20120222_SSR_DT_ID671088.doc

Unidentified Participant: Okay, thank you.

Unidentified Participant: Yes.

Unidentified Participant: Okay, Rick will bring his own.

Alejandro Pisanty: Okay, so I'm very impressed with the work you guys have been putting in. I'm -- I mean actually the -- it's going to be a very, very good document. I feel that we have a huge editing and still a lot of writing work to do. But I think we are getting there. We needed to have this document in full display now in order to be able to see structural things, like whether what you read first makes a good -- I don't even speak about making a good impression, because we don't know that yet -- we aren't there yet. But I would say at least the relative weight for the reader of the different sections we can begin to see where it is, whether the recommendations with -- or the findings and so forth read balanced, well founded, and so forth. So I think that we're beginning to be able to work at reducing or expanding lots -- huge sections. In particular I think that we will have to be -- to compact-ize the sections that refer to the way the security plan is presented or the security framework is presented and so forth. And we'll -- that will be even more noticeable when we finish writing the later sections.

Simon McCalla: Alejandro, can I comment on that? My feeling on that one is I think twofold really. One is, I think probably before we start to think about which sections may be looking on balance in the report, I'd urge us to make sure we finished -- we've got all of the recommendations drafted and all those underscores and text drafted. Because I think that will then -- the relative weight of the various sections of the report will feel more balanced I think once you've got the --

Alejandro Pisanty: Yes.

Simon McCalla: At the moment it feels like there's a lot of talk about process and documentation because of course we've only got text for sections 1 and 2. I think once 3starts to fill out, then they'll feel a bit more balanced.

Just my second thought on that is I'm pretty comfortable with the level of detail we've got in there and the reason is there was a lot of comment from particularly ccNSO and others about the way that the SSR framework has evolved and has been reported and documented. So I think it's important if we skip those sections, then I think there's -- then I think people may feel that we haven't done duty on that. So, I'm pretty comfortable with what's in there, particularly because I think that quite of lot of work went into doing that analysis and I'm sort of loath to lose all of that, given that we've got so little analysis on some of the other sections. So that's just my two cents' worth.

Jeff Brueggeman: This is Jeff. I guess I would add, Alejandro, I definitely want to read it so that I don't think the focus should be on the presentation, but I felt like it was very important to summarize the breadth of what ICANN is doing within the SSR framework. And there is just a lot of material there to cover and I think it's an important part of the report is to -- because some of our recommendations are you've got so many activities identified that we'd like to have better prioritization and tracking of those. The other is we are, I think really endorsing that ICANN is working on a lot of the right issues and is appropriately kind of managing what it's doing. So I definitely will read through that part of the report with an eye towards your comment, but I want to be careful. I guess I agree with Simon about not just too quickly removing things, but let's figure out how to present it in a way that is substantive and not looking like we're just focused on presentation.

Alejandro Pisanty: I'm not fighting it, I'm just signaling it, so I'm glad to move forward. Anyway, we don't have to do to a lot more writing there, so those sections will not be expanding. The ones that will really be expanding are the other ones, the ones with -- they are ones that really describe the work that ICANN's doing more than the way it's being presented or processed with the community and so forth. And we'll be certainly expanding a lot on the recommendations.

We have pending some material there in order to write some of the most substantive parts, which will have to do with the IANA VeriSign NTIA processing of the root. I've signaled some things there, which have to do with manual processing in IANA and the automation in IANA. I know that it's a constantly evolving thing, so Patrick, we'll need some help from you there, please. This should have to come from Martin's and from Bill' work and we'll have to substitute for that to -- I mean we've done a lot, but we still have there some a couple of very sensitive things that I know are not complete. We're not capturing them. The full status there.

So, moving onto the next sections, Jeff, Simon, what do you think that we should -- how should we share the load for the next, we'll say five, six days over the rest of the week and the weekend?

Simon McCalla: Could I make some suggestions about how we might proceed? And just that it's based on experience of doing this a number of times in other documents where we've got groups working. What I feel we should do and our work (inaudible). I would like us to go down the document and anywhere that we have green text on this call I'd like us to make an agreement on whether we keep the text, change it so we could say whatever -- we end up either agreeing the new text and taking the green highlighting out or we agree a new action that means somebody's got to go away and do something. So we've got all of the green turned back into white again, which would be good.

Then I would propose that we go down all the yellow actions that are in the document and take a look at who's owning those actions and who's going to put -- and then what the next steps are for those actions, if that makes sense.

Then what we can do is we can -- that should align directly with the status grid that Alice has very kindly been keeping up to date while I've been editing the document. My feeling is if we can focus down into (inaudible) to work, be really, really clear on who's doing what.

My nervousness is that we haven't made any progress on section 3 in the last five or six days and that's the one section that needs the most work. And 1 and 2 are looking pretty good, albeit they need a trim and that sort of a haircut so to speak once we look at them across the whole document, if that makes sense. But I'd be really keen to get some of these agreements ticked off today if we could on the call.

Alejandro Pisanty: Yes.

Simon McCalla:	Ideally what I'd like to do at the end of the call if it's possible, as a sort of current editor, is I'd like to then be able to accept all changes (inaudible) so that we've got a clean version going forward to the next set of changes the next four or five days. Otherwise I think we just get loaded with markups, if that makes sense.
Alejandro Pisanty:	Right.
Simon McCalla:	I think we know -- if we're happy with what we're seeing on the screen roughly at the moment, obviously pending a final review of the overall report, I'd like to accept changes and then we'll start tracking again from the end of today's call, if that makes sense.
Alejandro Pisanty:	Right.
Simon McCalla:	And Jeff, are you okay with that as a process?
Jeff Brueggeman:	Yes, definitely.
Simon McCalla:	Cool, okay. Shall we -- if it's okay then, can we -- shall we hit the top -- if we just go from the top down? I'm not proposing we address the comments directly, if that makes sense, simply because we'll be here all day if we do that. I think what we need to do is individual authors of the sections need to look at the appropriate comments and then decide whether their text takes that into account.
	Okay, if we could just go straight. I would propose all things as a methodology that we don't touch sections 1 to 3 at the moment, because they fundamentally are the summary of the review and summary of the report, which I think we're putting best on at the back end. Is that okay with everybody?
Alejandro Pisanty:	Yes.
Jeff Brueggeman:	Yes.
Simon McCalla:	Cool. So if we head straight to section 4, which is the old -- oh sorry, section 4.1, which is the old section 1. Thanks, Alice, for bringing that on screen. I think we're okay down through to -- if you keep scrolling down, for Alice, to okay, page 16 is the first one where we've got some yellow markup on there. Thank you, that's the one. So, Alejandro, this is a merge of your work plus some of my work, which was around the third party relationship. And you've helpfully put some really useful -- first what we've done is we sort of summarized the sort of spheres in 4.15 integral areas. ICANN's areas of control and influence. And then taken those internal relationship with third parties and then relationship with other parties.
Alejandro Pisanty:	Yes.
Simon McCalla:	There's some really helpful bullet points I think around that you've -- sort of the progress made by ICANN. I put things that -- this needs wordsmithing in there, because it's quite lengthy, that last one. (Inaudible)
Alejandro Pisanty:	We're in 4.15 you said, right?
Simon McCalla:	Yes, we're looking at -- if you look at -- are you on the Adobe chat room? If you look on the screen on the Adobe room, Alice has got it highlighted right there. But we're now looking at 4.17, sorry.
Alejandro Pisanty:	Okay?
Simon McCalla:	What do people think about those bullet points there?

Alejandro Pisanty:	I didn't get to see them. Let's see again. So what are the bullet points, Simon? I'm not sure I'm seeing them.
Simon McCalla:	Are you looking on the Adobe -- are you on the Adobe chat room? Are you in Adobe?
Alejandro Pisanty:	I have the chat room and the document.
Simon McCalla:	Okay, so if you look on the screen -- have you got the -- Alice has got the document shared on the screen right there.
Alejandro Pisanty:	Yes.
Simon McCalla:	If you click full screen, the full screen button that will bring it up full screen so you'll be seeing it. Then you can scroll up and down that. I think -- Alice, can we all individually scroll or do you have to scroll it?
Alice Jansen:	Yes, the (inaudible) is synchronized for settings, so you should be able to scroll down the document.
Simon McCalla:	So okay, I've got them now. So can everybody see those four bullets on screen? I can definitely see those. Hello?
Jeff Brueggeman:	Yes, Simon, I see the bullet. What is the question you're asking? Just --?
Simon McCalla:	So the question -- so I'm asking really what the comment is. I think we need to wordsmith these, because particularly the fourth bullet is quite wordy. And it leads to -- if we go -- just slightly go down on the page, it also leads to quite -- what I think is quite a weak recommendation, which is just kind of carry on doing what you're doing, which I'm not sure is a great recommendation to make. So consequently this little section I feel we'll just -- I'd like to get people's comments and thoughts on what we want to do with this section, whether there is an action to tidy up these bullets and additional text, and change the recommendation or whether we are comfortable with what we've got there.
Jeff Brueggeman:	Well, it struck me, and I commented I think on the -- or I tried to comment on recommendation 5, maybe the part that you added to 5 really becomes recommendation 4. In other words, I think one recommendation is that there should be a more thorough documentation of the relationships and more of a specific process that ICANN lays out for how its going to engage with these parties, which are complex relationships. And then the other is to develop joint recommendations with those other providers and how to improve transparency and accountability.
	So one is almost more of a -- from ICANN's perspective, establish more of the structure of these relationships and be very clear with everyone what those are. And that's where we had talked about just documenting what is the form that these relationships take today? Where there are contracts, where there are not contracts, all those things would be a good baseline. Maybe that would strengthen number 4.
	And then number 5 would be -- and then work with those other parties to try and be transparent and improve accountability.
Simon McCalla:	Okay, so if we swap -- yes, so in which case if we -- you say swap 4 and 5 around and then make 4 about clear -- focusing the part forward -- to carry on -- yes. But 4 really should just be make sure you have clear, established focuses to ensure engagement, whatever it is. So we -- do you want me to find some new wording for that?
Jeff Brueggeman:	Yes. And I think -- again, that second sentence that you had added to recommendation 5 I liked, which is kind of just document these relationships and define the nature of them

would seem to be a good part of that. Maybe better -- a better fit for that, strengthening 4. And then 5 could focus -- I like 5, just the first sentence about collaborating with them to develop kind of specific recommendations for transparency and mutual accountability.

Simon McCalla: I wonder if 5 -- I wonder if you're right. I wonder if 5 on its own becomes -- 4 is effectively unnecessary because 5 -- the nature of documents in those relationships is going to help establish the clear processes of working together and therefore I wonder whether 5 just needs a slight change in wording and then that covers both of those?

Jeff Brueggeman: I don't know. I actually think it's two separate points, but --

Simon McCalla: Okay.

Jeff Brueggeman: -- why don't you try this too and then if we see it -- if it really doesn't seem to stand on its own then we can combine them.

Simon McCalla: Okay, well I will take that. So that's the first section on me. Do you think we need any more text? Do we need any more text in -- to support those recommendations or do you feel that the content of that section is enough?

Alejandro Pisanty: We may need more, but this is (inaudible). And the extra role of VeriSign. That -- I mean in very concrete terms, that's what we're talking about.

Simon McCalla: Okay, so in which case I will change -- so that's the first one. Second actually, is I will change that yellow text to say -- just to make sure we capture the fact that we're going to insert some of the (inaudible) there.

Jeff Brueggeman: One question I had is -- and I don't have a solution, but in this section when you look at 4.14 and 4.15, we're talking about kind of the areas of control and influence. It just -- the way we're categorizing ICANN's responsibilities in this section don't correspond to the way that we talk about them in the next section when -- that I wrote on the SSR framework. And I'm trying to figure out to harmonize it and maybe, Patrick, you can help.

So, in 4.15 we have internal operations, direct relationships and indirect influence. And then in the SSR framework it's kind of things we control, things we can influence and things we are just an observer. Is there a way to try and -- I think it's -- in order to not be throwing out different things that are -- yes, I just think it'd be better to try and be more consistent so that it doesn't look like we're overly focused on these categories, but we're using them to talk about the issues.

Simon McCalla: That's a really good point, Jeff. I guess, Jeff, from my perspective, when I looked at this and what I was trying to do was harmonize the existing text we already had in section 1 with some of Alejandro's input that we got from the -- from his wording. So, that's kind of what this is trying to achieve. I think you're right though in the sense that it's kind of strayed slightly away from where we are in section 2.

Alejandro Pisanty: Yes, no easy solution there. It really feels like it starts (inaudible).

Jeff Brueggeman: I mean, Patrick, what -- and I also think just logically I think starting with ICANN's limited technical mission and then discussing their internal operations, which is 4.16, and then getting into like 4.15 and 4.17, seem to fit together. Relationships with third parties are also aware they're controlling and influencing. Unless --

Patrick: So, Jeff, one suggestion is that we've tried to characterize this third bullet as more of the things that ICANN does in support of the multi-stakeholder model. And while relationships with third parties are part of it, it's more of things that ICANN does in collaboration with others. It's not necessarily things that are -- singular relationship that

ICANN may have with external parties. I may not be explaining this very well, but it's something more community collaborative than -- and as part of the model itself than just individual relationships with individual entities.

Alejandro Pisanty: It's like -- sorry, to jump in -- it's very much what Jeff is asking about, if I understand (inaudible). We are going back to the inner, middle and outer sphere.

Patrick: Right.

Jeff Brueggeman: Yes, and Alejandro, I think what you have drafted I think really gets it. It's broader engagement with the Internet community, it's law enforcement, it's governments, right? Kind beyond the direct -- I hear what you're saying, Patrick. So, part of it is ICANN has a somewhat complex set of relationships, varying degrees of influence and control even within the ICANN process, right? And then there's -- but you're also part of this broader Internet ecosystem and so it's very important for you to be linked into that as well in that third category.

Patrick: So perhaps instead of calling the section ICANN's Relationships with Third Parties, it's ICANN's Relationships within the Ecosystem. And I think the text fits, and I'm looking at 4.17, because all of these groups, while they're ICANN structures, they're also composed of entities that are in the ecosystem, where they're not just parts of the ICANN structure. They stand alone and have their own interests and goals that they pursue.

Alejandro Pisanty: What we have started with and have been useful and we saw more of that also in ICANN's own text in yours, Patrick. I mean teams as well as other parts on ICANN. It's crisper than a definition of these three spheres of control, where the first one is ICANN's own operations. I mean ICANN staff, ICANN board, IANA. Things that are, let's say, on the payroll, that are in principle under a hieratical boss/employee relationship, stuff like that.

Then we have things like the gNSO, ccNSO and so forth, where you have parties that have bilateral relationships that cause them some obligation with ICANN. So, that includes the members of the gNSO and the gNSO policy development process, stuff like that where there's some level of binding between what parties do and what ICANN does.

And the third one is where ICANN cannot -- doesn't even exert this indirect control. That would be like users at large, domain resellers, domainers, parties where ICANN has no control. And there's a (inaudible) between the second and third one, if you look at stuff like the IGF or the IPU, which is basically an external entity, which ICANN does not control, but which also appears in the GAC, for example.

Simon McCalla: Okay, so just for expediency, as to where we've got a lot of edits to do on documents today in this hour, so what my suggestion would be I'll change those titles to -- I'd say 4.17 is about with the ecosystem -- with the ICANN stakeholder model, whatever ecosystem, which then clears that up. I think the next bullet --

Jeff Brueggeman: I think it needs reorganizing too though. I mean I think -- I think the discussion should flow ICANN operations, ICANN coordinator, collaborator and then ICANN in the broader ecosystem.

Simon McCalla: Yes.

Jeff Brueggeman: And then I will tighten the section 2 I think the same way. And real quick, on slide 26 of the new SSR framework that Patrick sent around a few weeks ago, it's got these categories. And one thing -- Patrick, a comment is -- it says the third category is ICANN as an observer of the activities of others in the global ecosystem. I put that section in because you had it last year and it ends up kind of having nothing in it. And I think that -- I think observer is too weak of a term there. I think it's a participant in the activities.

And then some of the things that -- I think we actually can end up having some good recommendation in that section about ICANN as a source of information. And Alejandro, some of your points about outreach, I think that becomes a more substantive section. If you're -- if ICANN's not just an observer, right?

Simon McCalla: Okay, in which case, will you split the 4.18 then?

Jeff Brueggeman: Yes.

Simon McCalla: Alice, can you scroll down 4.18 if you've got it? Which is what's currently called ICANN's Indirect Relationships. I think this is the section we talked about, which is a broader ecosystem.

Jeff Brueggeman: Right. And if we just -- Simon, you and I can coordinate. I think if we use consistent language and consistent organization, we have a lot of good information for all three of those. It's just kind of tightening up the organization a little bit.

Simon McCalla: I think you're right. I think (inaudible) you and I to -- so, with that in mind, if we do that, I've got a new -- asking for a new recommendation there, which I think comes from Alejandro's analysis and plus as we wrote this, that became increasingly obvious, which is a recommendation about a targeted outreach program. Understanding what outreach means into that broader ecosystem. Are we comfortable with putting that -- if we can find the right wording, putting that in there?

Jeff Brueggeman: Yes, although I think that would go -- to me it would go logically in section 2 of something that we would recommend as being a substantive add to the SSR framework.

Simon McCalla: Okay.

Jeff Brueggeman: Right?

Simon McCalla: Fine.

Jeff Brueggeman: Activities? And actually I would also say there are some things that they're already doing there, so I think what I should do is look at Alejandro's recommendation and then compare it to what is already in the framework. And then see if we can -- I do totally agree with the recommendation. It's a question I think of building on what they're already doing to try and figure out what the right way to say it is.

Simon McCalla: Yes, agreed. Yes, it's not like -- it may not be a totally -- but it's interesting. I mean Patrick and I think (inaudible) for the date about the anonymous attack on the root servers. And actually this is an ideal opportunity for ICANN to be publicly reaching out and showing itself as the coordinator. And that's not that transparent at the moment, and so this is -- this sort of brought that home on this recommendation. So it's about what is ICANN's role when it comes to incidents like this? It could easily public -- I mean is very clearly publisher, a sort of method of operation when you get into something like this. So it's no -- so I think reaching out to all DNS operators would be a really important thing. And certainly all DNS operators are not represented in the ICANN community.

Jeff Brueggeman: Right.

Simon McCalla: Okay, so in action, just you and I coordinate on just making sure those tie in with section 2 and (inaudible) the language, yes.

Jeff Brueggeman: I actually think that'll help streamline some of the subsections in section 2 as well, because I found it a little bit repetitive where -- I'll just -- I think a good scrubbing of that and have these three sections be clearly the categories will really help.

Simon McCalla: Yes, I think you're right. I think you and I need to work -- I know you've been saying there's a bit of -- there's duplication and there is definitely duplication. Okay, so we just -- should we keep going down if that's okay?

Jeff Brueggeman: Um-hmm.

Simon McCalla: I want to just make sure we get through as much of this. We've only got half an hour left.

Jeff Brueggeman: And then the other thing I would just say is I think an important part of that section 1 is maybe a little bit of an expansion on what ICANN is saying it's not responsible for. I do think that is a key part of -- and it's something that has been included in the FY'12 and FY'13 SSR framework of kind of statement of what they're not responsible for. And I think that's good to maybe highlight that a little. It's in there, but I'd make that very clear as well.

Simon McCalla: Okay, I'll just make that -- I'll bring that to -- that should be not be a separate -- I'll write a separate heading on that. While we're still on section 1, I appreciate it's not in the document yet, but my comment about RSAC. It feels to me that there's an overlap where we should be talking about those relationships with SSAC, RSAC, specifically around the what is the formal documented relationship? This isn't about implementation; it's what is documented and what isn't documented? And is there any clarity around that? It feels that there ought to be a bullet in there about -- I know we've got broader -- we've got the ICANN overall stakeholder group in 4.17. I wonder whether we alter the target section on SSAC and RSAC. How do people feel about that?

Alejandro Pisanty: I definitely need -- think that we need to describe them. They are very different and we have to make that very clear. I think there's a source of -- one of the most contentious parts of the -- emerging from the report will have to do with the RSAC more than the SSAC. I mean the SSAC is ICANN formed, it works well. It has failed to deliver on the framework. That work has been handed over to the new working.

RSAC is much more prickly. I don't think it's working -- that relationship is right and I don't know that it can be improved with the -- real fast or in any -- we don't have concrete proposals that will improve that without causing even more noise. But we can't just shirk away from singling it.

Simon McCalla: I think we -- I'm wondering whether what we should do is in that section just highlight that there are two very key relationships inside the ICANN stakeholder model. And they are the advisory groups. And of those, (inaudible) and SSR, from a specific SSR point of view, the most important are SSAC and RSAC. And consequently there's probably some commentary on saying SSAC seems to be okay, RSAC probably could do with some work. And I think if we leave it at that rather than making very specific recommendations like you should have contractual arrangements. That's so that we spotted that without necessarily treading through dangerous ground.

Jeff Brueggeman: I mean, Simon, maybe just make -- let me make a suggestion and see what you think. I mean I think when we talked about the RSAC, it did strike me it's, I don't know, someone made the comment it's a similar issue with the ccNSO as well. And so, given the -- if we work backwards from the recommendations, we have a recommendation about kind of documenting these relationships with whether it's the RARs or the ccNSO or the RSAC. I mean I would say why not describe those set of relationships and then you could add a couple of paragraphs on the importance of the RSAC or the root zones specifically. And then flow into that recommendation. And --

Simon McCalla: (Inaudible)

Jeff Brueggeman: I'm fine mentioning the SSAC here, but I do think to me the most interesting part of the SSAC is if you tie it back to our recommendations is getting clarity about SSAC responsibilities versus the board committee versus the DSSA working group and making clear there should be accountability and clear roles. You've got a little bit of a complex structure now doing the risk management SSR issues there. Not necessarily a problem but want to make sure that's working well.

Simon McCalla: Okay, so I will -- in which case I will take an action. I will add some text around SSAC and RSAC that will lead into recommendation 5, the current five that's going to swap around, without -- but no specific RSAC recommendation as such. Is that what you're saying, Jeff?

Jeff Brueggeman: Yes, or that -- I'm okay mentioning SSAC there, but SSAC to me really seems more relevant when we get down to talking about the risk management and some of those (inaudible).

Simon McCalla: No, completely. I just think they've got -- ICANN's got hundreds of relationships in that ecosystem, but those -- in terms of the most important ones, those are really -- it's really important. And I think it's probably worth some text here saying -- I think it's text alluding to the fact that RSAC perhaps may need some looking into without us putting a recommendation down to say you really need to clarify your relationship with the RSAC.

Jeff Brueggeman: Okay, thanks.

Simon McCalla: Okay, I'll take that action. Okay, so we're now into section 2 or 4.2. I'm scrolling down. I'm scrolling through, just trying to get to the next page. Okay, page 24 is the first one. No, that's it. Sorry, that's great. So we've got some text -- we've got an action from Martin. Jeff, is that something you're coordinating at the moment?

Jeff Brueggeman: Yes, I'm just going to have to -- I mean it kind of gets at what Alejandro was saying. I haven't dug in on this issue of automation versus manual. And I think Martin has some thoughts about that, but I haven't been able to get anything from him. So --

Alejandro Pisanty: No, I think we could wait. I mean at this stage, we have to begin substituting for his work. So, here the point is Patrick, could you provide us a few progress describing the present status there? And we'll work on evaluating and recommending from there. The basic point is whether the exposure to risk is feasible and manageable with the manual and with the automating processes. Because each of them has proven to have its own benefits and risks.

Patrick Jones: Would it help to look to see what our -- either the IANA team or DNS ops has already provided --

Alejandro Pisanty: Yes.

Patrick Jones: -- to Martin on this? Because it could be that it's -- the text is already there.

Alejandro Pisanty: That's my point.

Simon McCalla: Patrick, would everybody be all right, rather than provide it to Martin if you provide it to the whole group?

Patrick Jones: Oh, yes. To the drafting group?

Simon McCalla: (Inaudible) time (inaudible) we've got now it's going to be question of somebody picking up the action then and then writing that text. It's not been great, but we haven't got time to wait a week for him to (inaudible).

Jeff Brueggeman: Yes, well I'll take the -- if you can send me the info, I'll take the to do of -- and send it to everybody, but I'll take a first stab at summarizing it and looking at. And then you guys can add your thoughts.

Simon McCalla: Cool, okay.

Denise: Hi, this is Denise. I have the information that I sent Martin on this topic, so I'll resend it to you, Jeff, (inaudible).

Jeff Brueggeman: Oh, great. Okay.

Alejandro Pisanty: I'll be (inaudible) for -- if you send it to the three of us.

Denise: Absolutely.

Simon McCalla: Cool, okay. Moving now, on page 25. So we have section 4.223, which is Internal Corporate Security. And Jeff, there's an action there if you could review and analyze non-public information.

Jeff Brueggeman: Yes, I've got the information, I just need to read through it.

Simon McCalla: Okay, you're still good with that then, right?

Jeff Brueggeman: Right. Can we have a brief discussion? One of -- Alejandro, I think you raised a good comment of the point about referencing non-public material in the report and whether that's going to cause issues. In my view, it's reasonable that on security issues there would be some things that ICANN doesn't want to make public, but that we could discuss. But are you thinking that it's going to raise some --?

Alejandro Pisanty: If we call it the memo, then eventually someone will ask for it. So we have to be sure, together with Patrick and the ICANN team that they will have something that they will be able to release. And in fact, in -- then don't wait for the request. I mean what I see here and elsewhere is if something's going to be -- if you are going to be forced to surrender some documents to a Freedom of Information Act kind of process, to a request for information, then why don't you have it ready and even publish it preemptively?

                    So, my point here could be reduced to just not calling it a memo. Not calling -- not naming the private, secret, highly confidential document, but just say as a result of interviews, what our findings. We don't have to necessarily refer to a specific document there. I mean that internal document was -- that non-public document was in fact prepared as a reply to our press. So we don't have to say that a memo exists if ICANN's not comfortable with releasing it or a version of it. And on the other hand, Patrick, if you are comfortable, then we should mention it and it should be public or be an annex or whatever. (Inaudible)

Patrick Jones: Yes, I mean I would prefer that these not -- we not be put in the position of having to make things -- documents published that we wouldn't normally make public.

Alejandro Pisanty: Then let's just not mention it by the name of an existing document.

Jeff Brueggeman: I think that's a great suggestion. I do think if there are things that you can compile out of the material that you've given us that have not been publicized before that are the level of reassuring people that you have addressed a lot of these issues, it could be beneficial. But I do understand the sensitivities there, so.

Alejandro Pisanty: My personal policy here is if you're going to end up doing it, start up doing it.

Jeff Brueggeman: Yes.

Alejandro Pisanty: And sorry to mention -- I mean to drill this one more -- this is like a (inaudible) kind of situation. ICANN could have spared itself a lot of pain by -- I mean this is in hindsight of course, but if you're going to end up doing it, just (inaudible). Get the more diluted document out.

Jeff Brueggeman: Right, I like your approach, Alejandro. It's -- yes.

Simon McCalla: Okay, cool.

Jeff Brueggeman: So, yes, so then we take that as a to do.

Simon McCalla: Right, I'll leave that one in there. I won't take specific action, because we're not changing a thing or document, so I'll leave it with you.

Alejandro Pisanty: It's just not mentioning the memo.

Jeff Brueggeman: Right.

Simon McCalla: So taken out?

Jeff Brueggeman: Right. And then I'll finish the review of the ICANN security document.

Simon McCalla: Okay, cool. Page 28 then in that case. Okay, we've got, Denise and Patrick, clarify goals of certification for a global BTB center and Internet number resource certification, question mark. I'm not quite sure what that one was. That was (inaudible).

Patrick Jones: So, Internet number resource certification is actually another way to say RPKI.

Simon McCalla: Yes.

Patrick Jones: And so that's completely different than certifying on a global business continuity process standard. I mean they're two different things.

Simon McCalla: Okay.

Alejandro Pisanty: I'm sorry. Here for BCP, does it stand for best current practice or for business continuity process?

Simon McCalla: I think best current practice. I think that's what we --

Jeff Brueggeman: Yes, that's -- no, I mean that is -- ICANN consistently uses it's other reference of business continuity. And so I think we need to either not use an abbreviation or use the one that ICANN is already using. That was an issue that I had flagged, Simon, as --

Simon McCalla: Yes, (inaudible).

Jeff Brueggeman: Patrick, correct me if I'm wrong, but I think you guys use it for business continuity and not as best current practice.

Patrick Jones: It depends on the context and it's probably best to fully spell it out.

Jeff Brueggeman: Let's just spell it out.

Simon McCalla: Yes, so you think -- who wrote that question? Is that (inaudible)?

Jeff Brueggeman: Wrote what?

Simon McCalla:	This specific request into the document.
Jeff Brueggeman:	I think Patrick just answered the question, right? I just wanted to understand what the -- there was a reference to a global business continuity practice standard. Is that something that you have more about?
Patrick Jones:	Yes, that could have been earlier, and also from our discussion in Dakar about whether ICANN was going to pursue certification under the ISO 2700 series or equivalent certification process for its contingency planning and operations. And so far, the decision has been we're aware of the steps, we track what those steps are and our progress against them, but we're not pursuing certification and there's a variety of reasons around that. But we're at least following to the best that we can those international standards that exist.
Simon McCalla:	Okay, well --
Alejandro Pisanty:	It's also discussed elsewhere in the document when (inaudible) and Corbett and 27,000 -- the ISO 27,000s are mentioned, so we would -- I mean it's more editing for things that have already been mentioned.
Simon McCalla:	So do we want to scrub this particular -- this --?
Jeff Brueggeman:	Yes, you can take that out and I think the RPKI is already in there. So I think we're good.
Simon McCalla:	Yes, I think so.
Jeff Brueggeman:	I think we're good, yes.
Simon McCalla:	Okay, so we'll scrub the ELO on page 28. So I'm just trying to take very specific actions here because I think what's we need at this stage. Right, okay. Moving down, okay, to page 31, Strategic Plan, Jeff. Actually this isn't an action as such. It looks like somebody yellowed or highlighted some text that we had on that. Is that you highlighting that, Jeff?
Jeff Brueggeman:	Yes, I think I just forgot to delete the highlighting. But I deleted the -- because Patrick sent me the comments that were filed, so I added a paragraph.
Simon McCalla:	Oh, I see, okay. Well, I'll scrub the highlighting then. Highlight on page 31 and not text. Sorry, I'm just writing down actions here. Okay, scrolling down again.
Jeff Brueggeman:	I think that's it for section 2.
Simon McCalla:	That's it for 2, yes.
Jeff Brueggeman:	Yes.
Simon McCalla:	Okay, understanding the risk landscape. So, we've got a whole ton -- didn't I make a change to some of the recommendation text? Have I missed something here or was that in 4 point --? Oh, no, it's all in here. Okay, fine. Sorry, I'm just being a bit random. Okay, so this is the section we really need -- that needs a heck of a lot of work. There's a lot of actions here. So, ignoring they need more text and introductions, because I think that can be done toward the end, the first set of actions is -- in section 4.31, which is page 38, which is describe SSR of using descriptions of existing and emerging risks of DNS and relevant documents. Who -- Alejandro, are you picking that up?
Alejandro Pisanty:	I'm picking it up, but I know I've just only started on that, but would care for your reactions at present, but mostly I just have to keep developing that section.
Simon McCalla:	Oh, okay, so I see the yellow text is your -- sorry, I hadn't noticed that that yellow text is --

Alejandro Pisanty:	Yes, it's the one about the Anisa report and homeland security one. And remember also that there as a very important question --
Patrick Jones:	Sir, can I suggest something here on 4.31?
Alejandro Pisanty:	Yes.
Patrick Jones:	Hello?
Alejandro Pisanty:	Yes, go on. We lost him.
Simon McCalla:	Are you there, Patrick? Alice, have we still got Patrick online?
Patrick Jones:	I'm checking right now.
Simon McCalla:	He's still showing up in the --
Alejandro Pisanty:	Patrick left -- he's asking (inaudible).
Patrick Jones:	Hello?
Simon McCalla:	Oh hi.
Alice Jansen:	Patrick, can you hear us?
Simon McCalla:	Okay, dialing back in now.
Alejandro Pisanty:	Great. In the meantime, Simon, is there -- okay.
Simon McCalla:	There he is.
Patrick Jones:	Okay. Sorry about that.
Alejandro Pisanty:	Good to have you back. So you were just going to tell us your suggestions on 4.31, which is assessing existing and emerging risks. This part with the Anisa and the DHS reports.
Patrick Jones:	Yes. So, there's a couple of things here. ICANN's had a risk board -- risk committee for a few years and that risk committee has looked at side risks to the organization. Looked at -- I mean that has discussed DNS risks more broadly. But, ICANN's been a participant in some of these external efforts for the last few years as well, which you list the DHS risk work and also as a subject matter expert in some of the earlier Anisa work. The fairly new board level DNS risk management framework working group has -- that's come out of conversations at the board that were out of the SSAC review. And so there has been discussion and thinking about to sort of consolidate that more broad DNS risk work. And the current text doesn't seem to categorize that it's something that's been part of a more longer-term discussion.
Alejandro Pisanty:	So, you'd like the text to show more of the evolution and we can do that based on Denise's timeline. The thing is that we didn't find any documents coming from the board risk committee. So if you have any, I mean minutes of meetings where this may (inaudible), I would be very thankful for and I will use it for my writing of this section.
Patrick Jones:	So, let me look back at the posted minutes to see if there's something that I can point to. And --
Alice Jansen:	We have agendas and items -- is that what you're referencing, Alejandro. I can give you links to a topic on the risk committee's agendas for the meetings.

Alejandro Pisanty:	Okay.
Alice Jansen:	I mean the minutes are pretty sparse, but -- is that what you're referring to?
Alejandro Pisanty:	That will be good.
Alice Jansen:	Okay, I'll send you that.
Alejandro Pisanty:	We can actually see what -- because for all I know the risk committee was looking more at financial and kind of organic risk or the risk of the CEO going wild or things of that level and financials were very important as well. But I'll be glad to be corrected.
Patrick Jones:	Yes, one more thing I'd highlight is -- and I think it was the most -- so the 2012 or FY'12 SSR framework had a section on emerging threats. And I know that's still slightly different than emerging risks, but we at least referenced it as here's a collection of things that are happening in the ecosystem and we're aware that they're happening and they deserve more attention.
Alejandro Pisanty:	That's in the framework, correct?
Patrick Jones:	Yes.
Alejandro Pisanty:	Okay, yes. I mean that's just going to be funneled and I haven't done it yet.
Simon McCalla:	So, Alejandro, can I leave you -- are you comfortable working with just Patrick and Denise and padding that section out?
Alejandro Pisanty:	Absolutely.
Simon McCalla:	Great, fantastic. If we could move onto 4.32 then. Again, this is kind of the same territory really. You want to count that in that same discussion.
Alejandro Pisanty:	Yes.
Simon McCalla:	Okay, great. Let's keep going then. In which case that also covers the stuff about risk management process. Okay, we have some wording for recommendation 30. I just did some editing of all of our recommendations to try and make them -- this is, sorry, Alice, this is page 40 -- to try and just bring them -- making them a little shorter to make them a little more concise. But I've kept exactly the same meaning for these. Is everyone comfortable with the wording of recommendation 30?
Alejandro Pisanty:	I'm okay with it and if any change emerges from the work we're going to do then we'll --
Simon McCalla:	Exactly, we can re-tweak it, but for the moment if we're happy with it without reproof. Okay, then we -- there's a piece of text there about in order to support recommends at (inaudible) 31. Again, it goes back to risk management, but it's about that sort of long-term forecasting of risks. And then the use of third parties and support organizations (inaudible). It kind of supports, yes that point about outreach as well that we talked about earlier on.
	Alejandro, are you picking up that action? Is that (inaudible) --
Alejandro Pisanty:	Yes.
Simon McCalla:	-- comfortable picking up?
Alejandro Pisanty:	Yes.

Simon McCalla:	Okay, in which case could we just -- is everybody happy with the text of recommendation 31?
Alejandro Pisanty:	I think we'll need to rethink it a lot because it still becomes like too vague.
Simon McCalla:	Okay.
Jeff Brueggeman:	I think on these sections it would be helpful to review the -- to see what the analysis is. Because these are the recommendations that were a little bit of the most blue sky in Dakar and maybe seeing the analysis then we'll be in a better position to see if the recommendations could be tightened up or modified.
Simon McCalla:	Yes, I think you're probably right there. I think it's -- that's kind of why I kind of -- I tried to tighten them up a bit just by doing -- by taking the absence of the recommendation and tightening them up. I think that's fair for a second one.
	Okay, we'll leave 31 for the moment. Moving down to section 4.33. Again, this goes back to that piece (inaudible) management. We probably need to do a (inaudible) analysis on that. Which begs the question, Jeff, is this in 4.33 or in -- back in your section?
Jeff Brueggeman:	I think this should go in the -- yes, I think this is already -- it was -- I thought it was already a recommendation in section 4.2 and (inaudible) thing is the analysis of it.
Simon McCalla:	Should we move 23 up into section 4.2 then?
Jeff Brueggeman:	I don't have it in front of -- I thought we already had one on this issue.
Simon McCalla:	You're right. This is -- I mean these are just the Senegal recommendations, so we may want to create a duplication in Senegal in that case. Have you got 4.2 in front of you? Can you have a quick (inaudible)? I mean I should actually scroll up for an on screen.
Jeff Brueggeman:	Yes, I'm doing it. It'd be 4.2. Well, recommendation 11 talks about a standard base change control process.
Simon McCalla:	In which case, 23 and 32 in that case -- recommendation 23 and 32 both ought to sit next to that, because 32 is about publishing formal standards that you -- in conjunction with SSR work.
Alejandro Pisanty:	32 is much broader.
Simon McCalla:	Elaborate on that.
Alejandro Pisanty:	It's also -- we already went about -- I mean we already mentioned this earlier in the call with the standards for management. This is the one with (inaudible).
Simon McCalla:	Yes.
Alejandro Pisanty:	Which I mentioned earlier. So we should basically look for alignment and see whether we do need the redundancy or we can measure them into one with -- we need to look at the full document again. So for the sake of time management, I would ask what are the most urgent things that you still see, Simon, because I guess --
Simon McCalla:	We're nearly there actually. We're not doing too badly here, so hang in there. We're just -- we're nearly there. Okay, we'll look at -- the actions on that is, Jeff, if you and I just review those and see if we can merge that into 4.3. Does that make sense?
Jeff Brueggeman:	Yes.

Simon McCalla:	So, okay. Sorry, let me just write down 31. Okay, is to the response process. So this is a little bit about some of what the -- Anders did. Are you picking that up, Alice? Alejandro, are you picking this one up?
Alejandro Pisanty:	Repeat please.
Simon McCalla:	4.34, are you picking up the action for 4.34 Incident Response?
Alejandro Pisanty:	Yes.
Simon McCalla:	Okay, fine. I'll leave that one as that is. Then we've got SSAC. This is the -- there are three recommendations, all of which I've reworded, actually shortened them, which is under 4.35, the role of SSAC. What do we want to do with these three? Well, actually they're not all -- 34 isn't technically an SSAC recommendation, but it seems to be sitting under that heading.
Alejandro Pisanty:	These are the ones in 4.35 for the SSAC, right?
Simon McCalla:	Yes, it's 33, 34, 36. There is a recommendation in 35, but I'll get to that in a sec.
Alejandro Pisanty:	Yes.
Simon McCalla:	What do you want to do around those? Because there needs to be quite a bit of support in text around SSAC, RSAC I think.
Alejandro Pisanty:	Yes, the question here is how much the support team text that we already have feeds into these.
Simon McCalla:	Yes, and I guess to get back to my question is actually does this fit into -- those fit in section 1 or section 2, which has got more explanation of the relationships and how they've related it to play it out, rather than in the sort of risk management.
Alejandro Pisanty:	I think that 33 definitely goes into the earlier sections.
Simon McCalla:	Yes.
Alejandro Pisanty:	Probably 36 as well.
Simon McCalla:	Yes.
Alejandro Pisanty:	And 34 is the incident notification, so that stays here.
Simon McCalla:	Okay, so 34 and 36. I'll look at moving those up to section 1.
Alejandro Pisanty:	33 and 36 move.
Simon McCalla:	Yes, 33 and 36, yes. Jeff, you (inaudible).
Alejandro Pisanty:	Move up and 34 stays.
Simon McCalla:	Yes, 34 stays, yes.
Alejandro Pisanty:	And I'll work on that.
Simon McCalla:	Okay. Jeff, are you happy with that?
Jeff Brueggeman:	Yes.

Simon McCalla: So, okay, 35 -- so we're nearly there. This is the last of the Senegal recommendations. 35, I wasn't clear on what we were asking for in 35. I'm sorry, I think I've lost the text for it. Alice, have you got the -- can you flick up the original recommendation on the screen ?

Jeff Brueggeman: Unfortunately I've got a call that I have to get on that I'm hosting. But I think we've covered my to dos and I have a note from Martin and I will basically offer to follow up with him separately. But I will not wait for input from him, I'll just proceed to start filling in and summarizing, analyzing the information that Patrick's going to send all of us.

Simon McCalla: Okay, so just before you leave, Jeff, make a (inaudible) do a quick one.

Jeff Brueggeman: Okay, yes.

Simon McCalla: We've got a ton of recommendations in other work as well, 25 to 28 and 37 to 47, which we need to work through somehow as a group and decide whether we want to include them. And then the analysis that goes with those. We've managed to get to all the Senegal ones today. What would people prefer to do around that?

Jeff Brueggeman: I'll look at any of them that relate to section 2 as I finalize that. And then next call I'll be prepared to discuss them. And then I'd say we'll be in a better position to analyze them once section 3 is more filled out and I'm open to adding more, but I think we can maybe better assess that once we finish the writing.

Simon McCalla: Okay, fine. But let's -- so, if we focus on getting, between now and the next call, getting all of these actions done and new focused and these completed, then we can take a second look at the others.

Jeff Brueggeman: Yes. I'll say this was an amazingly productive call. And I'm happy to have another call Friday or early next week, but I really do have to go.

Simon McCalla: Yes, so thanks, Jeff. I will circulate the actions I've written down just so we're all clear on who's doing what. Then why don't we take it from there?

Jeff Brueggeman: All right, thanks for keeping (inaudible).

Alejandro Pisanty: Thanks, Jeff.

Simon McCalla: No worries. Thanks, Jeff.

Jeff Brueggeman: Bye. Thanks, Alejandro, bye.

Alejandro Pisanty: Have a great day.

Jeff Brueggeman: You too, bye.

Patrick Jones: Bye.

Alejandro Pisanty: So, Simon, where are we?

Simon McCalla: (Inaudible)

Alejandro Pisanty: Hello?

Simon McCalla: Hello, I'm still here.

Alejandro Pisanty: Yes, I'm here.

Simon McCalla: Cool. Obviously I've got a few minutes and I've got to go and host a call, but the -- are you comfortable with where we are in terms of getting through the process and getting this report (inaudible)?

Alejandro Pisanty: Yes, absolutely.

Simon McCalla: Okay.

Alejandro Pisanty: I will cancel some meetings and stuff and leave lots of hours for this work so that we may be communicating by Friday.

Simon McCalla: Cool, yes. I'm aware that there's quite a lot of text to come from you and making sure we've got plenty of time for you talk through that text and make (inaudible).

Alejandro Pisanty: Yes, well I'm filling up for a lot of work that was more spread out. So I'll pick up as much as I can and get it in some workable text. So as I said, I'm going to be canceling and skipping some meetings and continue to concentrate even more on this.

Simon McCalla: Yes, great, fantastic. It's -- I think that one of the (inaudible).

Alejandro Pisanty: One thing that would help me. I mean I've taken very extensive note of the edits needed and so forth, but if you can send your version then we can be sure that we were (inaudible).

Simon McCalla: Yes, I've taken the 12 specific actions I've taken from the call, so I'll basically write those down now and email them and just circulate them amongst this group. Yes, what -- just -- if it helps, one of the things I've found is the -- it takes a surprising amount of time to do this. It never ceases to amaze me how much time it takes to edit a document and go through it. So I certainly recommend whatever time you can to -- you can free up, because it's a killer. It takes a -- (inaudible) --

Alejandro Pisanty: No, definitely.

Simon McCalla: -- on it four or five hours every day for the last week (inaudible) --

Alejandro Pisanty: Yes.

Simon McCalla: -- it's kind of a -- I know it's painful, but --

Alejandro Pisanty: No, well we're doing it.

Simon McCalla: Yes, I think we are. It's getting there. It feels like a report, that's for sure, and it's -- I think what I'll do is I will accept all the change. I will tweak -- the actions that I've got, I've taken I will do. I'll accept all the changes into the report so we've got a clean version 7, and I'll send around version 7, the clean version for everybody to work on.

Alejandro Pisanty: Right. And I'll try to make it easier for my edits to be clearly incorporated. Let's say for them to be clear where they go or what they substitute for.

Simon McCalla: Yes, I mean I'm using the Word's merge document feature to bring in everybody's edits into one document, which seems to work quite well, so yes.

Alejandro Pisanty: I'll be very careful of not using merge, so -- because -- more than one person in the editing cycle using merge is really dangerous.

Simon McCalla: Exactly. If you send me your -- you just send me -- if I send out version 7 and you send me yours, I relay what you and Jeff have done, we just put in a v7 AP edits on it. Then I

can merge those across into the main document and I'll keep the main stream going, if that makes sense.

Alejandro Pisanty: Yes, for my work of today, once I get to it I will try -- unless I've gotten a document from you, I will work on the -- on Jeff's latest.

Simon McCalla: Perfect, thanks.

Alejandro Pisanty: (Inaudible)

Simon McCalla: I'll try and have a latest version and accept changes on that, but I should have it this afternoon. I've got another call to jump on and (inaudible), but I'll get it out this evening.

What would be useful for me actually is whether -- if you do add in any text, if you could -- if it's not a specific action, not have it in yellow, that would be really helpful, because what I'm doing is I'm just using anything in yellow as an action.

Alejandro Pisanty: Okay, so I tend not to use highlighting, I tend to use my initials or the color of the edit.

Simon McCalla: Yes.

Alejandro Pisanty: So you probably signal at the top of the document, because you -- what I see in red, you're -- when you open it you may see be seeing it in blue.

Simon McCalla: Yes, that's right.

Alejandro Pisanty: But I will try to initialize the (inaudible).

Simon McCalla: Cool, yes, and just --

Alejandro Pisanty: Yes, to make it really (inaudible).

Simon McCalla: If you want any sort of discussion with a theme on it or a comment, if you stick it in green, if we use green for comments needed and then yellow is an action. That way that becomes nice and simple. And then so anywhere I felt it's sort of like oh, I need some help here, I want your thoughts, I stuck it in green. So that works really well in terms of flagging it up. And then it's very visual on the eye when we scroll through it.

Alejandro Pisanty: Yes, I'll try to do that or just adjusting easily --

Simon McCalla: Yes, okay.

Alejandro Pisanty: -- (inaudible) with. Very good.

Simon McCalla: Excellent. Thank you, sir.

Alejandro Pisanty: Have a good afternoon.

Simon McCalla: You too. I'll drop out the notes and a document later on this afternoon.

Alejandro Pisanty: Great. Alice, Patrick, Denise, thanks a lot.

Denise: You're welcome.

Alejandro Pisanty: Really great.

Patrick Jones: Thank you.

Alejandro Pisanty: Really great to work with you guys. So, bye everybody.

Alice Jansen: Okay, thanks a lot.

Simon McCalla: Catch you later.

Patrick Jones: Bye.

Simon McCalla: (Inaudible) bye.