
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to all, and welcome to the Security Framework Drafting Team meeting on the 25th of May, 2017 at 15:00 UTC. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Just a reminder to everyone to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this, I will turn the call back over to Dennis Chang.

DENNIS CHANG: Hello, everyone. Welcome again. So, I see everyone, I think. One, two, three, four, five, six people on the Google Doc, seven including me, and I think that count matches what I see in the Adobe Connect room. So, we're all there.

And you know the routine. We've done this several times before. So, let's get to it. This is a [collaborative] document that we're using to craft the words, and this is not the document that is going to be actually used, but the contents of this document will be transferred into the ICANN.org when we make the announcement. So, what we're doing here is planning.

First, just a reminder that when we open the date [for] public comment, it'll probably be at minimum 47 days public comment duration because of the ICANN59 in the middle of the public comment, and that's typically what we do.

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.

Webinar, we talked about this a little bit. I think we probably want to do the webinar one or two weeks after the public comment is open, and so we can talk about that later. And the close date follows it and report date follows the close date, and public comment report.

Jim Galvin asked the question whether the ICANN organization do the summary. Translation, Dennis Chang. Yes, I will do that. And then what I thought I would do is – and actually I have created sort of a template that you'll see below, but I will be collecting the comments and so that we can use a tool to together review the comments and the way we're going to respond to the comments.

And then finally the publication date is something that'll fall out of that. Right now I'm thinking it'll probably end up being probably August or September, right? As when you count the days, but we'll see.

So, let's get started with a brief overview. And this is an interesting question, and Alan made a comment and I wanted to hear from all of you. Alan, why don't you – since you're on the line, talk about your comment here on the ICANN organization. Go ahead.

ALAN WOODS:

Sure. obviously, we put this in at the last meeting, and I was kind of noodling over it on whether or not... I suppose it comes back to that question and that discussion that has been had a little bit over the last few months on whether or not ICANN organization being the facilitator role versus the active participant in the role, and I see your response there.

So, I'm kind of being devil's advocate in this, putting it out there for discussion to see what people do think. And I was intrigued to see you're taking this as you're saying that it is an ICANN document which has been produced at the request of the Board, therefore the ICANN organization is a member.

I would like to see what other people may have to say on that, to be honest. Yes, I'm just going to be the one who opens the conversation and let other people fight.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yes, go ahead. So, I'd like to hear from others. Anybody? We're a small enough group, so if you want, you can just speak up. Go ahead, Jim.

JIM GALVIN:

Thanks, Dennis. I think it was a good question that Alan asked, but you know me, I'll just say out loud I'm kind of neutral on it. It's useful to call that out and make note of it for ourselves, but I could go either way. So, I'll just support the group. I'm not concerned about ICANN being listed there, although I appreciate that under ordinary circumstances, one wouldn't really want to do that.

But we're not a PDP, which is I guess the main reason why I'm feeling kind of neutral about it. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG:

Anyone else? Let's see, Brian has a comment.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I see Brian here.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: I'm kind of with Jim on this one. It doesn't necessarily say that ICANN had a pen in the process, but ICANN – particularly Dennis – certainly did collaborate with it, more so than the registrars, I'll say. I don't really have a huge issue. I think it's a question worth asking, Alan, but admittedly, I think I'm fine with it as it's worded.

ALAN WOODS: Okay. Well, from my point of view, that's grand. I am somewhat ambivalent towards it as well, I just wanted to make sure that we had the discussion and that it is covered, as Jim had pointed out. So, I'm happy to accept that and to withdraw my comment.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. It's an important question that we should ask, and I think the registrars, last time we talked about registrar, right? I know that [inaudible] not on here, but he has been tracking our work and supporting it, and he's also – he representing registrars [are] member of the team. So, I sort of looked at it the same way.

And as much as I can, I'm sort of using this as a model too, this whole experience. I'm getting a lot of positive reports and impressions from others that they really like what they're seeing here and want to sort of bottle it and use it in other places. So, kudos to all of you.

We will definitely try to do some lessons learned on this project and see if we can leverage it elsewhere. That's just a side comment. Next comment is Brian, and this one, I can see that Brian is sort of stepping back from [inaudible] endorsement, and that was talked about last week. But go ahead, Brian. You want to maybe talk to it a little bit.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC:

Yes. Thanks, Dennis. I think that it's not that the registries are in favor of this, but I think just to – putting cards on the table, the way that this happened was that Alan sent it to the registry stakeholder group and said if you don't – please let us know if you have any comments. If we don't hear from you in X date, we're going to assume this is good to go.

I just think that it's Law School 101 at least in the states that silence is not a sin. I just think that an endorsement is maybe half a bridge too far for the position on behalf of the entire registry stakeholder group. If there was no objection levied against it, I don't know if that's the same thing as an endorsement.

ALAN WOODS:

If I can just jump in there –

DENNIS CHANG:

I completely understand. Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN WOODS: I was just going to say I completely agree with Brian on that one. I think it was something that when we went in the last week, we were like, “Yes, I think it’s a good sign.” But with hindsight and a few discussions, I think this is a much more representative, and thanks to Brian as well for putting in the wording as well. I’m much happier with it that way.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes. So, if you listen to Theo, I mean you haven’t listened to Theo, I was Skype chatting with him on the last call. He said he kind of did the same thing. He distributed to the registrar and waited for a new one to come in. He didn’t receive any comments, and therefore just kind of remained silent and did not object.

Now, on the GAC, on the PSWG, interestingly enough when I received the approval to proceed, they actually used the word endorse by the GAC. So, for them, I think we could say it’s accurate. But if we’re going to lump everyone together, I think what you have here is probably a lot more close to the reality.

So, I’m fine with it. If everybody else is okay, let’s accept these changes and move on. What do you think?

ALAN WOODS: Yes, I agree with that.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay.

ALAN WOODS: I see Jim had also accepted [inaudible] so it's all good.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Next, let's see. Next step. We mulled over this last time, and it was stretched out then, but at the end we shrunk it back to a very simple statement, two sentence. Sort of implied that yes, we will consider an in-scope comment which is a good word to use, and then we didn't say anything about whether or not we will change anything, but it's basically up to us and we're not going anywhere else, but this is SFDT will be making the decision to post it. And I think that's fine. Anybody else have anymore?

ALAN WOODS: I'm going to agree with that. I think that it has taken on a very nice brevity to it, and I think it gets to the point. It also does quite clearly within its wording state that we will have the final say. It's subtle but it is definitely there, so I like that.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes. It's good to look at it again after a week, and it still looks really nice, so there's nothing that bothers me about it.

Okay, detailed description and explanation. So, again, this is a different case in the consensus policy case. This is where we actually want to highlight areas of focus or comments that we're seeking, because sometimes we may not be sure, and at times there's actually –

especially in PDP – where the public comment opens, there isn't one approach but there are multiple approaches that are being presented and seeking comments on preferences by different groups.

And again, before people have to read the whole detailed document, this is a section where a very simple summary of what this is all about is presented. In this case, I think this team has talked about that last time and agreed that that third paragraph is all we should do. The first two paragraphs are basically out of the document itself and talks about what it is and what it isn't.

And I see that Kristine is making a little bit of editorial [formatting], that's all good. Looks all good. Any other comments on this section? How does it read now?

ALAN WOODS: Yes, I like the way it reads. I think, again, it's a good teaser for the document and will hopefully make them read it.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: I have one quick proposal.

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: What do we think about swapping paragraph two and paragraph three in that section? Because this first paragraph talks about the objective, the second paragraph says what the framework does not do.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, I see exactly what you're saying.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: And the third framework again goes back to what it does do. So, I'm suggesting that we just swap two and three. What do you think?

ALAN WOODS: No objections here.

DENNIS CHANG: I like it, actually. It makes total sense. Let me try it. I think it reads a lot better. I think it's probably me who's putting two spaces between sentences, from my old typewriting days.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Yes, I'm kind of hit or miss on that myself.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, I kind of like the two spaces between sentences. For my poor eyes, it's actually easier to separate the sentences. And I think in terms of bullet points, when all the words run together, it gets jumbled in my head.

ALAN WOODS: I assume the ICANN web developers will do their own thing to the formatting anyway.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, you're right. Yes, so the process is after our team is done here, we turn it over to the public commenting, and what they do is they put it into their own style guide and templates. You've seen the public comments, that's why they all come looking same. So, that's what, we have a public comment machine we feed it through.

So, it'll probably take maybe ten days after we say go. So, I'm looking at – if we are okay with it today, probably looking at the first week of June.

ALAN WOODS: That sounds absolutely good.

DENNIS CHANG: Which is probably good, if we open. Yes. It is good. We will open in June and then we can have our – let's see. Who's going to be at the ICANN59? Can I see checks? Or just speak up. Brian, Jim. Not Kristine. Okay.

ALAN WOODS: Not me I'm afraid either.

DENNIS CHANG: Alan, are you going to be there?

ALAN WOODS: No, I'm afraid not.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Brian and Jim. Okay. So, in terms of webinar, I'm thinking that maybe a good thing to do at the ICANN59 when some of us are face to face, but it may be just the wrong thing to do. I'm not exactly sure how that would unfold. Maybe here to do remotely like this.

And it'll probably be something like this call. But of course, with broad participation invitation. And we'll probably make a few charts, but mainly go over the actual document section by section. It's not that long a document anyway. An hour-long, one webinar at one time is what we're thinking. Maybe even at this time.

And the way I was thinking about that is – I'm sorry to talking about the webinar, but maybe I should get back on task here.

Any other, anything else on the detailed description and explanation? Seems like you have been looking at this for over a week and we made all the changes already, so if that's the case, it should be good.

And then we have background and resources. Thank you, Kristine, for some good edits here. Is this from your professor days, correcting students' paper? Thank you, professor.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Old habits die hard.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes. Those are good. Excellent. I did get one comment from someone within our own document, the framework document. When we used the NGPC, we did not spell it out the first time, and we should do that. So, I'm going to go back and look at it one more time. Probably true that we used the NGPC as a known acronym.

ALAN WOODS: Yes.

DENNIS CHANG: And I'm being reminded that NGPC is a very [old] concept, and a lot of the new people will not know what NGPC is.

ALAN WOODS: Yes. I will admit to having to look that up periodically myself. Like, "What's that again? Oh, yes."

DENNIS CHANG: It's [inaudible]. It's a small committee, yes.

Okay. Background, and then the reference, the links. I think those four links are the ones that I thought of and listed there. Do you guys have anything else that you want to reference that you think is appropriate?

We have the NGPC direction, GAC advice, our own wiki page, and the draft, right?

ALAN WOODS:

Yes. I generally don't think there's much more relevant documents in there that I can think of. I've put a bit of thought into that and nothing came through in my mind anyway.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yes. If you think about it, just add it. It's easy to add a link in the announcement. That's the easiest thing to do. And at the bottom, this is – as you know – just for us. Right?

Let's go over this, see if we have – we have concerns about opening the door at this point with the public comment. I think this was it, but I think we have discussed it and decided to go ahead and do it anyway, so I think that concern has been addressed.

Number two, expect some interest from BC and ITC so it may help to socialize ahead of time to make sure they're well informed about what this is and how it is developed.

Now, I wasn't going to do anything about this, and socializing in advance, I'm not sure what that is and how we would do that. I suppose we could send them an e-mail saying, "Hey, we're going to open up public comments, so we wanted to let you know and this is what it was about."

I think that's one thing we could do. What do you guys think about that? Should we take action on this advice? And why only BC and ITC? Why not other?

ALAN WOODS: Again, just speaking personally now, why would we? Aren't normal just public comment periods announced in a normal way? By announcing it directly to them, are we –

DENNIS CHANG: Right, yes, that's how I feel about it.

ALAN WOODS: Yes. I don't particularly think I would. It's like we're almost asking them for a comment, when in reality, as far as we're concerned, the [ITC] and the BC, the only possible thing I could think of is they're going to try and get in with things that we don't want specifically in scope, and they won't be in scope, I would expect, as stated by both registries, registrars and even eventually we had our friends in the PSWG agreeing with that as well.

So, I would just do it as a normal one myself.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: I agree. I completely agree. We're probably going to get some comments about how trademark infringement is a real security threat regardless of whether or not we give them a heads up, so I think we should just let it run the natural course, not treat them any differently or more special than anyone else.

JIM GALVIN: I'll just –

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Yes, I think I agree with all of that.

JIM GALVIN: Yes. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: I think I heard Jim and –

JIM GALVIN: I'll just agree with all of that too. I don't know why there would be a special case, and if we don't have a reason for that, I think we just skip it.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Good. We addressed it. That's how I was feeling it too, so I think we're all on the same page here.

Number three, use caution in how we frame the [intro] information. Not sure what that is usually called. A background question mark, it needs to be clear, and that this is not the [community] to nitpick wording or attempt to shoe on other [inaudible]

And I think this is why we were collaborating on these words. Have we done this, you think?

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Yes, I think so. I'm the one who submitted that comment, and I think that what we've come up with addresses my concerns. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay.

ALAN WOODS: Yes. I agree with that too.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, good. Number four, any public comment made, although they shall be afforded all due consideration where meritorious and relevant to do so, the decision for change or inclusion rests solely with the SFDT and it will be final. And everybody at the SFDT agrees with this, right?

ALAN WOODS: We agree, and as I said, we did that quite succinctly in two lines, so I'm happy enough with that.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Good. Let's see. Are there ways we can ask for constructive feedback that communicates that it's not a free for all? Same answer. Okay.

ALAN WOODS: Yes. As Kristine put in those two words, in-scope. One word, hyphenated.

DENNIS CHANG: I love that. I think I'm going to use that. There's so much scope issue I'm working on. Those of you know, IGO, INGO policy implementation. Oh, gosh, the scope issue is a challenge there. Okay, now number six, there are only two questions we need to ask ourselves about the comment. One, is the comment in scope? Correct?

Two, does the comment bring new information to the discussion? If the answers to both question is yes, then the comment deserves some consideration by the working group. If either answer is no, then we have a generic response along the lines of, "Out of scope," or "Already considered by the working group," and move on.

We're not obligated to a detailed response or summary of our deliberations, and I absolutely agree with this. Of course, I don't know how other people feel. Have you guys thought about this? But what I did in response to – I think this is Jim's advice, and I created this thing called PC Report Prep Template.

This is just so that you get an idea of how I will be going about it when the public comments start coming. And I like the idea of having two columns of, "Is it in scope?" Or, "Is it new data?" If it's no, no, then there's no analysis, we just have our standard, canned answer number one, canned answer number two.

So, that's the sort of thing that I was going to capture. And however many comments I get, I'm just going to go ahead and fill this out. There are two categories of comments in terms of how we track. One is organizations, and the other is individual.

So, that's why I have two tables. Let me see. So, we can talk about this after we go ahead and open for public comment. Then we will work on this. Okay? So, any other comments?

ALAN WOODS: That sounds great. In general, [inaudible] I think I like it.

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead.

JIM GALVIN: Just a quick question. What does initial mean in the first table, in that column?

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, I'm sorry. Okay. Initial. Oh, so that is... I don't know what that is.

JIM GALVIN: Oh, is that he reference back to the [origin] group in individual detail? Is that the way that works?

DENNIS CHANG: Yes. So, here is a comment. Here's an example. Dennis Chang. Individual, right? And it's the name of the organization submitted by Michelle. And we might give this a DM initial, and we might mention here. Okay?

JIM GALVIN: Okay, that makes sense. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: So, when we keep the table, we will know – it'll be simple to identify who the comment is from. And we give everybody an initial so we can keep track of it and use the initial to reference our analysis or summary. It's sort of our public comment technique, a standard technique that we use.

ALAN WOODS: Well, I do hope that all the public comments are the same as that one, Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG: You know what? Every one of you submit an individual comment saying, “We love it.” How’s that?

ALAN WOODS: Yes. Slightly self-serving, but I’m okay with that.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. So, we have our plan for the report. And number seven, conduct webinar either before, [I will not advise nor suggest], and two webinars preferably maybe. So, let’s talk about this a little bit. I’m suggesting one webinar right now, one or two weeks after the public comment open.

What do you think about that? I’ve thought about this a little bit, and to do a webinar before we open for public comment seems like not that effective because everybody will say, “Well, yes, let me look at it.” Right?

And then once we open the public comment, they have everything to look at. Maybe they’ve had one or two weeks to look at it. And then when we do the webinar, then they could actually ask questions that are relevant and having – okay. What do you think? Do you guys think –

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: I agree. I don’t know – I don’t think that this is – this isn’t a result of a PDP. This is we barely even reached a conclusion that we needed a public comment. So, I don’t think we need to break our backs going crazy with any sort of public educations. We’ll follow the proper steps,

we'll have a webinar, but I think having two webinars, that doesn't make a whole lot of sense to me.

DENNIS CHANG: How about if I ask, should we have a webinar at all?

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: I do think a webinar is a good idea, just so it doesn't look like we're trying to bury the lead. But having two doesn't make sense for this simple document in my mind.

JIM GALVIN: Yes. I agree with that.

ALAN WOODS: Yes, I agree, Brian. Completely.

DENNIS CHANG: And one webinar after a couple of weeks of having it open, does that sound like the right timing?

ALAN WOODS: Yes, that sounds about right as well. I think you're spot-on with the give them time to consider the document, give them time to perhaps come up with questions, have the webinar, and maybe cut some of the [inaudible]. So, I agree.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Let's do that then. How about – any more advice? Give us advice. Collecting advice.

ALAN WOODS: I'm fresh out of advice.

DENNIS CHANG: Before we go. You're fresh of advice? Oh, the professor has left. Okay. I'm just checking the chat.

Yoshiro, "I will not." I see, "I will not." Oh, you will not be at the – I think ICANN59 is that response. Do you have anything you want to add, Yoshiro? You've been quiet. I see Sean here, Sean's quiet. Anything else?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No.

ALAN WOODS: No. I think it's a grand tradition of the registry stakeholder group.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, and also people who have maybe signed on – okay.

ALAN WOODS: Go on, sorry.

DENNIS CHANG: And those of you who have signed on letter, I have [inaudible] a community wiki page link that I have posted there is for our FAQ. So, I have just created that with our first question, and that is, "Will this be translated?" And the answer is yes, we'll start with the UN 6 and we'll see how that goes.

So, if you have any other questions, we will go ahead and add to those. Let's do that, and what that does is we have an FAQs page for all of us, so we're all consistent in the way we are answering questions as we receive them. This is one team, so it's one answer.

And I think it'll go well, because when we do our public comment, I think they will see that there is an FAQ page. So, before they submit the comment, maybe they'll look it up, hopefully. If they're diligent about that. And they will get their answers so they don't have to submit a comment if it's already plainly obvious.

So, that's the idea. I think we're good. Can we get thumbs up?

ALAN WOODS: Great.

DENNIS CHANG: Positive check from everyone if we're okay to go forward with the words here that we crafted. We've addressed everybody's concern and we're together on this? Move forward? Go? Jim, Alan, Brian?

ALAN WOODS: Yes, we're good I think. Yoshiro is plus one.

DENNIS CHANG: Yoshiro? [inaudible] I'm not seeing any negative checks, so I see Sean is typing. Good too. Okay. Thank you, everyone.

ALAN WOODS: Great.

DENNIS CHANG: We have 20 minutes left on the call, but we don't necessarily need to spend all that time unless you guys want to kind of hang out and chill out with me.

ALAN WOODS: As much as we'd love to, I have other ICANN-related matters I must get on to today.

DENNIS CHANG: You know what? The other thing that I'm going to do –

ALAN WOODS: The less I say about that at the moment, the better.

DENNIS CHANG: So, okay, so just to give you some expectation, I'm going to then turn it over to our webinar – I mean, not webinar. Two things. I'm going to go ahead and start the public comment machine on the ICANN side, and Michelle is going to help me with that, make sure that I do this correctly. And then the other thing is I'm going to start initiating a webinar preparation with our Comms team.

And then the third thing is with that, we probably want to create a few slides, PowerPoint charts, and what we'll do is we will collaborate there as well. And we are going to use the Google form of the PowerPoint. Let's see how that works.

I haven't done that before, but that'll be something new and fun for us while we collaborate on the slides and [we'll use] it. And I have some ideas about the way we present [inaudible] but we can share that using the slides itself. Okay?

That's all I've got, folks. I'll say goodbye. Alan, any words? Brian, final words? No?

ALAN WOODS: No. Just to say thank you, as usual.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, guys. It's been fun.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Thanks, Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG: We'll be in touch.

ALAN WOODS: Thank you. Bye.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]