retain something like this.  So maybe we can work on it. It wasn't an intent to micromanage the report; it was an intent to say, "You've done a definition in the Foundational Section, so to the extent you're going to do that, it should be consistent and it should be there somewhere."

Simon McCalla:           Yeah, this is in response to when we first started very early talking and when I went back to the ccNSO and said, "This is the SSR

team," and so forth.  The debate raged around the ring around what was in and out of scope for ICANN – usual story, right; the stuff we normally go through – and I feel that this is about being really specific, really clear and then using that consistent terminology and language throughout your documents in such a way that there leaves no room for interpretation wherever you're looking at SSR-related stuff.

So, as you say, we've seen some great changes.  This is really just a tweak to that in making sure it's…  So I'm comfortable with it being relatively prescriptive like that but I accept there are other opinions.

Jeff Brueggeman:    I'm just saying I think to Alejandro's point, we don't have to say you have to keep a Foundational Section.  I think we're saying the recommendation is that you keep a definitive statement such as the one that you currently have in the Foundational Section and that would be consistent…

Simon McCalla:    Yeah, I'm very happy with that answer.

Jeff Brueggeman:    So then we get to 2.2 Implementation – We have some information about… So we broke the recommendations, as we talked about this morning, there's kind of a public tracking process component and an internal tracking process.  We're going to get any additional

information from Patrick about the process that they're using internally and we're sensitive to not micromanaging at a level of detail that either is burdensome or would raise security concerns.

And I think this is the kind of thing where we want to get down to a little bit more detail to be careful that we're not creating something like that.  The ATRT tracking model as a starting point looks to be high level; doesn't look like it's an exhaustive type thing, but I think that's one where we want to see what the information is and maybe have a discussion with Denise and Patrick to kind of figure out how can we frame this in a way that is not overly micromanaging.

Simon McCalla:    Yeah, I can co-  Definitely  I think this is very much about giving ICANN the chance to say, "I think we did pretty well on this last year; this one we would have liked to have done better."  I don't think this is in any way, shape or form meant to be a detailed project tracking exercise where every month you have to report, "We are 36% of the way through this initiative and 12% here."  It's not that at all.  It's a kind of a rag report or a traffic light report – whatever you want to call it – to…

Male:    And I would say to the gentleman who was here before, I think maybe the priority would be on the Annual Review as we talked about what Patrick and Jeff on Monday.  Maybe we would say, "The ongoing tracking during the year may not be important.  Let's

just do a good rear-view mirror at the end of the year" kind of thing.

Jeff Brueggeman:        Simon, you want the next Sections or do you want me to keep going?  We're in 2.3.

Simon McCalla:          This one is really and we're sort of pending further bits and information from Patrick and the team at the moment, but this is really just about trying to be making sure we've got really good transparency about how the money gets allocated across the organization, how the staffing gets allocated, how we track the performance of those bits and pieces of the organization – those projects.

Again, it's not about being overly onerous; it's just about having that.  It's really about transparency and about looking at kind of an insight into - for the sake of argument – Jeff's world and the other staff, the rest are related and how they tie into that.  Again, if it flows from that Foundational Statement through an SSR Plan, down to projects, down to staffing in a way that's nicely transparent, I think that would meet this fantastically.  I don't think a lot new needs to be corrected.

Jeff Brueggeman:        A couple of things we talked about here – one is that Xiaodong made a very good point that we're going to focus here on

ICANN's own organization, not supporting organizations and Alejandro mentioned this to you. So we're not going to be looking at... We assume that you're going to be looking at things like SSAC and those types of things.

And then Patrick, I think has a very good conception of functional. You have the security functions that relate to ICANN's own operations and then you have kind of the supporting security functions which include support for the policy development process and things like that.

So I think with some discussion with you, I think that's the kind of thing we can describe. There are some unique things that you do in the security organization here that a company like AT&T doesn't deal with. And then we also have the information that Denise provided before the meeting that had gotten resolved with the NDAs.

And I had a question for Anders. Does any of what you had requested fit into this Section where you had been trying to get information and if so, maybe we could ask Denise for an update before we leave the meeting.


Anders Rafting:              We can come back to that.


Jeff Brueggeman:           Yep, okay.

[background conversation]

Jeff Brueggeman:     You had asked me some questions that would relate to this.  Yeah, so I know you are getting answers.  They're just going through the process of clearance, so it should be soon.

Jeff Brueggeman:     You want me to do this cause I have the notes we have added.  So I think we had broken this into two pieces.  Simon was going to look at the new 2012 Strategic Plan and the linkage issue and also was going to look at the compliance responsibilities while making sure to not duplicate effort with the WHOIS Team which we understand is also looking at that and making detailed recommendations.

Our overall recommendation is much more general about including it as a priority.   And then Martin was going to look at the operational issues that we talked about with respect to the change control process and also look at the Zone Automation Study that's already there.  So I think we'll refine the recommendations once we have some additional analysis in those areas, but that'll be good.

2.5 – I think we have some documentation here probably to deal with what's in the SSR Framework and then Martin was going to review the L-Root; get some additional information about some Best Practices.  I think we talked about not using the BCP, but you

know, using something more like Best Practices and I think once we get more information we'll be sensitive to how we want to frame that, so we'll be working on the language of those recommendations as well.

And then on 2.6 – Areas where ICANN is an observer – we decided to put that on hold.  There are a list of things in the SSR Framework for ICANN so they act as an observer, but it struck us that really that has to do with things like identifying risks that you're going to be looking at in Section 3, so we would note for you that there are some things in the SSR Framework about that, but it seemed like that was a good fit for what you were doing in Section 3.

Simon McCalla:    Yeah, I think we felt that was a real risk with this one that we could end up duplicating what was going on.  And we did debate about whether the sort of more policy aspects we were looking at – things like Protect IP Bill or that sort of stuff came into this one without getting too close to risk.  But I think what we're better off doing is wait till you guys bring your bits into it and then anything that's missing, we'll capture under that bullet.

Alejandro Pisanty:    Anything further?  Thank you.  Let's go over the ones we did here.  So, Alice, what we need is to move through the ones that say new version and they are all in 3.  There you are.

So the first one is related to the TSSA plus Board stuff.  We tried refreshing it.  ICANN should follow up on this; should transfer the function of creating and managing a DNS Management Framework to the combination of a Board level structure and a community-based mechanism like the present DSSA.

I'm going to try not to second guess what's exactly going to be the result of the Board.  If there's any this week or sometime soon, whether it's a Board working group, Board committee, whatever, but just to continue with the Board level and community level.  That's basically.  And I think for the writing, there's some things still to be worked out because this follow-up on the decision and transfer and transfer was sort of based at to instead of through.  So I would work on that if you agree on the general spirit of wording there.

A second paragraph was just the administration of the Risk Management Framework should follow high standards of participation and transparency, be expedient, privilege expertise and ability to execute and be given high level of priority and precedence.  So any comment there?  This is a subordinate to the previous one.

Simon McCalla:          Alejandro, just a quick comment.  As we go through these, what we haven't heard from your side is how you're going to document and who's following them up and how it's going to be written.

Alejandro Pisanty:          We haven't gotten to that point.


Simon McCalla:              Oh, okay, fine.


Alejandro Pisanty:          We have time.  Actually, in order to achieve what we did, we had first full group discussion of some of these resolutions, some of these recommendations and then what we did was farm them out so that each one of us worked on a couple in parallel and we're all going to see them for the first time now.

                            So the next one - The risk-management framework that ICANN adopts should be clear, comprehensive, able to evolve strategically and facilitating ICANN to respond tactically.  This comes from Ondrej whom I thank very much for doing this work.  I don't know if you want to read it yourself.


Ondrej Filip:               I basically used it to produce the comment.  I just split it into sentences and made it a bit readable.  So again, the risk-management framework that ICANN adopts should be clear, comprehensive, able to evolve strategically and facilitating ICANN to respond tactically.  It should consider risk cost and benefits factors, delineate responsibilities clearly and create and manage incentives for all participants.

It should permeate all activities of ICANN core, such as Board, staff, supporting organizations and advisory committees.  It should serve to call on other parties in a compelling way to induce their collaboration for the SSR of the DNS and further.

Alejandro Pisanty:     Thoughts, comments, requests for reworking it completely?

Male:     I guess I'm interested cause I've been hearing bits and pieces about the Board Working Group and these things, but to me it'll be interesting to see once we have all of that information together and then, Patrick, you mentioned there's even other efforts going on.  It'll be easier to react to something once we…  I feel like I don't have a good understanding of exactly what's already being developed.

Simon McCalla:     That one feels very wide and broad at the moment.  I feel as like it probably needs to be split down or focused in.  It's kind of… what we're saying is kind of a risk management process that pretty much covers everything ICANN thinks, does, breathes, talks to and everyone should adhere to it, kind of feels quite wide, if that makes sense.  I mean, the aim is laudable; I think how we focus in might be useful.

| Bill Manning: | For me, if I look at that, and for some of these others, we appear to be in these recommendations, we appear to be proscribing ICANN's possible responses.  The "such as" – that Section might be deleted entirely and just say, "and should permeate the activities."  At other places we say we're presuming that simply because there's an existence of certain structures that ICANN's using now, that we continue those in our recommendations, like Board working groups – those may disappear. |
|---|---|
| | So I think that perhaps some of these things, as we go through them, we should probably look at how much we're proscribing ICANN should do the job as opposed to telling what the job is. |
| Alejandro Pisanty: | It's either that or that we are insisting on balance of certain standards which is like participation but not losing efficiency or efficacy, for example.  So it remains controversial; we'll work on it.  The next one – do I have it? |
| David Cake: | No, I think I just came over to you.  Do you want me to read it? |
| Alejandro Pisanty: | Yes, please read it.  What David Cake is going to read now, we haven't yet incorporated into this document. |

EN

David Cake:    It's pretty much the same.  It's the same content here, but just the wording changed.   The ICANN DNS Risk Management Framework should foster open discussion on the evolution of risk and obtain information inside from operational research, business and other sources, including long-range strategic factors, while also maintaining confidential reserved information as dissemination may harm the performance of the SSR function.  Open discussion should be a priority to foster coordination and prioritization and so the DNS Risk Management Framework reflects the widest range of input.

So that's just basically a wording change on what's existing text there to make the open discussion aspect more prominent, I guess.  Particularly like to hear if we should be more, like I've said, sort of the widest range of input – do we want to be more specific about including all appropriate ICANN bodies or specify, including appropriate external sources or whatever.  I'm just emailing that text through.

Alejandro Pisanty:    The next one then – we know this one will need – I mean, all need work – ones who have full documents.  This one is the one that basically asks for interacting with the forward-looking community.  So, ICANN should include long-range strategic factors in its Risk Management Framework obtaining information…

We are searching for the standards one.  In the annual SSR planning documents, ICANN should publish the SSR

management-related standards it complies with and the maturity models that it is following and its status.

The thought here was that all the (inaudible), etc. models, the value they do add to their organizations, besides getting organized, is that you can follow the maturation of the organization from, let's say, only a core team owns and follows standards and practices to one where the whole of the organization is well organized, which we have requested everywhere else.

So it's like you don't have to adopt an ideal covet for the ISO 9000 for quality or anything like that, but if you're going to track any of them, it's like tell the community about them and they'll tell this in the plan and if you are following internally, not necessarily by compliance with… externally verified compliance… If you are not following something by verified compliance, but doing an internal CMN just reporting it so people can track progress.

We did away with the whole explicit list.  We agree all it seems that that kind of compliance is expensive.  You can choose to make it very gradual, model your behavior after the system without actually have to enter a straight jacket.  So how do others feel about this?  Let me ask you – who of you have experience with maturity models – things like CMN?

Male:                          Bill's not mature.

Bill Manning:                    I didn't say I was.  I said I have experience with maturity models.

Alejandro Pisanty:          Someone else was going to say something.  Martin, just curious - and I won't ask for specific companies - but there are some companies which are closely involved following any of these models – CMN for software development?

Martin Hannigan:           Not that I know of.

Simon McCalla:              My only hesitation with this is ICANN's the same size as Nominet and with a similar staff; almost identical, actually.  And we wouldn't go to this level of depth, and whilst we see our sort of accreditation as very important and so forth, this feels quite dry, quite an academic point to put in.

I think what I'd like to see is just… this goes back to the planning and process side which is a good strong process and a well-managed and good change control and adhering to that.  I'm just a bit nervous about putting on a sort of layer of additional bureaucracy that's overkill for what is quite small team.  I don't know.  It just feels…

Alejandro Pisanty:          Certainly that's why we didn't go to… or I didn't propose any explicit adherence or formal adherence because some of these

standards are only good for large organizations where you can spare the resources and the cycles for documentation and inspection. But we can remove part of it.

Male:                           So if you look at this, ICANN already has gone out and said, "We have gone through these accreditation or these processes to greet certain things," right? And it would be useful to actually have a listing that said, "These are our accomplishments. We actually received this threshold. We met this criteria across the industry and have that reported." We want to see what they've done and whether or not… So the community can say, "You know, maybe you should start looking at this one."

As far as maturity models go, the ones that I've seen are used primarily in financial institutions about what their risk profiles are and if ICANN hasn't actually looked at a maturity model for its particular industry. What's that thing that the Italians are working on? GCSEC – they're having something they're talking about… Yeah, yeah, yeah, it's GCSEC.

They have a project that's looking at something sort of like a DNS Risk Profile and molding that back into a maturity model as to how well you are able to manage those things. That's the kind of stuff that was in my mind when we were talking about this. So you actually can look at a set of metrics for "are you continuously improving" without actually having to buy into whole ISO 9000 expense.

Simon McCalla:          Yeah, that makes sense.  I was just trying to get to the point where the admin of tracking the compliance becomes so onerous that it takes away from actually doing the duty of being a core team organization.  Does that make sense?  Part of the change of a lot of these accreditation processes is they become so bureaucratic and they become so paper-based and so you end up with a staff that focuses on making sure you're passing the standards rather than doing a great job, and that's where quality and process can sometimes diverge.

A great example of that is we saw DigiNotar recently, who are accredited to the hilt, and then they had a significant problem.  So I just want to flag that out so it's a challenge that we're wrestling with at the moment at Nominet about which accreditations we should have and we shouldn't have if that makes sense.  I think I agree with the sentiment; it just slightly makes me nervous.

Bill Manning:           So help fix the wording.  If you agree with the sentiment, then, great – fix the wording.

Simon McCalla:          Yeah.  No, I was just thinking, "What would I say."

Alejandro Pisanty:    Let me come clear on two polar extremes of the coordinates here. One of them is, I believe, as Simon has just said, most of these processes – except in really large formal software development organizations and stuff, just [spy for] the organization. They take lots of reporting, people will ask you just do it for the standard… start from the PMI and all that acronyms. So just creates a huge bureaucracy. Some quick interventions are useful because they sort of make an RX of the organization and make people aware of the shortcomings, but you can do it in many other ways.

But my other extreme here in this coordinate is why the heck does this team have to dig into the change management policy, human resource security policy and so forth as Dave correctly asks from us. Because that's not documented; because that's not certified. If there had been a 27,000-word certificate, we would have very few questions to ask. So we're somewhere in the middle.

But let's just flag the whole paragraph for much further analysis and we won't come recommending anything that a third party like an auditor will… What is the use of admitting yourself to an audit from an IT-enlightened auditing company that would want to know your CMNs and all that stuff? We shouldn't try to spark that bad result. But on the other hand, you know, there has to be something that evolves.

Male:    Can I just ask for some clarity as to where the maturity model came from? How did that get inserted there and…?

Alejandro Pisanty:    That got in there from what I describe.  We started looking for adherence, any recommendation – not even of adherence to the Standards of Certification, but whether the organization was doing something along the lines, which is something many organizations do.

You know, you look at all the standards and say, "We're not going to ask for compliance, but we are going to pick this and that and we're going to self-assess, for example, in five of the 80 covet questions.  Self-assess just to know whether we are in two, four, one or five.

So we asked ICANN for that.  The reply was, "No, we're not doing it, but we do follow a path parallel to some of this."  We got the bounds from Dave from the ICANN team as well, that, "Why are you looking at all these documents and all these details if a third party would have told you?"  A third party would have told you this except a third party has not been involved by ICANN and it's deliberately not going to be involved.

So next generation of this paragraph was ICANN should tell whether it's tracking any of this.  That's what we came with to this session today and the specification of that one, plus looking for your time piece that the models do bring – which is to make sure that the follow up on maturity – is what made me propose this part. But I'm ready to take it away.

EN

Male:                          But this is the security of what?  What are we assessing or what are you applying the maturity of model – to the security of what – of the IANA operations or ICANN as an organization or…?

Alejandro Pisanty:             These will be mostly IT from the SSR Review and the SSR Team and it could certainly be extended to the IANA Team as an IT operation or as a management operation, depending on where you pick your standards from.  But I'm ready to retire it and just look for another formulation that says we should have a way to see how management… the IT side of SSR management that works.  If it's certified at all or if it follows any standards or any known models, see how it goes.

Male:                          So in the context of the SSR, right - cause we're the SSR Review Team – the SSR scoping is the limited technical remit, right?  So I'd look at this and say the standards that apply to the limited technical mission of ICANN.  The maturity model that looks at the risks associated with the limited technical mission of ICANN, not necessarily the broad brush about ICANN's interests in internal security or external security or business relations.  That's not part of my understanding about the parts of the SSR that we're paying attention to.

Male:                          One thing that might be helpful then – and maybe this is part of our introduction too – is to say what we're not looking at cause I know we had talked early on, for example, that we're not looking at the meeting security, right?  And Denise had sent 10 to 12 documents and I had questions about are we looking at employee and personnel security; we looking at IT within?  You know what I mean?

So I think it would be helpful to go through and refine according to that standard of a limited technical mission, you're assessing the security of what with this Risk Management.

Male:                          Right, so basically place this in the context of what we're looking at.  Sometimes it's difficult.  We have to bump up a couple of levels and say, "Oh yeah.  This is our context," and then drill back down.

Simon McCalla:                Yeah, I think one of the challenges is if you can just compare Nominet to ICANN.  Nominet's operational responsibilities are significantly greater cause we're running a live DNS for 10 million domains; whereas, ICANN, as we know, has got limited operational responsibilities outside of its own operation.

So it's kind of what level of framework do you put onto that, if that makes any sense.  I agree, absolutely, it's important to formalize it.

**EN**

I think this is one to be… I mean, Patrick, I don't know what your thoughts are on this as you're listening.

Patrick Jones:        Historically ICANN's technical operations have been much more limited than others, but when you add the complexity of maintaining the KSK of the structure, how much does that change our level of operations now?   And L-Root infrastructure is significantly different than it was six, seven years ago, and it's about to change in orders of magnitude again when the new gTLD operations are added.

That's an operational function that has a lot of layers to it and will have security needs.  So I don't know how you factor that into your report, but the traditional ICANN operations is changing.

Simon McCalla:        That's very useful.  Thanks.

Male:        I was just going to suggest maybe we're rattled and we should come back.

Alejandro Pisanty:        This one's about trying to look up a different relation for a clear definition of the SSAC which we now know is… I mean, we've been reminded… It has a well-defined mssion in the bylaws and elsewhere.  But on the other hand, there are questions about things

that happened between SSAC and RSAC like the Root Scaling Study.

So it's basically ICANN should continue to refine the coordinated efforts of the SSAC and the RSAC, particularly where they overlap with a view to avoid gaps and induce robust collaboration between both parties which means more… Well, what's not there is the limiting the functions of each in a clear way, saying to each of them what not to do.

That's liable to create gaps and manage the overlap instead of doing it the other way forbid overlap and manage gaps.  Comments there?  And Bill, of course, asked if this will have to add waive of consensus and…

Male:                         So the reason why we came up with this recommendation in the first place was because we were under the impression that the definition of the responsibilities of the SSAC were not clear.  And the original language came from an idea that it would be in the interests of all that the responsibilities were clear and if they were made clear in collaboration with their RSAC, that that would imply that both organizations agreed and I guess solved two problems at once.

This language here seems to be a bit softer, which is good, "with a view to avoid gaps and induce robust collaboration" - but takes us away from the actual definitions and responsibilities which is what we had set out to determine in the first place.

EN

And my question is why did we move away from clear definition or inducing some need to establish a clear definition of the SSAC role and what does removing that language give us with respect to the current language?

Alejandro Pisanty:    I'm glad to take that with an incitement for further improvement and if you can just send not a new text; just a reminder.

Male:    It's a significant change from the original suggestion and actually it's taken it and changed the contribution, which is fine.   I just wanted to understand the logic around responsibilities versus coordinated functions seems to be quite different.

Alejandro Pisanty:    The responsibilities are well-defined at the level of the bylaws, and it's more an operational thing or a timing thing that in some cases jobs that one would read as being on paper for the RSAC and done by the SSAC, maybe there's overlap between them; maybe some other cause.   So sharpening the definitions is not going to help us much as defining the relationship.

That's the apparent result of these couple days' analysis.   Basically it was a sharpen the definition.   People will tell us they can't be sharper than the bylaws.

**EN**

| | |
|---|---|
| Male: | So let me step in here briefly and kind of back up Alejandro's comments here. The RSAC definitions in the bylaws have never changed and they are in fact non-reflective of what RSAC actually does. The bylaws do need to be updated. It's been attempted twice and failed. The SSAC charter was eventually folded into bylaws and so part of this is those crisp definitions really do need to be refreshed, but that's kind of outside the scope of SSR. |
| | The coordination of those two bodies is, I think, important for SSR. And so I actually like this what you call "softer wording," but it actually encourages these two advisory committees to work more closely together and not necessarily duplication of effort. So I actually appreciate this better recognizing that the bylaws do need to be refreshed, but that's outside the scope of SSR. |
| Alejandro Pisanty: | So what I suggest is that we keep some wording like this right for now and, depending on when we have the final from… |
| Male: | Yeah, that's fine. I think it will be interesting to see how the analysis supports it and what it actually ends up really meaning. |
| Alejandro Pisanty: | That's exactly what I mean. Once we have the full text we'll see if it's really consistent or needs sharpening the other way. Another motherhood and apple pie which will be blown out of the water, among other things. |

ICANN should enhance its ability to identify present and emerging risks to DNS by connecting with the operational, academic and security agencies using both early warning of potential incidents and forward-looking understanding of the evolution of the DNS and its hole in the apple pie, and 90% of that is already happening. It only says that you should enhance.

Xiaodong Lee:          (inaudible).  I think it is a difficult task.

Alejandro Pisanty:          Thank you for telling me to do that.

Bill Manning:          Read.  The first one?  ICANN should enhance its ability to identify present and emerging risks to the DNS by connecting with the operation, operational planning, academic resource and security communities, inducing both early warning – is that inducing?

Yeah, inducing both early warning of potential incidents and forward-looking understanding of the evolution of the DNS and its environment.  Ehhhh.  That one's hard.  I'm not sure I can parse that one.  Patrick, what does that mean?  (laughter)

Alejandro Pisanty:          The one you're supposed to read is the one under that.

**EN**

Bill Manning:          The one underneath it?

Alejandro Pisanty:     Yeah, the one you wrote.

Bill Manning:          Okay, well, it's not entirely on the screen, so…  Would you move it up a little, Alice?  Thank you.  Alright, so we'll move that one that's difficult for me to parse and I'll read the one that I wrote which is also difficult for me to parse.

                       ICANN should document review with public comment, implement and regularly test redundant systems for continuity of operations for its systems.  To the extent possible, design, document, implement and regularly test redundant systems for interaction with customers, clients and partners.

Patrick Jones:         So this one I actually have concerns about.

Bill Manning:          I'm sorry.  We'll dismiss your concerns as being irrelevant.

Patrick Jones:         Yeah, that's fine but I…

Bill Manning:          What are your concerns?

Patrick Jones:          I have concerns about it.

Bill Manning:           Please, please jump back in.

Patrick Jones:          So the document… some of these systems aren't the way that… So depending on what the systems are – if it's an internal IT network – the documentation of that – we don't publish for public comment.  We may test it and we've done tests and published after action reports in the past, but we haven't…

I see this opening up ICANN to a lot of… This raises all sorts of red flags for me.  You're an operator.  Does this sound to you like it touches on things that normally other part…  All the other stuff, I've had no issues with but this is one that, red flags all over.

Simon McCalla:         I'm kind of with Patrick.  I can see where you're coming… Funny enough, we're going through exactly the same thing at Nominet, so it's very, very relevant at the moment, which is we are changing our BCP to use – in my understanding a BCP, which is Business Continuity Planning – approach.

Would I choose to document it publically?  You might see me standing up in an IT fora somewhere and talking about it in general terms.  In terms of the details, absolutely not because it becomes a

security threat by doing it.  It makes it easier to attack and easier to… I have no idea how accurate my BCP plans work.  I'm sure they've got great BCP plans, but…

And so I think there's a bit about… I think it's a really important statement there and it should say something along the lines of ICANN should insure it has robust BCP processes and capabilities and that these meet current Best Practice, they are regularly tested and things.

Patrick, would it be fair to say if you didn't have to publish them for comment, but Jeff Moss is prepared to say, "I hereby swear I have good BCP," would you be comfortable with that?

Patrick Jones:        That and even publishing what types of Best Practices ICANN is using as its references for systems and other…  I would think we could publish that, but publishing the documentation of the redundant systems for public comment and the testing of it seems like it's opening up the… raises just a lot of concerns in my mind.

Simon McCalla:      So the way we get around this at Nominet is we publish public SLAs for all of our systems and those SLAs include unplanned downtime and planned downtime and we also publish that we regularly and frequently test our BCP.  We don't publish what it was we tested and we don't publish how we go about achieving the

higher than ICANN-rated SLAs.   So that's how I get 'round making sure.

I couldn't have those SLAs if I didn't have really, really strong DR and Business Continuity Systems in place to do that, so it's implied I have those because I've got SLAs that are pretty aggressive.   But in terms of publishing the details of it… I'd more than happily share the basics with the group, but anything further than that, I'm sorry.

Bill Manning:                    You'll note carefully I didn't say line item veto detail for public review and Milton Mueller sign off.   But from a transparency perspective, the ability to say, "We have a BCP.   Here are the general highlights; here are the points we cover.   Have we hit everything that's of interest to the community?"   Not the details.

"And also, we are going to test on a periodic basis.   Here is the results of the last test.   We actually moved our operations entirely from Marina Del Rey to Boulder City, Colorado and we ran operations there for three months before we moved it to New York and then we moved it back to L.A."

Those kinds of things I think would improve the comfort level in the community that ICANN actually has a robust BCP and can do these things and those redundant systems actually work.   So that was sort of the intent here.

| Simon McCalla: | I think it's really good.  I think if we can achieve that, then I think that's excellent. |
|---|---|
| Bill Manning: | Right, and then the secondary piece of this is that not only… that's the ICANN sort of internal systems.  The linkages to its partners and the other people that actually it is dependent on for the execution of its tasks, those systems, if they're redundant, we need to know that those exist and are tested and work.  And if they're not, it's probably interesting… it would be worthwhile finding out that, "Oh, by the way, in fact, there isn't another Vernita Harris and NTIA has lost the keys." |
| | That would be kind of interesting to highlight.  The weakness is here; it's not ICANN, it's somebody else that ICANN depends on.  In a past life, I have gone to the thing that says, "Okay, we're going to test our generator capability.  We're going to go off the grid and run off generators and oops, the diesel's dry.  We didn't get the supply in."  So those are the kind of things that I think it's important to bring out here.  So thank you. |
| Alejandro Pisanty: | I think that we shouldn't go into this prescriptive detail.  This really micromanagement… We're one step away from specifying the connectors for the fibers for the second…  I think that we should ask for an industry standard, let's say, top tier of industry standard Business Continuity Plan. |

Let me say this – inevitably this will lead in two or three years for someone in the GAC, from VeriSign, whatever, to either ask to inspect or to ask to see the latest audit.  So I think that ICANN will need to sort of start certifying this in some way in order to avoid the ad hoc demand for inspection.

That will be community-based; it will be wild shots.  Some of them may actually be poisoned sweets.  So I think we should not do this; we should ask for industry standard in its continuity preparations and testing and we probably will either leave that unspecified or ask for a third-party certification of those and I think that's the safest path for ICANN as well.

Male:                             I don't think that works.

Alejandro Pisanty:         Otherwise, you'll get someone in the GNSO demanding to go see the fiber and whether it's glass or plastic.

Male:                             The GNSO or other people might do that but this industry isn't like most of the other ones.  I don't think you can go and get a cookie-cutter template from a different industry and apply it.  Anyway…

Patrick Jones:               That's actually been the struggle for us in putting together a Business Continuity Framework that we follow.  It's difficult and I

know there's TLD operators, either registries and registrars that may have examples, but ICANN's sort of in this unique position.

Male:                          Right, so anyway, that was a draft that whether or not we accept it as a recommendation.  The second one is ICANN should use multi-tiered model for community unification of incident – emergency warning systems – as well as have documented and regularly tested notification and escalation procedures with partners and clients.

Alejandro Pisanty:             Anders has another item which (inaudible).

Anders Rafting:                Just a proposed rewriting on a piece of this text.  ICANN shall document review with public comment, implement a regular test. The continuity of its operational systems.

Bill Manning:                  That doesn't talk about redundancy.

Anders Rafting:                Redundancy is something Bill continues with, I should say.

| Alejandro Pisanty: | Continuity is much much larger than… I mean redundancy is needed not only for contingencies.  You need it all the time |
|---|---|
| Anders Rafting: | Continue or continuity?   It's a continuous system, but it's redundant. |
| Alejandro Pisanty: | But I don't think that we should be doing this combination lawyering at this level.  My view would be to ask for a higher tier of industry standard, Business Continuity Plan tailored specifically for the different operations of ICANN.  You need one thing for Human Resources; you need a different thing for internal IT or the L-Root; you need a different thing for IANA. |

They're all connected but each has different needs and we shouldn't… I mean, other than assuring that it exists, it improves and someone can check on it, I don't think that we should go any further into detail.   And this will leave, of course, the recommendation that either the next test of our review goes into detail as a group that goes into detail or that they actually get it certified by probably more like an SSAC certification than a covet that they are up to industry standards.

The first thing that I guess you are struggling with – one that you mentioned struggling with – is just what kind of SLA you actually need from your providers for some of this stuff.   It's what continuity for availability of the data bases you insure yourselves.

Bill Manning:          So, Patrick, would you object to see these kinds of recommendations or things show up in an SSR T Report?  Would it cause you too much uncomfortableness?

Patrick Jones:         I don't think I can have a position one way or the other from a staff perspective of telling you what you should and shouldn't put in your report.

Bill Manning:          I know.  I'm just asking you what your feelings were.

Patrick Jones:         Oh.  The second one seems quite fair and actually it's something that we're doing anyway.  I don't know.  I'm just tired at the end of the day.

Male:                  So Bill, as somebody that operates one of the largest internet presences in the world, I would be hugely uncomfortable with point No.1.  With respect of point No. 2, if that point was applied to me and my details or aspects of any company's Business Continuity Plan were required to be public related to some SEC requirement for public companies and what not, I would assume that that's why something like that is not actually required of us.

Second point with the notifications, I wasn't aware that ICANN already did this but the intent of the original suggestion was we don't really need to know that there's a new virus on the street; what we need to know is what's going on at ICANN, not so much on the public internet.  And I think that there's a balance to be kind of worked there.

When I read emergency warning system, I'm thinking that the suggestion talks more about a large scale incident kind of tracker, more so than our change process was violated; here's what happened and here's the mitigation to it.

Bill Manning:          So in that notification thing, having been in some operational roles in the past, occasionally you need to tell people, everybody that uses your service, "Something went down; we're working on it. ETA is going to be this.  Don't bother us.  We're aware of the problem."

The second one is dealing with the people that you need to work with to resolve the problem and getting those things escalated. And those are the kinds of things that you don't really want everybody and their brother coming knocking on your door asking for an update.

Male:                  True, and there's hundreds of services that are probably monitoring ICANN from every which way but left and right.  And I think most

of those problems are solved from the political process and don't necessarily need to be resolved through suggestion, at least I'm starting to feel as outside of the scope of the remit.

Simon McCalla:    There's an ever so slight whiff of cert about this as well if we're not careful and bear in mind that ICANN…  I think what you're saying, Bill, is really useful.  It's funny – we've just done a similar thing at Nominet, but I sort did warning system should there be a problem mostly internally.

And ironically, the current warning system we use is the most successful by far is on my laptop at home.  It's called Twitter and in terms of getting out to our customers, we found that to be the most effective way at the moment, which is interesting.

Alejandro Pisanty:    Some discussion on this point now.  We'll try to formulate a more general statement and if it still itches and aches for specifics, we are ready to hold onto RJ45 or RJ11.

Male:    So one last point.  If I could make a suggestion instead of be completely negative on your suggestion, I think with respect to the BCP option, we might be better served by suggesting that ICANN certify on a regular basis that their BCP is up to date instead of getting so specific.

Male:                          That would be fine and then there's going to be somebody who's going to say, "I want an independent third-party audit," which is what Alejandro was talking about.

Alejandro Pisanty:             Well, that's…   We'll engineer that into the test.   I think that… What's not to like about a punching bag, right, Bill?   (laughing) Thanks for writing them down so clearly.   It's only that on reading them, they're really out of balance with the rest of the level that document needs and we'll have to wait to move forward now.

Bill Manning:                  I'll step out for a minute now.   I apologize.

Alejandro Pisanty:             Everybody who has reported is granted the apologies from the start and if you don't know your report, you have still be granted the apology please.   Hope you are feeling better though.   I'm aiming to finish the session at 5:00 and I'm not aiming to stretch it for no reason but I would like to try to make use of the most… the most is full time use of the time we have left.

                               I think that we should move to process and planning.   That will be farming out tasks and, Mark, I only need one thing from you before you leave if you can just say yes or no – utter one word, which is do you foresee to be able in conditions to lead a team or

more like the last couple months – which I feel fantastic work with you – without having the demand of the regular schedule.

No further verification necessary.   You're a magnificent team leader; you're a magnificent team member.  It just depends on your availability and I know that's not determined for you.   Just for knowing how many teams we'll have.

Male:                                  And I would say, Martin, you've taken on two substantive issues that'll be really important to what we're doing so you'll really have fun.

Alejandro Pisanty:           It's just knowing whether you're allowed to be on the clock.

Male:                                  I think I'm in the same situation I was before with respect to any kind of leadership.

Alejandro Pisanty:           A pity but understood and we can plan for the other scenario and have been great.   Okay, so I have a contribution that all of us worked on the draft for the notification of incidents but I think that we should leave anymore wordsmithing or iteration of text for, you know, we're done with that.   I see just in the shine of the ice that we're done with this space.   No winners left.

We could restart when we have a half an hour break with lots of water and coffee.  I don't think that makes sense either.  I don't think that we should move forward to a clear definition of tasks and timelines and who takes care of what if you all agree.  I think that's the best we can do and then we can even finish before 5:00.

And, Patrick, I don't think we're going to make good use of your time if you stay.  We're happy to have you but I don't think it's a good use of your time.

Patrick Jones:          That would be very good.  Thanks.

Alejandro Pisanty:     I want just before you leave to reiterate deeply my thankfulness and it has been expressed by many in the team before.  That way we finally got into gear; it wasn't easy.  We got some very good gear.  I hope it serves as an example for other teams and other reviews and stuff like that, you know, so that actually people can be prepared and ICANN staff to always…

One of the recommendations we haven't worked out in detail is the one that says again be prepared to live in a glass house environment.  You know you do.  So that every operation of ICANN should be ready to have a redactive public version of even its most internal documents.  I am appreciative of the huge efforts through your team.  Some of these literally made over… I don't

say overnight like in the fly, but like, you know, with sleepless night.  Thanks a lot and thank everyone who has contributed.

Simon McCalla:          Can I suggest that we take a short break?  I need to go and do a couple of…

Alejandro Pisanty:      Short break.  What I don't think we have is the luxury of a half-hour break.

Simon McCalla:          Would 15 minutes…

Alejandro Pisanty:      Fifteen minutes, reconvene, hammer out the plan.  Perfect.

[break]

Alejandro Pisanty:      Okay, ready?  Is anyone missing?  Are we missing anyone?  So if you all agree, we'll try to be quick and nimble and decisive in spreading the pain to the division of labor here.  I think that the best division of labor we have that will serve us well for the next stretch is core drafting and research team again and people working with the coordinators.

We don't have more coordinating on subjects this time or pieces of the document, of course.  It's not like everybody and everything, but getting three leads and people assigned specific tasks with each of them.

Simon McCalla:    For the Section that Jeff and I and this team, we've got names. Effectively we're expecting that the people assigned to each of those tasks are going to write that Section of the report anyway, so in some respects that's the drafting team.  In many ways we've become the drafting team Section 1 and 2.

Alejandro Pisanty:    If you can project that or tell us how that worked out…?  You already did a division of labor or it's just a team for 1 and 2?

Simon McCalla:    For all the Sections that Jeff and I went through, we've got named tasks and everyone knows they're going to come back and write their Section they've been assigned to.  I know you guys have kind of got a slightly different… because…

Alejandro Pisanty:    Because we don't have much text to work with from the start.

**EN**

| | |
|---|---|
| Simon McCalla: | Exactly.  We are much further on so it's a little bit easier for us, I think, if that makes sense. |
| Jeff Brueggeman: | I was making changes as we went through the recommendations with everyone, but I'll send you the annotated which shows who's got what assignment for all of our work items. |
| Alejandro Pisanty: | Then let's just come back to that.  For 3, do you agree – Ondrej, David, Bill, Anders.  Bill, you were working on that side or you are working on this side?  So let me take a quick look. |

Let me ask you to take a look through the headings at 3 and see if there's any ones to which you would like to actually commit the work.  The work that you're committing will be continue hammering on the recommendations, but very much providing the text that goes behind them.  That's the extent of the task.

There's a lot more on 3.1.  So let's see – David – Contingency Planning.  Anyone else for Contingency Planning?  Anders for (inaudible).

[background conversation]

Alejandro Pisanty:    Besides 3.4 review, if you are (inaudible).  So you're together with Ondrej, but you'll be focusing more on the describing consequences from the…

We're not limited in the number of recommendations, but we'll try to do ones we have them all and see the stories that go behind them is to choose a very few which are very high priority and distinctive.  I think, Simon and Jeff, this applies for your side as well.  We'll have a list of recommendations, we'll have the stories behind them and we may reorganize and certainly we'll have to choose because we're not going to come with a flat list of 30 recommendations.

We should come out with like five really biggies, the things that really needs to be done and that are very compelling and distinctive.  They're not generic management; they're not feel-good; they're not mothership and apple pie, but really cutting into the matter.

The structure we talked about and we discussed in our meeting Monday, organizational, it's like I have a few – like five – big recommendations, a number of not so big recommendations and one more thing which is called "findings," which is things we see which are significant to a function, which may not even lead to recommendation.  Or they lead to recommendation, but they still list them as important findings.  We were surprised by the fact or we were (inaudible) in fact.

Which parts do you want to take?   I'm first looking on the volunteer list.  Did someone take 2.6 – Areas Where ICANN is an Observer on your side?

Simon McCalla:          I think we'll get the rest of it done; wait for your Sections on risks and observation of that risk.  And then depending on what needs to be done, we can then reassign it within that.

Alejandro Pisanty:      If Areas Where ICANN is an Observer includes things like the IGF and so forth, I'll take it.  It fits with you.

Simon McCalla:          Yeah, I think every time we went down that approach of where ICANN observes and it's not strictly risk-related, it was either, well, it doesn't refer to SSR or if it does, then shouldn't it be being picked up in the wider risks Section.  So it was a kind of… I almost feel that may end up being redundant in that Section.

But if not, it'll capture the ones like IGF where we might say something like "the risk of government intervention at a later stage due to a specific policy then might lead to some stage to destabilization."  But that's such kind of down the line.

Alejandro Pisanty:            It almost fits better into 3; certainly it's transitional into both, so I'll pick it the right name for now.  Picking it doesn't mean other than drafting and putting to consideration of the group.

Simon McCalla:               Yeah, I think leave in as a reminder that there might be scope to have something in there, but as the report gets closer to fruition we might choose to pull that Section out.  Does that make sense to you?

Alejandro Pisanty:            Bill, any choices?

Bill Manning:                  So 3.1 is interesting because it's kind of nebulous and there's a lot of people talking about it but there's not a lot of structure and framework around 3.1.  So I would be happy to contribute to that along with everybody else kind of clustering around the famous problem space there.  But more interestingly, I think I would like to work on either 1.3 – or are those closed?

Alejandro Pisanty:            We are in 3.

Bill Manning:                  Oh, just in 3?  Okay, cause…

Male:                              Stay away from that Section.  (laughing)


Alejandro Pisanty:               The whole thing was a plan against you.  (laughing)


Bill Manning:                    Alright, so if we're just doing 3, then 3.1 seems to need a fair amount of work on it but we don't have enough input as to what other people are doing to actually, I think, do anything sort of concrete.  I think tomorrow we're actually going to find out what the Board is doing – you know, the Board Risk Committee – and its assignment of people to a working group to help guide and direct the DSSA and possibly us.

So 3.1 is kind of busy.  3.3 – there was a little bit of push-back on 3.3 and since you asked me to take care of that previously, I'd be happy to follow that one.


Alejandro Pisanty:               Anders has already offered…


Bill Manning:                    I thought Anders was doing 3.4 – the contingency planning as opposed to incident response?


Alejandro Pisanty:               Okay, who's the do-or-die?  Anders, can you coordinate?  Can you be the coordinator for 3.3?

EN

Bill Manning:                      Okay, if Anders wants to do that, then – are you doing 3.2?

Anders Rafting:                   I'm doing just part of 3.3, the Conficker case, actually.

Bill Manning:                      Is anybody doing 3.2?

Anders Rafting:                   I don't think so.

Alejandro Pisanty:              I was going to offer myself and ask you to help.

Bill Manning:                      Okay.  That works.

Male:                                   I would be happy to help with 3.2 if possible.

Olof Nordling:                     Is this an information point – the emerging risks to the DNS.  Why is it point there?  We amended it.

Alejandro Pisanty:          Okay, so let's see.  We have 3.1 – Bill and myself.  Anyone else for General Risk Management Process?  1, 2, 3 – yes.

Male:                       I'd be happy to help.

Alejandro Pisanty:          Happy to help means you're in.  3.2 – Identifying Existing and Emerging Risks to the DNS – myself, Bill, Ondrej.  Incident Response Process – Anders drafting.  Yeah, 3.3 – Anders drafting with Ondrej.

[background conversation]

Alejandro Pisanty:          Well, our recommendation will be to use the SSA as a mechanism or not.  But it's not like we have to redo the work.  It's all written for us.  The SSA is not in 3, but in 3.2.

[background conversation]

Alejandro Pisanty:          Yeah, but they're in 3.2.  They're mostly identifying the risks.  3.4 – Contingency Planning Process – David Cake and Anders

drafting.  And who's a do-or die?  Who doesn't sleep if it doesn't get done?

David Cake:                There's only two of us.

Alejandro Pisanty:         We're done. Anything else that arises, we'll farm it out some way. So, Simon, Jeff, you worked already on schedules, so we would like… I think it would help us to see your schedules and try to adjust ours, although we have a larger task.

Simon McCalla:            We haven't got a schedule.  I think most of the tasks we looked at were… a lot of them were just a couple where we've already got existing analysis, so I think it's just a few hours work.  It's nothing to get tied up the next two or three weeks.

There's a couple of bigger bits I think we should involve into - people like Jeff Moss and a few things.  There's going to have to be a bit of time to organize that.  I didn't see anything that was desperately onerous in there.  I think three to four weeks with a… by the end of November certainly I think we ought to have our Sections all wrapped up and done, provided we all get a decent run at it.  Do you agree with that, Jeff, or…?

EN

| | |
|---|---|
| Jeff Brueggeman: | Yeah, I would say we should touch base in two weeks and try and issue-spot either missing information, see how things are going. |
| Simon McCalla: | Did you want a more detailed breakdown on that?  Are you comfortable if Jeff and I coordinate that and when we… |
| Alejandro Pisanty: | I don't see how you could make more of it. |
| Simon McCalla: | Yeah, we'll speak a couple of times a week anyway and bounce that back and forth, so we'll keep that going and be done. |
| Alejandro Pisanty: | Any further detail would be fate. |
| Simon McCalla: | I think as soon as we know we can say, "This is in; this is in," but I sort of… in my head I think ending for end of November. |
| Alejandro Pisanty: | How do you feel, Bill, David, Ondrej, Anders?  We can be done in four weeks?  You have the time to finish this in four weeks?  Bill, you okay?  Ondrej? |

Ondrej Filip:            Yeah, I'm okay.


Alejandro Pisanty:       So what we would like to do is, Alice will support us as she has always done.  I think that we should have conference calls to check on progress; certainly emails exchanged, but conference calls have a good effect in being able to actually exchange stuff.

I don't know if you agree, David, Ondrej, Bill and Anders, let's try to have one in two weeks – Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday was arranged.  Do it through a Doodle.  We'll try to look for an Australia-friendly time.


David Cake:              I'll actually be traveling in New Zealand.


Alejandro Pisanty:       Oh wow.  That sure makes a huge difference in time for us.  It's what – two time zones; one?  But, yeah, thanks for stating that in the sense that we… it will be useful to know later what kind of times of day you'll be available or if you'll be completely off in the wilderness.  It's work?  So we'll do that.

And Simon and Jeff, I would like to have a teleconference call with you guys also in two weeks, maybe same day, maybe different day, depending on scheduling.

And for Team 1 and 2, did you agree on any…?

Male:                    Why don't we just set up our own meeting and you can sit in on our meeting.  That would probably be easier.


Alejandro Pisanty:       Yeah, but you also talked about having a check point in two weeks.  Very good.  What else do we need?


Jeff Brueggeman:         One of the things that I did is to catalog the specific data requests that we have for the staff for our Section, so I will send that around to our team and to you and to the staff.  So it's got our updated outline; who's doing what and then the data requests.  So I think it's helpful to have that all identified in one place so that we…


Alejandro Pisanty:       I think that there's a couple of things that we have to do there with the more compressed time frame that we have now.  A little bit more coordination in that requests and interviews will be useful.  So basically what I would think we should do first is to collate all the data sources and all the documents that we have, especially the ones that have been crafted or sent recently.

                         Make sure that either there's a single email with all of them or a couple of emails if they become too unwieldy and to have them on the group.  To make sure we look up there before asking for something that may already have been provided.  We're getting to

that point where I've already seen some requests which seemed redundant.

And those interviews – I think we should make sure that everyone who's going to make an interview, who's planning on interviews or requests for specific things or whatever, should give fair warning.  If you are basing the plans that you are going to be requesting an interview with someone or some organization.

So that if anyone else sees that he or she may have questions to ask or information to get, we do it in a coordinated fashion cause we're going to be putting pressure on people to give us appointments for the calls for these interviews or to respond email within the month of November and if they begin to get three, four, five different requests, we're not going to get any useful response.  This is not a request for centralization, but for coordination that the lists from our productive result, okay?

I'm still fully for empowerment in the sense that each of you is doing an excellent job on your own initiative; don't want to stop that.  It's just that one doesn't strip another's feet just to manage that risk.

So I don't think we need a lot more right now.  We have tasks assigned to people.  We can send this out if somebody would write a note maybe, a note out to maybe…  I want probably to be able to work on a note out until Tuesday or Wednesday – sometime like that next week cause I have several full-time events once I get back to Mexico.  But I will have one for the rest of the team.

But mostly I don't think that it will induce any further cooperation from the people who are not here today.  Basically we will do the work.  I'm sure it's going to be…  I don't know if there's other comments, proposals, needs?  Ondrej, Dave, Olof, Alice on staff side.  You see this clearly enough.  Bill?  Simon, Jeff, Xiaodong Lee, Hartmut – we're good?

Jeff Brueggeman:    I think we'll send you what we have right now and then you can consolidate it however you want for the broader report.

Alejandro Pisanty:    If you all agree, I will make it a pass between Jeff and me to have edits off the documents because you're a much better editor than I am.    So we'll share that to have controlled versions of the documents as they come together – a full document.  So we all know what the others are working…

Jeff Brueggeman:    Right, but for now we're only writing on 1 and 2 and we'll assume you are writing on 3.

Alejandro Pisanty:    That's correct.  Anything else?  Well, we're done.  What we're doing till the end of November – or we're aiming to do by the end of November – is to have a complete draft.  It will be rough in

many ways; it will certainly need an edit for uniform language and so forth and it will still need consensus from the whole team.

So we may need a large teleconference with everybody at that point to discuss specific points.  If we are really lucky in getting the whole lot done, we may feel that we can vet that document so that we can send it out, for instance, like the GAC.  Let's say that we would love to do that and have pressure from there, but not promise it to anyone but ourselves.

I think that's a great call and we'll assess as we get closer, whether we are really there or we'll have an extremely limited circulation. It doesn't include all interviewees, but the stakeholders.

They tell me that yeah, we should do that or no, we never should do that, so we'll push for the best.  Something that goes for the last public round and is delivered formally in the meeting that follows in Costa Rica.

Male:                          Do we need to give it to the GAC before we put it up for public comment or could we do that at the same time?

Male:                          We give it to the GAC beforehand.

Alejandro Pisanty:           This has to do not only with the asymmetric role of the GAC in general, but also with the asymmetric role of the GAC in the AOC

Review Team.  That makes it different for the review teams and then for a standard ICANN review because there is actually a mandate.  I mean there are half of our bosses and the other half is the ICANN CEO.

Male:                           What are the other teams doing?

Alice Jansen:                 Well, they did go to the GAC with specific questions, a document with questions and they also presented their report.  I don't think it was simultaneously.

Olof Nordling:               They had a specific set of questions to the GAC.  The actual draft of the report was the same to everybody or was it pre-released to the GAC?

Alice Jansen:                 No, it was the same for everybody, yes.

Male:                           … and we also state clearly that's the case.  This version by then is only for GAC to look at and understand not to ask the community.

Male:                           So the first version would be individually…

Male:                                … and we say when we send out the first version, we tell them at GAC that we are going shortly to send out a better version for the broader community, including the GAC.


Male:                                I think so, especially since shortly in this time means two months or something, seems to me.  And then it would be something else, it wouldn't be a special GAC submission to be followed by a more advanced draft, just in order to accommodate the processing time in GAC.

As long as we be clear about what is going to happen or when, it will be okay, but if we sort of release one document to the GAC and then two weeks later, let's say, we have a public announcement with something different.  I think that's not the desirable scenario.  But that kind of stretch between them – well, I think Anders, you're a better judge than I am on this.


Anders Rafting:                I agree with what you say.  I think that's fairly good time frames for the work.


Male:                                I just don't see how the schedule works out because the soonest I can see having a draft you'd want to circulate to the GAC would be, say, mid-December and, as Alejandro said, we can't give them

a 3-week turnaround and so you're talking at least 30 days, maybe 45 days and then we would not be able to have a public comment period before Costa Rica.

Male:                          I think the aim is to give them a head start in reading something that they could start to reflect upon.  In view of their response time which would be no earlier and hopefully not later than Costa Rica – that's what we're aiming for.  They won't respond before Costa Rica anyway.

Male:                          I don't know – is it worth talking to Heather about… To me then the tradeoff is between, you know, we could give it to them at the same time as we put it out for public comment well before Costa Rica.  But if we don't do that, we're really pushing off the public comment till after Costa Rica – that's a pretty stark choice from them, right?

Male:                          Not necessarily.  I mean, it could go for public comment for 30 or 45 day public comment – that's your choice and just before Costa Rica anyway.  This is just that we would then have to more or less parallel process it and it wouldn't be updated with the GAC comments until you reach the final-final which would be dependent on the public comments as well as the GAC comments some time following Costa Rica.

Sorry to say there's no stipulated timeline for this particular Review Team.   There was one for ATRT, but don't take it for granted that it can go on forever.

Alice Jansen:              Yeah, bearing in mind that we need three years to implement the recommendations.

Jeff Brueggeman:           But I would be concerned about giving the GAC a version and then saying we're going to release a public version without taking… I don't see the benefit of giving it to them early if we're not going to fully incorporate a round of comments from them before releasing it to the public as opposed to just getting it out to them and the public by the end of the year and saying, "You have a nice long comment period before the meeting."

So my expectation in setting this rough timeline up was that when we got something that was coherent, that we would individually hand that to the people that we had interviewed…

Alejandro Pisanty:        May I interrupt you for just questions.  Alice is leaving for her trip.

[Applause]

Alejandro Pisanty:              Thanks a lot.  Safe travels.


Jeff Brueggeman:                So in mid-December we would say to the people we had interviewed, "Here is a draft copy.  Please review and send us back individually," and provide the members of the GAC on an individual basis, the opportunity to look at it with the stipulation that in the end of January – 45 days later – we expect to in calculate whatever comments they give us into a public release, but would then go out for public comment near the end of January.


Alejandro Pisanty:              Let me work it out with Olof and send it out cause it's quite difficult in January.  I hate it, but it's quite difficult so let me work it out with Olof and Anders and we'll send it out.  We still have the goal of finishing… I mean, everything is academic if we don't finish by the end of November.

We are done spectacularly thanks to how good every one of you are and how well you all work together.  Thanks a lot.


[End of Transcript]