
MICHELLE DESMYTER: Well, good morning, good afternoon and good evening to all. Welcome to the Security Framework Drafting meeting on the 18th of May 2017 at 14h00 UTC. In the interests of time today there will be no roll call. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. And if you could please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this, I will turn the meeting over to Dennis Chang.

DENNIS CHANG: Well hello, everyone. Good to see you all again. So, I trust that everybody is on the Google Doc. The link has been provided by Michelle on the chat.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Dennis, this is Kristine, I'm on the phone only for a little bit.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, good to know, Kristine. Okay, I will try to talk you through it. It's the same Google Doc that we had been working on. And what it is, is it captures the work that we will use when we make the public comment announcement, and in particular we were wanting to make sure that the important words that we use are all agreed upon and we are collaborating and therefore. So the document is laid out with Contents but also some instructional material on top, where we say it's a collaborative document, and then the leaders have the edits, right, and

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

the other people can make suggestions, as agreed. And we have a Table of Contents that has Brief Overview, Purpose of the document, Current Status and Next Steps.

And in particular I mentioned the next step is very important that we get that right because we don't want to mislead what will happen here, and we'll talk more about that. And then of course we follow a Detailed Description and Explanation. In this section we want to highlight any areas that we do want feedback on and then provide some explanation. So for those who do not really need to open up the framework and look at it, they can get a good sense of what it is without really studying the document. And of course we follow with Background and Resources.

And at the end of the document, and I thought this was very important, I have been collecting your comments via email and dialogue. Your suggestions, recommendations, you know, areas of risk that you were pointing out, those are all captured in the same document and you're welcome to add to them. So, we'll go over the document quickly throughout and then we'll get into each section in detail. How does that sound? Is that okay with everyone?

IRANGA KAHANGAMA: Yeah, sounds good to me. This is Iranga.

DENNIS CHANG: Welcome, Iranga. So, I think the first section is the Target Dates. We have not set the open date yet but the way this works is, of course, we don't have any deadlines that was imposed on us, which is good, but at

the same time we do want to publish this document for the benefit of the community as soon as possible. So, we want to press on and thank you all for supporting that call. And it would be nice if we can make May but certainly I don't see any reason why we couldn't publish this by early June.

And in our typical duration, minimum days for public comment is 40 days, but we'd like to add another week if the ICANN meeting is in the middle of that session, that duration, so that we'll have the full 40 days to work on. And close date will follow that duration and then we have a report date, and the final publication date we probably want to set a goal. We want to go for August or September. We'll have to talk about that too.

The Brief Overview. Purpose is like one statement and you're welcome to add to this. Current Status is another very short default section about purpose, current status and reason. And Next Steps are supposed to be brief, so they're short. The Detailed Explanation can be very long and as I said that this is one area we're going to talk about the focuses that we want from the comment. And the Background and Resources, I know that some edits, the suggestions have been made and they're incorporated already. Referenced. There's four references that I suggested and I don't have in any addition to that. And then Voices of caution and advice from SFDT meeting. I don't think there is anything new here.

So let's get back to our first section, Purpose. It reads as one sentence:

This public comment forum is intended to gather community feedback on the proposed Framework for the Registry Operator to Respond to Security Threats that have been produced in collaboration by the Security Framework Drafting Team (SFDT).

One sentence. Anybody have any other edits/suggestions to the Purpose statement? Please feel free to make suggestions either on the document or to speak up. Or raise your hand. Jim, go ahead.

JIM GALVIN:

So, Jim Galvin for the transcript. Just as a point of clarification, the sentence just reads kind of funny to me. Really just an editorial thing here. “Produced in collaboration by the Framework Drafting Team”? Wouldn’t we want to say something, “by the members of the Drafting Team” or “with the Drafting Team”, something like that? I guess I’m just trying to understand what we’re trying to say here. It just sort of reads weird, strange to me. Don’t know what others think, thanks.

DENNIS CHANG:

Are you on the Google Doc, Jim?

JIM GALVIN:

Yes I am, and I see the change that you’re making.

DENNIS CHANG:

Okay. Does that look better?

JIM GALVIN: How about this?

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead.

ALAN WOODS: This is Alan Woods here. I'm just wondering whether or not we could say, "This has been a collaborative effort by the members of the Security Framework Drafting Team"? Maybe, or along the lines of that.

DENNIS CHANG: Sounds good. Sounds good. Alan do you want to take the edit? Go ahead, let's try.

ALAN WOODS: I think probably Jim, he put it in or the anonymous python did. Let's see. This has been a collaborative effort...

JIM GALVIN: Yeah, I guess I'm the anonymous python.

ALAN WOODS: Oh, okay.

JIM GALVIN: Looks like we got in in there though, Alan. I like it.

ALAN WOODS: Great.

BETH BACON: Can I hop in? This is Beth.

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead, Beth.

BETH BACON: Okay, so (inaudible) my microphone here. Feel free to (inaudible) sounds even more inclusive. “Collaborative effort of the members of the Security Framework Drafting Team” but it was on behalf of the full GAC and the Registries and Registrars, because we had co-ordinated quite extensively with them. So do we get any value out of kind of presenting this as document that lots of people have already agreed to. And if you want to leave it here I don’t have a problem with how it is now but it’s just an idea.

DENNIS CHANG: I like the idea and I think Jim likes it too. Go ahead, Jim.

JIM GALVIN: Well, I was just putting it in to start to see what it looked like, but I don’t know that I have the complete list. That’s why I put the list there at the end. Beth had said RrSG and GAC. I mean, we should probably spell

those out I suppose. I don't know if we want to stick to using acronyms but we just need the complete list to—

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, we need to... they come up under Current Status, although GAC has not been...

JIM GALVIN: I see the anonymous hyena's added words too. Gotta love Google sometimes.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Yeah, this is the wrong... I don't think you can put GAC, you could probably just put PSWG.

DENNIS CHANG: I have a question. Let's see, anybody from Registrar here? Theo's not here? Because what I've noticed is that the Registrar representative has not really been participating heavily anyway, I have not noticed that, and I don't believe that the document, the draft, has been circulated with the Registrar Stakeholder group and we got any sort of a report back. I think the only thing that we did was making sure that Theo had reviewed it and gave us a thumbs up, as the representative of the Registrars or as a member of the leadership team. Any comments there?

ALAN WOODS: Hey, Dennis, it's Alan here. Yeah, I mean, I don't know, unless you've formally conveyed that to... I mean, that's a tough one. I think if you haven't raised an issue to this point is probably... we can say they haven't raised an issue, I don't know if we can say they formally signed off on it. I certainly don't know. Perhaps we should just give them that final opportunity to say, do you have an issue, and then if not, just go with it.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Hey Alan, it's Crystal, I'm just on the phone, but I really think that they should sign off on it, it just seems weird if it's just the RySG and the PSWG. For me it would look better if the Registrars were also signed off.

ALAN WOODS: I was just saying that I completely agree with Crystal. It may cause a slight more delay but, you know, it might be worth it again for cohesiveness if we're trying to do this, you know, ticking each box and doing it by the book, let's probably do that.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, I am chatting with Theo. Let me see if I can get him to join us here. It's impossible right? (inaudible). Anyway, he is the representative of the Registrar and the Leadership Team so I think we have to defer to him and now let's leave it for him to see if he can circulate it in some way that he feels comfortable in making this

statement. Because at this point I'm not comfortable because I have not seen the evidence of such.

And the other thing that I wanted to ask you is that this is a Registry response, as it says, right, to the security draft, so, Registry operators' response, right? So, it's not a Registrar's response but you feel very strongly that Registrar has to sign off on it. So that's an interesting point for me. Go ahead, Brian.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC:

Yeah, Dennis, thanks. I initially agreed with you but offline someone pointed out the fact that a lot of what Registries do, even if we end up taking a specific action like holding/locking/whatever, we usually do end up referring to the Registrar so we can't really pretend that they're not part of this process. So I think it is probably better to get their formal sign off but I don't think that that needs to be a long process. I think if maybe Alan can work with Theo, or you can, and just say, hey, get this out to the Registrar Stakeholder Group, with the specific instructions. A very limited timeframe, like, give us the comments one week upon receipt, if not, we're assuming no objections, because this is really a document between the Registries and the PSWG.

DENNIS CHANG:

Okay. Let's try that. We'll see how Theo responds. But for now let's leave it with that cautionary flag that it could be delayed if we don't get that. Because I hate to... you know, the risk that we run obviously is the Registrar Stakeholder comes back with some comments and we go right back into the revision and consideration mode. And then we kind of

committed to the Registry Stakeholder and GAC, this is the version we're going out with for public comments. So that's the caution, do I'm a little bit worried about it, but we'll see. We'll have to consult with Theo on this. Any other comments? Go ahead, Maxim. Let's hear your thought (inaudible).

MAXIM ALZOBA:

Maxim Alzoba for the record. Actually I had the chance to talk to Registrars on somewhat similar grounds during the GDD Summit. I think they might (inaudible) unhappy for the fact that we didn't come for them at this stage. That's my thinking (inaudible).

DENNIS CHANG:

I think Maxim said that he spoke to a couple of people at the GDD Summit and heard that the Registrar Stakeholder Group is unhappy that we have not gone through to them officially, or something like this. It's really hard to hear you, Maxim, I don't think your throat mic is working very well, by the way. Go ahead, I think Brian has his hand up.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC:

Not at all to shoot the messenger, I get what Maxim's saying, if someone said that. But I can tell you admittedly I am extremely unsympathetic to that point. (inaudible). It sounds like there was some feedback there. So, what I was saying is that I am not sympathetic to the view that the Registrars have been shut out. The Registrars have chosen not to participate to this point. If anything they should thank us

for the work we've done, take a quick look, throw a thank you and we should all be on our way.

DENNIS CHANG:

Okay. Alan?

ALAN WOODS:

Yeah, Alan Woods here. I completely agree with Brian on that one. I mean, there is a Co-Chair from the Registrars and I know a lot of our discussions were PSWG and Registry and back and forth between us. But at any time they did have the representative on, they were all given the same opportunity to join the framework team, so I can't see why they would be unhappy considering they were given the representation and they chose not to take us as far, mainly because the way the actual document itself started to develop.

I mean, we were given the opportunity to comment on it but at the end of the day, it doesn't really affect them other than the fact that we're just crystallizing what it done probably in practice anyway, and that is, we will refer to the Registrar, you know, in most cases, because that is the correct thing to do, you know? So, again, I agree with Brian, I think we should sympathize with it to some extent but at the same time, you know, I don't really have an awful lot of time for it. And thank you, Maxim, for bringing it up. I think we're forewarned and forearmed, but it may be a conversation that we'll have to have.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, exactly, if we're worried about them being unhappy I'm not sure which (inaudible) will make them more unhappy, the fact that we go without a formal sign off or after we go to them and they give us comments and we ignore those comments and go to public comment without incorporating their suggestions. I think that would make them even more unhappy, don't you think? And I just don't see it as an option for us to circle back with maybe three operators on the GAC or another round of changes at this point. I just don't think that is a prudent thing to do. What does everybody think? Go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOPA: Maxim Alzoba, if I may. I don't think we must listen to them. (inaudible). Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: That was really hard to hear. Can someone else repeat what they heard from Maxim? Just so that we're all clear. You want to try?

ALAN WOODS: This is Alan here. While Maxim is typing there, I see he's typing that, I mean, can we be clear on one thing as well, and that is that when we had our last meeting in Copenhagen, that was a meeting of the Security Framework Drafting Team, and the conclusion of that team was that the team was agreed. That wasn't the Registries and the PSWG who agreed, it was that the team were agreed about. And again, they were invited to that. I completely agree, I'm probably being a bit more devil's advocate in this, but you know, the place is at the table, if they chose

not to be at the table, that was up to them. It's not as if it wasn't offered to them.

But, that being said, I think we definitely should do that formal, you know, just run it by them one more time saying that we're not particularly happy that we've gotten your formal sign off on this but please bear in mind that, you know, this has been going on for two years, you've had the place at the table and you've chosen not to speak up at that. So I'm probably taking a bit of a harder line than I probably should be at the moment but that's the way I feel at the moment.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, I'm chatting to Theo right now, let me see if he can quickly answer how we can get over this.

ALAN WOODS: While you're chatting there as well, just reading Maxim's comment there, that all we have to do is consider it and make that its base in the feedback. Absolutely, I think he's absolutely right on that one as well. Again, the team can decide whether or not the edits are warranted as a team. Yeah, I agree.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Hey, Dennis, while there's a lull, I have a question for either Alan or you, Dennis. I understood that informally Theo kind of left the work product we submitted. And could you guys, whoever has the most knowledge of it, explain for the benefit of the group what that looked like. Do we

know, was there any collaboration with the Registrar Stakeholder Group? Was he acting in capacity as the Registrar Co-Chair there?

I think that if the answer to that is yes, perhaps what we need to do is say, we understand you've already signed off on this, please confirm. I don't know that this needs to be a formal re-submission to the Registrar Stakeholder Group. Because I do share Dennis' worry about opening this back up in the event there is any sort of semi-material change. It's not exactly the easiest task to get GAC and Registry Stakeholder groups signed off on the same document in short order.

JIM GALVIN: This is Jim Galvin, if I can jump in here while there's a little quiet? Okay not hearing any objections.

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead, Jim.

JIM GALVIN: I guess I'm hearing consensus that we do it like, I'm going to call it, an acknowledgment from the Registrar Stakeholder Group, and we should otherwise move on. The new comment that I want to make here is two things. One, in fairness, the way in which operated was the bulk of the substance was actually done as a Registry only sub-group with the PSWG. I mean, we were always running it back through the larger Security Framework Drafting team, so I just want to be sensitive to that little detail in terms of how we actually operated. You know, that doesn't take away from the fact that they had plenty of opportunity to

be part of the review process and see the bulk of the substance, and respond.

And then with that in mind, to add to the comment that folks have made that this is not a PDP opportunity and therefore it's not binding in any way, so we're not obligated to do anything formally about comments that we get, but we do want to make sure that we consider all comments. We are having a public comment period, so I don't think we have to worry about the timing of getting an acknowledgment back from the Registrar Stakeholder Group. We should send them a note, give them a time, a week or whatever we think is appropriate, and just say, look, if you don't respond in any way before now it's going out for public comment and you will still have the public comment period to offer any comments that you might want to have, and leave it at that. I think we move on. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Hi, Jim. You may not have looked at my chat and I've been skyping with Theo while you were talking and Theo said that he has circulated to Registrar Stakeholder Group and he had received no input and he's happy that it will go to public comment as is, and he wants to make sure that public comment does happen. So we're all good, I think. So, what you're suggesting, Jim, has already been done by Theo as the representative of the Registrar Stakeholder Group in this team and as one of the co-leaders of this team. So, he has performed his duty beautifully. Okay? So I think it's fine. On behalf of (inaudible) Registrar Stakeholder Group, is there anybody else besides the RsSG, PSWG and RrSG, are there more groups involved? Should we add the ICANN

Organization? Perhaps? Little old me, Dennis Chang. What do you think? I think that's enough.

Now, the Current Status. And these words, I need to be a little careful here, I said that "reviewed" is fine, I think that that's factual. "Endorsed" is a word that could mean different things to different people. Let's see, what was the word that GAC used. They didn't use the word "approval", Iranga maybe will remember. I know that Alan had use the word "green-lighted".

ALAN WOODS:

Its' a very lawyer way of putting it, sorry.

DENNIS CHANG:

Sums it up. Because I want to convey the fact that, you know, not only did they review it but they didn't have any changes to it and they were approving of us going forward with public comment. Go ahead, Iranga.

IRANGA KAHANGAMA:

This is Iranga. What we had said in the email, I'll try to pull it up now, but I'm pretty sure we just said that it was going to be considered GAC endorsed, if no one pushes back or has comment. And then we got a couple of people positively responding saying, thanks for the work, good job, and then everyone else just didn't respond. So we have worded it so that it's a endorsement.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, I love that word. I like it. I mean, I just want to use it for all the groups but I don't know if I can use that for Registry Stakeholder Group and Registrar Stakeholder Group.

ALAN WOODS: Speaking in a personal capacity, I can't see any major issue with the word "endorsed" either. I mean, it was given to the entire group, there was no objection. I don't know if anybody has any strong feelings in the room on that?

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Let's go for it. Go ahead, Jim.

JIM GALVIN: I'm fine with "endorsed" but to offer another alternative, "accepted."

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, that's very dangerous because we're going out for a public comment so I don't think we can say "accepted" can we? For example, Registrar Stakeholder Group is counting on having their say-so in the public comment, so they have not yet technically accepted the document. Unless you're meaning that "accepted" for proceeding with public comment, which is kind of confusing.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah, I don't know. Whatever the consensus of the group is, I don't want to complicate it any further. Just offering an option. But if it's complicated just skip that.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Is everybody okay with Current Status? I think that is our current status, we're proceeding.

ALAN WOODS: Happy enough, yeah.

DENNIS CHANG: Next Steps. Very important. So, I have highlighted here, and I think Alan and I shared some concerns via email, and we wanted to make sure that everybody in the Working Group here, at this team, is very aware and we are kind of concerned that we may receive a lot of irrelevant comments maybe. And then maybe some would assume that once we have received comments and revised the document that it could go back to the GAC and the Registry Stakeholders and Registrar Stakeholders and all these other groups for final approval, and we want to make sure that that does not happen, right? Once we get the public comments, it's this team who we're going to count on to make the right decisions to incorporate the comments and make the necessary change and then after that it will be published. So that's the plan and I wanted to make sure that the words that we were putting here as Next Steps clearly communicates that. Any comments?

ALAN WOODS: Just Alan Woods here. Just the addition there that I put in about “substantial material update”, I think that’s pretty standard. When I was writing it, it seemed right, it might be overkill, people might think it’s overkill, but I think what I wanted to get across there was at the end of the day it is the Security Framework Drafting Team that will ultimately make the decision of whether or not something is material substantial and whether or not we feel this is necessary to give it back to our respective houses. But, as you said there, the implication is that, you know, we will publish it as final if we do not believe that. So, up to people whether or not they think it’s overkill or not.

DENNIS CHANG: Beth, go ahead.

BETH BACON: Thanks. Could we use the words “within scope” or “out of scope”, because I mean, we clearly scope the document so if it attempts to add and expand the scope of what we cover then we can very easily say, no thank you, out of the scope of this document. And I think that Alan gets to that with the “material” and “immaterial” but if we could add to that, “outside the scope of the goal of this document” then we won’t consider it.

ALAN WOODS: That sounds good to me.

ALAN CHANG: You want to go at it, Beth? You want to try it on the document? Go ahead, Jim.

JIM GALVIN: So, along the same lines, maybe a slightly different suggestion that we could do here is—apologize, Jim Galvin for the transcript. The sentence where we have “ICANN Organization and the SFDT will consider those comments and update the document as needed”, what if we changed that sentence more explicitly and, for one thing, take the “ICANN Organization” out, so that we should take ownership of it ourselves, I think, you know, treating the organization as more of a facilitator. And then say that we’ll consider those comments and decide whether or not the document needs to be updated. And so more explicitly state that we’re going to decide that we’re going to update it, not that we will update it as needed. Just sort of change the sentence around. How do folks feel about that? I’ll kind of put that in if nobody objects and we can see what it looks like.

DENNIS CHANG: I like the idea and I already deleted the ICANN Organization as we have already defined the SFDT to include the ICANN Organization, so that will be redundant.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: This is Kristine, I support that change.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, I like that idea.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Can I ask one, what is possibly a really dumb question? Do we have standard language for how comments are considered and I understand it's a little bit different so if it says, we're going to consider all the comments all day long. But I don't want to use that, but if it just says, we will prepare a summary report and comments will be considered and may or may not be addressed. Because we do public comments all the time so I was just wondering if it was standard language. Or if we wing it every time.

DENNIS CHANG: I don't believe we have a standard language.

JIM GALVIN: So the distinction to be made is whether or not it's a PDP versus not. That's the important distinction. Because in a PDP when you issue your report about the comments you actually have to say something about all the comments and you actually have to indicate how you responded to the comment explicitly. In this particular case, we don't have that obligation and that's the difference. For me, that's the way I see the difference. And I'm not aware that there's standard text to deal with that but that's the treatment that I think we want to reflect in the words that we have here. Thanks.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Yeah, that's a great point, Jim.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, Jim, I agree. Yeah, good point, Jim. Because I think we're doing the public comments. Jim, do you want to speak? You have your hand up? Otherwise we'll turn to Kristine.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Hi Dennis, this is Kristine, thanks. I made one little comment on the Doc. I have a feeling this is two separate things. First is we'll consider the comments and decide whether or not to update. And then secondly it refers to whether or not we're going to have a second public comment period, I think. And so I suggest instead of putting the "scope" part in the second sentence there, I guess it's the third sentence in that paragraph, what if you just change the second sentence to, "SFDT will consider in-scope comments and decide whether or not to update the document." So we're only going to consider in-scope comments, and then from there we'll decided whether or not to update the document. Then the next sentence can go to the "material substantial may be requiring a second public comment period."

DENNIS CHANG: I like that. I think I like that better. Want to try it? Yeah. (inaudible) I can't hear you, who is speaking right now?

BETH BACON: It's Beth. I put in the comments and also put in some language about kind of staying out of scope, so we just need to pick one and not be redundant. I think I'm the python, mine are green.

DENNIS CHANG: Anonymous python, okay, I see anonymous python.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: This is Kristine. My offering was to take Beth's suggestion basically and move it to the sentence above. So, I agree, I don't think we want to refer to scope twice, so I think that if we say "in scope" in the second sentence then the third sentence should say "unless in the opinion of the SFDT, a substantial material update has been made to the framework, the SFDT shall issue the final document without an additional public comment period." Okay, good, now it says what I think it should say.

ALAN WOODS: Just Alan here. Why are we referring to an additional public comment period? Wasn't the whole point of this that it was to be implied that we wouldn't send it back to the GAC or the Registry Stakeholder Group? I don't know if we want to even entertain the concept of an additional public comment period at all.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, I had an uncomfortable feeling talking about additional comment period, just like Alan.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: This is Kristine. I also agree with that but I didn't know why the sentence was in here then. Because unless in the opinion of SFDT, I don't remember what the original said, but "if substantial material update has been made to the framework, the SFDT shall issue the final document." That was what it originally said. So what was going to happen if a substantial material update had been made? I guess I don't understand the purpose of that sentence in red then.

DENNIS CHANG: I have a proposal. Why don't we delete the third sentence altogether. Do we need it?

JIM GALVIN: Works for me. This is Jim Galvin. I was going to take ownership of having added the phrase "without an additional public comment period." I'll explain why I added it, but if we're going to delete the sentence, that's moot, so I'll just be quiet now.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: This is Kristine. I support deleting the third sentence.

DENNIS CHANG: Anyone else?

IRANGA KAHANGAMA: Yeah, this is Iranga. I'm fine with that.

DENNIS CHANG: Let's see what it looks like. That's what it looks like.

BETH BACON: This is Beth, can I ask a question? Dennis, can I hop in the queue.

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead.

BETH BACON: So what would it look like if we just said, "The SFDT will consider in scope comments and after finalization the framework document will be posted." We don't even need to really say, "decide whether or not to update the document." It's just, "will consider the in scope comments" and then when we address them we'll put up the final document. So that it's not as if we're going to post what we considered or discuss it again, we're just going to take the comments, accept or reject, and then put up the final document. Does that make sense to everybody? Or am I missing a step?

DENNIS CHANG: No, it's much better I think. Yeah. What do you think? It looks like that? It looks good. Small and simple. Alan, go ahead. Oh, you're entering the room. Okay. Shall we leave it for now? Move on? We've got 15 minutes left to the meeting. Thank you.

Let's move onto the next phase. So this is where, what we want to do is provide some explanation of what this is for those who may not be involved in (inaudible) or may not even open up the framework document itself. And so the idea is to give them a brief description of, or detailed description, and as it says, an explanation of what this is and what the framework is intended to do. And invite any areas to be focusing on for the commenters. But that's what the purpose of the section is.

So, first of all, some of you have gone and edited the first two paragraphs. So anything there, what it is is basically copy and paste of the document. I think it's right out of the document itself. Because we do talk about the objectives of what this is and what this is not. So those two paragraphs are pretty well reviewed by you all and have been accepted. So, Beth says, can we please delete this? So yeah, we can delete it. The idea is that the section is supposed to be a detailed description so we have to provide some description of what the document is. So if we delete it we have to replace it with something. And sort of a, maybe a summary of the framework, hear the type of responses, and hear the way the reports are maybe a type (inaudible). Go ahead.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: This is Kristine. May I jump in?

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah.

KRISTINE DORRAIN:

Thanks. Yeah, I support Liz's suggestion to delete this. I've never seen a public comment period introduction with an iterated list of bullet points extracted from the document and then a specific like, please comment on this. I mean, if people are not going to take the time to bother to read the document and comment on it, then I think that that's their problem.

I don't think we want to like direct them to any particular place or suggest that they comment on any particular piece. If you care you'll read the doc and comment. I do support a summary. So I think we could say something to the effect of, the Security Framework suggests some of the actions law enforcement might wish to take, some of the options available to registry operators, and describe some of the limitations. Period. I just don't think it needs to say a lot more than that. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG:

Okay. I personally am with you but I'm guided by some of the instructions that I'm getting internally at ICANN. And as you all know, I work on the IGO/INGO policy implementation, that's one of my projects, and I just published a public comment yesterday where we do try to provide some description of what we're doing and invite certain areas to focus their comments on. So that's sort of a new thing maybe. But let's try the summary. So you want to go ahead and take the pen and try it and go ahead and delete it, Beth, feel free. I'm okay with it.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Hey Dennis, it's Crystal. As someone who was on that IGO thing with you, I think this is definitely a different task. That's very implementation and operationally focused, whereas this framework is not. So the public comment is serving a different purpose here.

DENNIS CHANG: Good point, Crystal. Yeah you are on the IGO/INGO and we'll talking again about that a little later.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Yes we will.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, thank you. So, let's do that.

BETH BACON: This is Beth. I just deleted it and I violently agree with both Crystal and Kristine. And this is a short document, if they can't open it then too bad, so sad.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, violently agree. You can't just mildly, peacefully agree. Funny. So, I like the words that Kristine was using. Are you still on the Doc, Kristine? Can you try to write out what you were saying?

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Yes, I'm drafting it in a comment and then I'll add it in a second. Just give me a minute.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, that's fine. And feel free other people. I'm going to resolve this and I'm going to delete this note. We don't need that. Yeah, this is rather a unique situation. It's unlike anything else I'm doing. And you're right, I have to be mindful of that.

While we're waiting for Kristine, I do want to talk about maybe the next steps we want to take with this framework. So, we will soon get to a point, I think, everybody will agree with the work and pens down. What happens then is that we take this and put it into sort of a (inaudible) template that ICANN uses that goes to public comment, and that gets reviewed internally but all parties here to make sure that we're following the process correctly. And then we go to public comment. And then after that we talked about having webinars before public comment, webinars, during public comment. We talked about meeting at the ICANN 59 possibly, to discuss the public comment, if we have received any. So, any comments there? Beth, go ahead. Did you want to speak, Beth? No? I don't hear you. So, Kristine has invited you to edit at will. She's inserted her paragraph:

The Framework sets out some of the security issues, law enforcement faces and outlines the most common options available to registry operators. It's designed to assist both law enforcement and registry operators understand the issues and the limitations the others face and to provide resources and alternatives for resolving security threats.

Okay. Like it, like it. Alan's editing. Anything more we should say? This is the simplest I've seen for Detailed Description and Explanation section.

Okay, so Maxim is saying goodbye. Iranga's had to drop off. So I think we need to conclude this meeting. So let's talk about when we meet again. Shall we try to meet again next week or a week after? How does everybody feel about that?

ALAN WOODS:

This is Alan here. Personally I think we should meet sooner rather than later to try and get this completely done and set our dates and get it out.

DENNIS CHANG:

Okay. I agree. If there's no objection let's do that. We'll meet at the same time next week. But in the meanwhile, please continue on this document and get it to a shape that you all can support going to the public comment. Okay?

CRYSTAL ONDO:

Dennis, this is Crystal, can I be difficult, for Kristine and I? 7:00AM is a little bit rough, is there any way we could push it an hour? You'd get more participation out of us.

DENNIS CHANG: Any objections? 7:00AM has been the traditional time for this team so that's why I kept to it. Anybody have any difficulty with pushing it out? Beth says fine. Alan?

KRISTINE DORRAIN: I fully support Crystal's suggestion.

DENNIS CHANG: You know, I have to get up at 5:00 in the morning for you guys too. Okay, so let's do that. Michelle, the request is that we have the next meeting not at 7:00AM but at 8:00AM Pacific Time and there's no objections so let's try that. Okay, Michelle? Anybody, final words before we break? One minute to go.

ALAN WOODS: That's the only thing I'd say to people on the line. This is Alan here. Just please keep going on the document, get all these comments on the document before we meet again so we can just knock it out of the park next time, it would be great. And thank you, Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Alan. Yeah, I agree. Okay everyone. Good bye for now. See you next week one hour later than normal. The things we do for Crystal, right?

CRYSTAL ONDO: Thank you. Bye bye.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: And Kristine. Good bye.

DENNIS CHANG: And Kristine, yes. Bye guys.

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Thank you, everyone. Meeting adjourned. I'll send the meeting invite out shortly. Good bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]