RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you Michelle, for remembering to record this. So, this is our, the entire team meeting, and we're looking at the document, what's up on here, and Alan and Iranga have the control as presenters. And today is the 16th of February, Thursday 2017. And welcome to all members of security framework drafting team.

And we're looking at a specification, the document version number 3.4.1, which is a version that was built from the 3.3 that PSWG authored by Iranga and Bobby, and collected with their collected [inaudible] from the PSWG.

So, I'm going to turn it over, right now, to our drafting team leaders: Alan, Bobby, and Iranga. Go ahead, Alan. Why don't you start?

ALAN WOODS: Great, thank you everybody for joining in. I'll just give my apologies at the beginning if this is not coming up too clearly, I've got a cold at the moment. So, I will be [inaudible] apologies. But, right, so thank you all for coming, and thank you for all of the work that has been put into this document.

Obviously, you know, Bobby and Iranga, an awful lot of work was put on in your side to cut the document down to the way it is now. So we took back, and to be honest, there wasn't anything overly, to use the word

controversial, within the document. When we went through it, we went through the original document with a fine tooth comb.

And came in with some changes, sometimes there is a slight change in language, maybe slightly more inclusive. Maybe just putting a slight more of a limit on certain things, but I think genuinely the result of the redline that we came through, it's so reflective, I suppose, the spirit of the documents that was presented to us.

Now, there is a few items that then came up in the additional extras that came through in version 3.3. So, there was a few more discussions with regard to that. So that is, I suppose, my first apology. We didn't get the document to you yesterday, just because the way the timing worked, we received the new changes just as we were finalizing our changes on the first document.

So that kind of set us back just a tad. So, the best way, I mean, I gave you the redline of the way we looked at it, as I was saying to Bobby, it looks a lot worse, probably than it is. Redlines have that tendency of doing it. But I hope that when the PSWG review, or they have been reviewing, I can say that the elements that they have included, most of them still are within that document.

We can go through specific ones if you had the chance to review it, and look at the specific maybe deletion that you want to query. I tried to put in some comments in the slide just to give a background as to why we made certain edits.

However, please feel free to query, and I'm more than happy to answer one of them. And of course, this goes to everybody from the registry

side that I have to represent either, I can be a point, but please feel free to come in.

We all collaborated in editing this document, so our answers should be in the spirit of collaboration as well. Let's see, I mean, what were your impressions? And I'm happy to continue on and discuss.

IRANGA KAHANGAMA: Sure, so this is Iranga. The first, yeah, I want to say thanks for turning around the document, excuse me. While we definitely understand being late, I mean, we had a lot of people putting it in for the PSWG as well, that's why that two versions got sent to you. So, we had some, but then we had some more edits, so I definitely understand that edits trickle in.

And so I think, we got it. I think we will probably need a little more time to circulate it properly, and get suitable comments. I mean, after doing an initial review, I definitely agree with some of your language changes. I think they're benign. You know, just changing some words here and there.

I think we'd like to work on including some of the stuff that you had cut out, even if that's you know, changing the language to maybe be a negotiation. I think, overall, we'll need to pass it around to the PSWG. I don't know if the planning of this meeting is to, you know, get into real specifics or not, because we just got it about 24 hours ago.

But after a very cursory look, I think we had a couple of things that we wanted, because maybe have included that you had cut out, but for the

most part, in terms of the lines, language edits, a lot of them were kind of fine with us. Bobby, I didn't know if you had anything to input.

BOBBY FLAIM: No, I didn't have anything to add. Yeah, we were just going to pass it in front of the PSWG, and you know, most of the edits, especially with the added part that had come in, were fine. There were just a couple of, I guess, more clarification parts than anything.

ALAN WOODS: Right. It's just Alan here again. Thank you very much for that. I mean, I'm sure I could possibly get what some of those points are. And yes, we need, I think it's very important from, coming from your point of view, we're coming from ours. And certain things, I know, for instance, things like third party, [inaudible] to third parties and things like that, potentially are those points.

Plus, you know, it would be great to be able to discuss them and give more of an in depth reasoning as to why. Now, yeah, I agree, I think you would obviously need more time to review the document. 24 hours is not going to give a few review of this.

However, obviously I think, we've got a goal now. We can have, you know, everything out on the table, and we've highlight what remaining issues they might be, and let's limit that for, you know, once we get to Copenhagen, if there are remaining issues by that date, which is a few weeks away.

That we can then devote all of our time and energy in those meetings that are turned out to be setup within Copenhagen, to hammer at those remaining points so that we can, you know, come at this with a laser focus, keep going, and then get this document finished for once and for all.

The last thing we want to do is be slipping back into again, rewriting and editing. I think we're both happy with the changes that the PSWG actually made, and making the document much more simpler. It was great that there was a fresh set of eyes clearly on us, and it gave it a bit more impetuous, but I would definitely, we can pull together between now and in advance of ICANN, we can pull together those core elements of discussion.

They are the things that we need to get through specifically in those meetings. We can knock this out of the park. I'm being very optimistic but I like being optimistic, I'm sure most people would say. So yeah, I mean, great. I see that Brian has his hand up to jump in. Brian please, feel free, jump in.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Sure, thanks. And I would agree with everything you just said. Maybe just, it might be helpful if we can try and get a, you know, maybe a commitment from Bobby and Iranga, and [inaudible] the PSWG as a whole, to give us, if not a redline back comments that we can consider at least a few days before the Copenhagen meeting start, maybe, you know, March 6th or 7th, so that we can come to the table, rather than

digesting any feedback on our last draft at first blush from when we're sitting down.

I think it would be much more productive use of everyone's time if the registries have at least a couple of days to digest the PSWG feedback in advance of Copenhagen.

IRANGA KAHANGAMA: Yeah, I think that's fully reasonable. We'll need to circulate it, and then maybe have a call next week, but yeah, I think something like the sixth and the seventh, if that's fine, we can aim for getting some teams back to you by then if not before. It would be helpful, if, I don't know if it's Alan or whoever maybe right now, really quickly, to just go over the logic of some of your comments so we know where you're coming from, to consider whenever we're adding our edits.

ALAN WOODS: Yeah, sure. It's Alan here. Yeah, more than happy to do that. I mean, yes, I agree there. [Inaudible] it might be easier to have the redline on the screen. [Inaudible] do you have the redline viewable there, Dennis or Michelle?

DENNIS CHANG: Let's see, I think this may be, no, that's not it. Michelle, did you have the redline before? There you go. Thank you.

ALAN WOODS: Marvelous. I'm not used to being able to control the thing, so let's bring it a bit closer. Great. Okay, so I suppose the easiest thing… I mean, an awful lot of, as I said, the benign language changes, are those areas which, Iranga, in your quick review so far that maybe were highest up in your priorities? That you know will generate comments or query? And then perhaps we can talk them through specifically.

It might be a bit easier than me second guessing. Could we do that?

IRANGA KAHANGAMA: Sure, yeah, well I guess we'll start with the trusted notifier section.

ALAN WOODS: Okay, yeah. Okay [inaudible], so obviously, well, it's pretty straightforward. We covered that. Yeah, no the reasoning behind them… Now, this is my recollection of the reasoning, so again, please registry people, if you disagree with anything I'm saying, please feel free to come in. I'm going to paraphrase. But the main issue behind the trusted third party notification is that there is absolutely nothing within spec 11 3D that would indicate that we must go to a trusted third party, or we must enter into any sort of a trusted third party notification.

Yes, we need to do our technical analysis. However, a lot of people push back saying that that was not visited by spec 11 3D. Now, of vital importance, of course, is that the trusted third party notification, it is up to the individual registry operator.

I know from my point of view, as from right side registry, we have such a trusted third party notifier with them, it's that [inaudible] foundation.

Again, [inaudible] imagery. So you know, I have created that relationship with them, and I can do that. However, that might not [inaudible] maybe to do location, anything else, anybody else, and maybe the, you know, again, coming down to a question of resources out there, that there are smaller registries who just don't have the capacity or the ability to do that.

And especially for maybe the smaller, you know, smaller registries and smaller zones as well, that it just doesn't make sense for them to even try and go into the trusted third party. So, even having it as a soft mention in this document, is indicating and hinting that it is something that could potentially be expected under spec 11 3D.

So, you know, I completely agree with trusted third party where it is relevant. However, I would have strong reservations of having it included in a consideration of response, when it is the epitome of a registry operator's call in this, and it's just not suitable in all areas.

Now, I probably waffled a bit too much there, but anybody else want to add to that, maybe from our side?

Thanks Brian. Iranga, have you any reaction to that?

IRANGA KAHANGAMA: Yeah, I mean, I understand the logic of smaller parties. I guess the logic of the public safety working group uses, that concerns that is all non-enforced, and non-obligatory, that we just wanted to create the option of having that in there, just to acknowledge that it is from both sides,

one legitimate, recognized as an incredible force from which to derive a report from.

Not that there is an obligation or requirement or anything like that to actually listen and to respond to it. But just like we mentioned that there are reports from other sources. This is just another source, and we wanted to include that as, that there are these other third parties that are doing good work, and they could be considered if the registry operator wants to do that.

ALAN WOODS: Great, thank you Iranga. I see Brian has his hand up there, please.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Yeah, thanks Alan. And I see, yeah, and Iranga, I certainly understand where you're coming from. I think though, that there may be room in the reports from other sources, category, and this may touch on what Nick was saying in chat, that you know, whatever referral, even from law enforcement, it's still incumbent on the registry to conduct its investigation and make sure that it falls within the scope of this framework and/or its policy.

I think admittedly, that the whole issue of trusted notifiers is somewhat political hot button within the ICANN registry community, and I think it, inserting that language will be kind of a lightning rod to attention to it, and some instances may empower trusted notifer entities to a power that they can somehow insert themselves into this relationship.

We'll always look at referrals for whatever source on security threats. I think it specifically calls out trusted notifiers, when as Alan pointed out, it's really a registry by registry basis. I think may unnecessarily politicize this document, or at least that section of the document.

And it may be a workaround, but alluding it to by the relationships registries may have with sources, something, languages along those lines, and reports from other sources section. But I think to include a standalone section on trusted notifiers, at least gives me heartburn.

IRANGA KAHANGAMA: Okay, yeah, I mean, that can be the compromise, I guess, instead of having the separate section, we could include it into another one. So, maybe we could just work on rewording that text and incorporating it.

ALAN WOODS: Great. Thank you Iranga, Alan here again. And yes, thank you Brian, I mean, I agree that [inaudible]. Okay. We'll put that on the list of things that we need to review, follow-up, and see if we can find more of a common ground on that. But this is, we now know the reservations on both sides and see if we can work towards an agreeable middle ground on that.

Great. I just see Donna typing there, so perhaps I'll wait for her to come through. Perhaps you can maybe flag the next standout issue from your point of view, Iranga, while waiting for Donna? There we go.

Oh yes, yeah. Donna said that… Sorry, just before you go on. Donna just says that she thinks the roles [inaudible] not necessarily have a

common understanding, and others, that is also very true, and this actually comes through in one or two of the other areas as well, which again, you're going to flag, where you know, yes, I can see why they want to be inserted, but because they're such new terms of art, or they are such a new concept, that you know, it might cause pause for a lot of people because they're just not well enough to find [inaudible], and the roles are not that well enough to find actually put in a document that called it [inaudible] as being a specific response.

Sorry, go on. I've cut you off, apologies.

IRANGA KAHANGAMA: Sorry, Bobby do you have anything? I think you had mentioned an edit that you wanted to talk about.

BOBBY FLAIM: No. No, I think what we'll do is, I think we need to do review it just a little bit more thoroughly, and then I think maybe we can use some of the interaction of the avalanche case, maybe as an example to see if that would be helpful or not.

But, I think we were just, for me, I know I would have to… I did read it, you know, just one time, but I would have to look at it again.

ALAN WOODS: Can I just actually come in? It's Alan again, just to suggest perhaps, Bobby, yourself, myself, and Iranga of course, could [inaudible] and anybody else from our side, maybe we can have a smaller call, give you

a few days, and instead of bringing everybody into a room, I can kind of provide some sort of general background.

We can have a smaller conversation, then I could report back to my group, just to give you, instead of the formality of a full call, just have an informal co-chair type meeting, see if we can work through any issues, I can bring it back and then we can discuss it, so we can have literally that list of, you know, these are the five or six, I'm hoping not that many, but issues to bring to the table that we can discuss within our meetings with ICANN, which I'm sure we will be discussing at the end of this meeting as well.

So, does that sound like something you can do?

BOBBY FLAIM: This is Bobby. I think that's no problem.

IRANGA KAHANGAMA: Yeah, and I think, I think we would need a couple of days to get some PSWG feedback before that meeting. That's the only thing.

ALAN WOODS: Of course. I think it's just easier for, you know, the smaller number of people to be able to pull together one of those shorter meetings when you're ready, as opposed to everybody on the call together, and you know, all of our time is shared. So, yeah, absolutely. I would just [inaudible] in advance by some degree of ICANN if that's possible.

IRANGA KAHANGAMA: Okay, yeah, that sounds good.

ALAN WOODS: Great. Maxim has a great question there, he brings us to a global view. Is there a case that is not limited to the EU or US, including China, Russia, or India? If there is anyone of them, maybe we can draw attention as well or maybe discuss.

IRANGA KAHANGAMA: Nothing comes to mind immediately, but I saw [inaudible] was typing.

ALAN WOODS: Okay. As we're waiting for Nick to type his comment or question, just to maybe just jump in and say, Dennis, I see, have we… There were some talk of some time that has been set aside for ICANN. Is this time much along the same side, same type that was for India?

Hello Dennis?

DENNIS CHANG: I'm sorry. Yes, I'm here. What was the question?

ALAN WOODS: No, apologies. I probably should have [inaudible] better. No, I'm just wondering, have we time then set aside for ICANN, at the ICANN meeting in Copenhagen?

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, I was going to cover that at the end of the meeting, but I would be happen to do that now. So, none of the sessions are confirmed, so that's the caveat that I want to make sure that I give you. But it is confirmed that we will have four sessions as we did in Hyderabad.

So, the format is identical to the last time. The first session, we'll have a private session for the drafting team. And tentatively, that's Saturday 9 to 10:30, so it's very 90 minute meeting. And that's again, a private session for the drafting team we'll have.

And following that meeting, on the next day, we're planning a registry only session. And the PSW only session, again to allow you to discuss any remaining items among yourselves. And then following that, we'll have an open session for the whole team. And that date has not been settled yet. We're still trying to find a spot where we minimize the conflicts, or we want to make sure that we do our best so you can be available for that input meeting.

So, I think we'll have adequate time, and you'll have adequate time between the individual session and the final session, so that you can fully work out whatever items, and as Alan says, it's our goal and hope that we will come out of the ICANN 58 with a document, a clean document, that the SFDT has agreed to, and be in a shape where we can proceed to the next step, and the next step is the public comment.

So by no means, it's a done document until we go through that process, but at least it's something that the drafting team can put forward for

the external comments external to the drafting team, I mean. Does that make sense?

ALAN WOODS: That certainly makes sense from my point of view, so thank you very much for that, Dennis.

IRANGA KAHANGAMA: Yeah, I think just one thing to add. I think, at some point, PSWG has to go through the GAC as well before, in the end, but that's, I think, way down the line.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, sorry. And I presume that the registries have the same sort of process.

So, we have some comments here, Alan, I don't know if you're looking at Nick and Max, they've made further comments, maybe you want to address.

ALAN WOODS: Sure, yeah, I'm happy to go through. So Nick replied there, saying I don't know the specifics of [inaudible] really indiscriminate in targeting specific jurisdictions? Maxim responded that it was the question, you take [inaudible] for sharing efforts. Nick says he doesn't think it makes much sense.

No, I think it does make sense. I think that your point was that it wasn't specifically targeting jurisdiction, it just happened to fall within jurisdiction that were probably accessible. So, I think this is all probably more a question of what we can rely upon as more of an indicator and, what's the word that I'm looking for?

As an example or sample, and what was learned from them? But absolutely. I think perhaps the inclusion of points of view from people such as Maxim and some of the members from the Asian registries as well, you know, might be able to give extra color as to some of the approaches.

And I know Maxim, you've been exceptionally vocal in trying to get the language into our document as well, and that is absolutely necessary and very well appreciated as well, because it's taking into account, you know, the viewpoints, this must be a vocal document and not necessarily focusing on the US or the EU or the UK.

So, I agree.

Maxine, your hand is up there, so please, feel free.

MAXIM ALZOBA: It's Maxim Alzoba for the record. Do you hear me?

ALAN WOODS: It's difficult, but we can make it out, I think.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Just a small clarification, about the [inaudible] laws etc. What I would like to say that in case we're, governments for example, to participate [inaudible] some agreement between them and [inaudible] more important, then if [inaudible] applicable for the particular registry, in case, for example, the registry in [inaudible], and the law enforcement from the United States [inaudible].

So, it was the reason for inclusion of applicable instead of the inclusion of [inaudible] more important, etc. So, [inaudible] it's a good idea not to breach local laws [inaudible]. So, if they can accept like the request from the [inaudible] law enforcement with each [inaudible]… then we'll see the framework in our [inaudible]. Thanks.

ALAN WOODS: Thank you, this is Alan here. It was difficult enough to hear, Maxim, but I think I've got the general idea of what you're saying, and I would [inaudible] and say, I think we are very clear in saying that, you know, it is up to the registry operator, and we did add in a lot of clarifying language, [inaudible] is nodding his head and thinking, yes, there was a lot of language put in there specifically saying, you know, governments of applicable jurisdiction to the registry operator in question, you know, very clear on that.

Perhaps, you know, Bobby, when you were saying the inclusion of Avalanche experiences, that you know, not necessarily experience as to what the authorities and how the authorities, [inaudible] operators or things to, to cooperate, but more so that they were the types of responses that helped the type of experience, not necessarily from a

legal point of view, but just from, you know, what sort of efforts worked in stopping the avalanche network.

Perhaps then, I'm paraphrasing people here, but that's the way I understood it, but I don't know if jurisdiction is necessarily what he is talking about, but right now just the efforts that were made and the technical side that occurred, that could lend some extra credibility to the document.

BOBBY FLAIM: Yes, this is Bobby. That's what I was referring to, Alan, exactly.

ALAN WOODS: Great. Thank you. I may have a cold, but clearly, I'm developing some sort of ESP. Anyway, great, so thank you.

Okay, I feel for some reason [inaudible] so I'm going to keep going. Is there…? So, at the moment, let's just recap very quickly then. So, what's going to happen is Iranga and Bobby and the [inaudible] in general who are dealing with this, you're going to go back, have a proper review of the edits of the changes, come up to what the, you know, the list of whatever you want to have extra discussion on.

In the meantime, you know, once you go through the proper GAC channel, or proper PSWG channel, we can set up an informal meeting, and in advance of any formal meeting, we can then go back, liaise with our own group in advance of ICANN. We can pull together some sort of kind of an agenda for our closed meeting, and say these are the key issues that we need to discuss at that hour.

And let's get them through in a private meeting, have a discussions then in our huddles, in our private meeting. And then in the public, we can be, as I said later focused, get to those issues in the public forum, you know, keep to the nice strict structure that we are putting in place, and hopefully then be able to come out of that public forum with perhaps, as Dennis suggested, and I would like to think we could do that [inaudible] document that we can move to the next stage.

IRANGA KAHANGAMA: All right, yeah, that sounds like a plan.

ALAN WOODS: Great. Does anybody have any comments or concerns or…? You know, cold medication and I'm making no sense.

Great, Nick.

NICK SHOREY: Can you hear me?

ALAN WOODS: We can indeed, yes.

NICK SHOREY: Brilliant. Yes, just an observation. The bottom of the document, there was a short paragraph on the annex. Annex may include examples of potential response mechanisms, etc. I noticed you had redlined that. I

was just wondering if you could sort of expand a bit on your thinking there? Is it just that paragraph doesn't really sit, or is that something the registries don't want to see in the document?

In terms of that, some of those best practice examples, I just… I haven't had much of a chance to discuss this with Bobby and Ingara and the others already, obviously. But I'm just keen to understand why that section was redlined as well. Thank you.

ALAN WOODS: Sure, thank you Nick. Yeah, my recollection of that one was, due to the focus that the document has now with [inaudible] as a result of the shortening of it, it actually reads, the way we read it was, there are so many specific examples and types of specific efforts and responses within the documents, we actually…

It's not that we didn't like the paragraph, but we felt that it had already been adequately covered with this shorter document. That the samples would be, the annex that we could add on to it, had already been covered within the shortened text which, you know [inaudible]. That was my recollection of it.

Is there anybody on the registry side who may have more specific additional color on that?

I see Maxine is typing, so we'll see what he says. But yes, [inaudible]… Yeah, I suppose that's the [inaudible] anyway, as well. But, yeah, I think from my point of view, not speaking necessarily the co-chair, but I think

adding an annex on top of everything that was in there, finally said many times that this is just a certain number…

There is actually one of the drafters paragraph up at the top, so to say that look, this is not all the responses, but it does represent all of them. And I like that. And I think that by adding an extra examples on top of that, just maybe… It might get confusing, to be honest.

And you've done such a good job of removing confusion from it, that perhaps we shouldn't continue down that road.

DENNIS CHANG: Alan, this is Dennis. It's my recollection throughout the process, the annex example was actually suggested and requested by the registries, which Bobby responded to by reaching out to his colleagues. Just wanted to make that known for you.

ALAN WOODS: Thanks Dennis. That may very well be true now that I think back on it. Yeah, I think, as well looking at the [inaudible] from Brian, yeah, I think it's possible [inaudible] maybe we don't need anymore. So, that's the way our thinking is.

So again, please feel free to discuss that with the PSWG, and if there is any necessary addition that you might want to put in there, well, this is all for discussion, absolutely, let's see what it says.

I can see that [inaudible]… Okay. Any other people wish to have any other questions, comments, or from either side?

Actually no sides here, from anybody within the group. There are no sides, we're all one group.

No? Okay, Dennis is there anything specifically then that you want to perhaps add?

DENNIS CHANG: Thanks Alan, no, I think that I'm just making sure that we're here to support you all, and what I'm witnessing is a very, very good progress and cooperation and collaboration. And I think the meetings and the talks are really clearing up some of the assumptions that some parties were having.

So, I'm very encouraged that we are going to reach our common goal of having a good document at the end of ICANN 58, is something we very much support, all of us. So, congratulations to you all, and thank you for your contribution and support.

So, I don't have anything more, and feel free to close the meeting, Alan, if you like.

ALAN WOODS: Fair enough. Well, yes, again, I would just add to the thanks as well, it was great to get a new view of the document. I mean [inaudible] let go of it, you think, on your side, but that's always a good and welcome thing, you know, when new eyes can come in and just say, wait, okay, let's just rethink this at the moment.

Quite encouraging and we've had some really good discussions and open, and full, and frank questions from the registries as well. So, I just want to thank, we've had a number of meetings about these documents, so I just want to thank everybody's support in getting back those, their comments and their redlines as well on that.

So, I'm happy to then say, you know, let's, the ball back in the PSWG court with your discussions amongst yourselves, and I look forward to hearing from you, and talking to you soon.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]