
IRANGA KAHANGAMA: Hey, this is Iranga.

DENNIS CHANG: Hi Iranga. Good, I was waiting for you. You didn't show up on the Adigo, but that's okay.

IRANGA KAHANGAMA: Yeah, no, sorry, I have a very few minutes. I got to run into another meeting.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. Yeah, I know. So, let's get started, Michelle.

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Great. Well, good morning, good afternoon, good evening to all, and welcome to the Security Framework Drafting call on the 4th of May, 2017. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. But if you're only on the audio bridge, would you let yourself be known now? Hearing no names, I would like to remind all to please state your names of course 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 it back over to Dennis Chang.

DENNIS CHANG: Hi Michelle. Maybe it wasn't clear, but Iranga just spoke up and he's only on the audio bridge, because I don't see him on the AC room.

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.

IRANGA KAHANGAMA: Oh yeah, sorry. Yeah, I am.

DENNIS CHANG: That was the cue. You're not used to it, I know. Alright everyone, let's get started. Thanks for joining us today, and thanks also for the quick response to my email call for public comment. And the reason I did that, is to make sure that the whole team is on the same page and we're all aligned. The question, why we need a public comment has come up multiple times from multiple members, so if you think you're the only one who asked that question, you didn't. We asked that question from the SSDT, we had discussions on it and internally at ICANN organization, we asked the same question, because this is not a consensus policy, and therefore we are not following any prescribed process.

And at the end of the day, this is for registries responding to the (inaudible) request, and more important, we would like to have collaboration and coordination on it. And we have been having very transparent and public meetings all the way through, so there's nothing that was hidden. By point to the community Wiki page that we have been using, and you will see that all our meetings, public meetings, have been logged and our documents are there, and it shows clearly what our steps are. So, just to explain that background to you, but the key reason and this public comment is a really useful tool, and we were going to use that tool for this purpose.

And I tried to explain this in the email, I'm not sure how clearly that came through, but I remind you that this SSDT, this one team, we don't

want split off to a registry team, a CSW team and have private meetings. We don't want to go back to that process, I think we're beyond that. We already have an agreement that SSDT has agreed to go forward to GAC and registry stakeholder.

And we are so fortunate that we didn't get any comment from them, so that means we have jumped ahead, and we can now say that we have a document that registry stakeholder and the GAC also agreed that this is a big step ahead. We have anticipated that we will get some comments, and once we get comments, let's say we get some comments from the GAC and registry stakeholder and we were thinking about how we handle these comments, like, what shall we do, SSDT handles the comment and we update the document. Now, then, do we have to go back to the GAC for another endorsement and registry stakeholder?

And then what happens if there's no comments? We could get into this loop of going back and circling back, coming back. So what we had decided was use this public comment tool as something that, where we collect the comments and update the document, we can put it out for public comment and all the members of the GAC and all the members of registry stakeholder, in addition to everyone else, and look at that, and publicly give us comment for the final plan. That was the purpose. I know that there have been concerns and what I've tried to do, is you guys will all join me on the Google doc, is try to capture those voices of caution and advice from SSDT members. It's what I called it at the end of it.

What you will see is a brief introduction that this is a collaborative document for us at SSDT, and you are all invited to edit directly. So

before I get ahead, so let me hear from the SSDT, any members, would any members like to voice their opinion on the public comment? I'm talking about do we need a public comment? You know, if you want to ask that question one more time, please do. Go ahead, Brian.

[AUDIO BREAK 00:06:03 – 00:07:14]

IRANGA KAHANGAMA:

This is Iranga. I just wanted to say, I have to hop off here in a second, but I agree with that. I think, you know, we told them that we'll have the public comment so we should be committed to it. I can commit to, you know, doing the public comment deconfliction together as a group, we don't, like Dennis said, we don't need to go back into our respective groups.

And I do think there are, especially within the security community, that ICANN would be interested in potentially commenting on that. But again, we've had the success and confidence that we can kind of deconflict accordingly. And I really did like Jim Galvin's response on the email chain of, you know, having a framework to identify relevant and then out of scope comments, and then whittling it down from there in terms of priority. But that's my general thoughts. I have to hop off now, but if someone could shoot me a message with whatever the conclusions are, I'd really appreciate it.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yes, thank you Iranga. Yeah, thank you for joining briefly. So we'll continue, and I'll send out an email after the meeting so you can be up

to – this is recorded, by the way. Go ahead, Donna. Your turn. Donna?
We can't hear you for some reason. Yes, I can hear you now, go ahead.

DONNA AUSTIN:

So, the NGPC proposal actually called for ICANN to solicit community participation to develop the framework. And to date, it's not been community wide. There has been representatives from the community. So I think that's why it's important that the public comment be used as that community participation aspect. I'd also suggest one thing to the group, might want to – before the public comment actually goes up, is do a webinar so that – or you could do it during the public comment period if you wanted do. But it just allows you the ability to respond to any questions that may come up about how the framework came about, and why is this included and why is that not included? So it gives you an opportunity to talk to the document, and explain the document, and how you got to where you got to. And that might take a little bit of heat out of any criticism that comes around that this is a bilateral arrangement.

Because that's my concern, that that's the heat that you will get is this wasn't a community effort. So it may not so much be about the substance, but the concern may be about the fact that this was done by the PSWG and the registries behind closed doors, and we didn't have an opportunity to be involved. So that's something that this group might want to consider, is to host a webinar so that you can explain all that, and hopefully remove some of that potential comment coming in. And I also agree on chat about Jim's framework that the way that the public comment is framed is really important, so it's important that we take

time to make sure that we're all comfortable with that too. Thanks, Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you, Donna. Just so that everybody knows, within this Google doc, I have a section at the bottom called voices of caution and advice from SSDT members, where I am actually capturing what I'm hearing, what I think is your concern and your suggestions. So please feel free to add directly, and I just added your suggestion for doing a webinar as number seven, Donna. So thank you.

And I captured your earlier advice from the email too. And the essence of Jim's public comment – what was it? In his email, his suggestions on how we do. To answer Jim directly, yes, of course, the ICANN staff will assemble the summary and we will share that with you. And my intention, right now my plan is do something like what we're doing now, as the comments come in, I will be capturing and categorizing and trying to see if it falls into category one, two, and answer yes or no and we can all work on it together as a team.

CRYSTAL ONDO:

Hey Dennis, it's Crystal on the phone. Can I jump in the line? I can't see, I'm not on the Adobe.

DENNIS CHANG:

Oh, okay, Crystal. Crystal Ondo, Michelle, she's on the audio bridge only. Go ahead, Crystal.

CRYSTAL ONDO: I was just wondering where we are with registrars? If anyone has reached out to them? Have they signed off on it? I think if we do host a webinar it would be important to also have them involved as well.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, I agree. Theo actually part of the leadership team in this framework, and I made sure that he was in sync with every step. Let me see, is Theo now? Is he here? No, he's not here. Yeah, he has been engaged throughout the process, but not the registrar group as a whole. So this is another reason why public comment will be great when we do that, and have the webinar, of course we will reach out to them.

CRYSTAL ONDO: I think it would be important to have them also sign off on, or at least review how the public comment is going to be framed before it goes up. Just because a lot of what the framework deals with relates to information going to registrars.

DENNIS CHANG: I see. Why don't I leave that to Theo I'll ask him to ensure that he is comfortable that the registrar's perspective of how we go out with the analysis. Is that okay?

CRYSTAL ONDO: Yep, that sounds great. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you, Crystal. Anybody else have comments? So, I just want to get it on the record that as I mentioned on the email, the SSDT support during the public comment and all the leaders (inaudible) before it, we are going to proceed, we're all going to work on it together. And there hasn't been an opposition (inaudible) advice from the members, but no opposition at this point, so I want to capture that. So that decision is made. So then, again, Alan couldn't make it, but he suggested as long as we're together, we should go right in to preparing for the public comment analysis.

So, then, let me direct your attention to the Google doc. The link has been provided by Michelle, it's on the chat. It's past the window but you can find it if you scroll a lot. Added the link right at the beginning of the meeting. So I see quite a few of you already here. Nine, there's nine participants. And this means that everybody got in without any trouble, and what I can see is a bunch of fake animals, I don't know which one is which. But that's okay. So what we'll do is use this document to collaborate on the announcement. And what I've done is add basically the title of what this is at the top, so you know what it is. And the fact that this is a collaborative document. And inserted table of contents, the blue linked at the top, starting with brief overview, all those are linked that directs you to the bottom, the content.

So first thing you'll see is, after the table of contents is the (inaudible). So I know somebody said we should do the minimum, the suggested minimum is 40 days. But typically, what we do, and this is feedback that we have received from the community, if the ICANN meeting is in the

middle of public comment duration, we extend the duration to accommodate that week. So, we're likely at 47 weeks now. I don't know if we can be ready. I will close the public comment window before the Johannesburg, but we will see how this goes. The faster we complete this document, the faster we can get out. But it does take some time.

This is in my experience, the comment announcement, especially for this, I think will take some time to prepare, because a lot of people have caution. We need to craft this thing just right, so we don't invite a whole bunch of comments that lead us to something else, and specifically what we are intended to do. So somebody has highlighted everything for some reason, but we'll see. So, first thing is open date, so that date is determined by when we get done and when we're ready. The duration can be 40, up to 47 days. And close date is (inaudible) follow that. And the TC report is the summary and analysis of what we will do after the comments in. We usually pick maybe three weeks after the close date.

And then we should really think about now, dates for publication. So if we are – after the public comment, if we all agree that we don't need to go back to respective groups, then we will proceed with publication. So after the TC report comes out we should probably meet one more time and make sure we're fine with going forward with publication. And also, as someone suggested, Donna suggested, we probably want to add a webinar here somewhere. That sounds like a good thing to do. Go ahead, Brian.

[AUDIO BREAK 00:19:14 – 00:20:12]

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, yes, so that's a good sign. So let me ask again here. The Johannesburg is a policy forum, and this is really not a policy, so I wasn't thinking about a meeting there. But does the team feel like that's a good opportunity for a face-to-face meeting and we should try to leverage that? If so, then I will go ahead and ask for a meeting, I'll ask for a session or submit one. I haven't yet, but I can. I don't know if it's too late, but I'll certainly submit one. Let me just get a sense of [AUDIO BREAK 00:20:53 – 00:21:29]. Yeah, understood.

On the other hand, I kind of see, if we were in the middle of a public comment phase, right, then it would be a good way to do a webinar as a meeting so people can come to the meeting and ask questions directly and discuss any points face-to-face. So I'm kind of seeing it in the benefit there too. So, yes, if the public comment period is closed, will be a good time for us to work on, or to finalize the document. If it's not closed, it may be a good opportunity to have Q & A with whoever is attending, and of course we can combine that with a webinar, because it would be public. So that's what I was thinking. Go ahead, Beth.

BETH BACON: Hi, thank you. I just have one question for clarity. I think a webinar is a good idea, and I think a webinar in advance of, or coinciding with the publication of the public comment is a good idea so that we can kind of nip some of those potential questions and comments in the bud. Are you saying that we would then do another webinar, or an in-person Q & A in Jo'burg? I like the idea of a webinar to educate and head off

comments, but then I think it might – a webinar from Jo’burg seems odd.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah. I mean, we were just talking out loud, I am. So there’s nothing that’s been set. We were talking about possible meeting in Jo’burg, so if we do meet, what would we do? And it depends on the situation. And Brian was suggesting that let’s meet if the summary, or public comment is closed. And I was saying if it’s not closed, will we still meet? That was one idea. And then the webinar idea on top of that is that we can certainly do a webinar before the public comment is open, and during the public comment.

And then if we are going to be in Jo’burg, we can certainly have a meeting with Q & A, but then combine that meeting with a webinar as well. So we’ll be conducting the webinar together as a team. So that’s sort of the options and ideas that I have. But my question to you right now is, should I be submitting a session request for Jo’burg? How many people are going to be there? Can I just see a check on the (inaudible)?

CRYSTAL ONDO:

Hey Dennis, it’s Crystal. I won’t be there.

DENNIS CHANG:

Okay, I understand. Okay, got you.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Dennis, this is Kristine. I also will not be there.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, thank you Kristine, for letting me know. Okay. So that's now. From the AC (inaudible). So, go ahead, Michael. You had your hand raised. Did you want to speak? Okay, that's fine then. That may have been a attempted check. So, let me think about it and I'll let you know. The policy forum, it is intended to be very small and they're trying to limit it to policy questions only. But if there's enough of us there anyway, then maybe we can leverage the time, face-to-face time for one reason or another, one purpose or another. So, that being said, let's continue on the document.

So we just talked about the target date, so you know what this means now, right? And the next section is brief overview containing three things. And these are, you've seen in public comments on our website before, so you can just go ahead and go to icann.org and look at the public comment, open public comment, you will see a consistent formatting of these sections. And you'll always see the people working first and the detailed description, an explanation, followed by background. Basically that's like the three section format.

In the brief overview, we want to be very clear about what the purpose is, what our current status is, and the next step. And by setting a meeting, purpose is very important to make sure that they all know this is "voluntary framework", non-binding, so those, I think, should jump out right in almost the first line. And this is not a requirement or whatever. Those words I think, needs to be crafted very carefully, so

the first line they see for public comment purpose is very clear about that we're not all of a sudden trying to solicit public comment on the vital security (inaudible). That will be an interesting gathering of information that we can look into.

The other thing is the current status I think is plain and I think the fact that we have gone through and gotten the endorsement from the PSWG and GAC as well as our registry stakeholder group is significant, and I think those should come out in that current status.

And next step is probably almost important to let everyone know that this is not a research project. We're not going to do a bunch of analysis and fact finding, and somehow report back to them. We're going to be taking in their comments and looking for new information that hadn't been considered, within scope, as Jim has suggested, and making updates to the document based on strict guidelines. And this comes up time to time, and that is the question, who has the authority, final authority, to decide what goes in, what goes out?

And I think that I agree with Alan, who says that it should be the SSDT. However, we have to be very careful about giving power to the SSDT publicly, because it was a "voluntary drafting team" and SSDT was not chartered with making decisions. So however we crack that, is going to be a challenge. But I think with the combined brain power here, and your deep understanding and insight, I think we can probably make that happen.

But that's the next step. And the following is the detailed description and explanation, and this is where we actually get into some of the guts

of the framework document. So kind of key points and summary of what the document contains and what that means. So, the way you should be looking at this section is, the framework document that we have created; we're (inaudible) right now, is meant to be consumable for the registries and the (inaudible), right? But it was not really written with the intention of public or arraignment. So this is where we say, hey, the framework we have crafted is this, and this is what it really means and this is what we're trying to do. So if you have comment on this section, please let us know. And this is where we may actually highlight some of the areas that you want to solicit comment on, and I don't know what these areas are, but please think about that. If you want it, to focus their attention to a certain area of the document, on certain issues, this is where we should bring them up. And I think background and resources are something that you're all familiar with.

And this is the background that I captured from the wiki, our work space on the wiki. Word for word, I just copied and pasted it here. I thought it worked well. But again, we can craft this to make sure that when they read it, they get a full understanding that this is not (inaudible) advisory project that's going on, but on a different track. (inaudible) ALAC gave the guidance document that we are collaborating on for voluntary purposes.

And the reference links that we want to add, I came off with four right now. The draft itself, or framework, and our wiki space, that they can go and look at archives and the NGP direction, is important the original direction. And then the GAC advice. I think those are four I came up with, but please add other references, relevant references you'd like to add here. Kristine, go ahead. Oh, Kristine wants to enter.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: My (inaudible) is not up, I just got to the office, so if you could let me in that would be awesome.

DENNIS CHANG: I'll let you in.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Thank you. Now I'm actually on Adobe. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, you're in. Welcome. I see you. Okay. So that's the reference and the last section is the voices of caution and advice from the SSDT members. And this is what I've been capturing, looking over the emails that you have sent us, and the comments that you're making here. I had a question on number seven. Oh, I see. So, I think the suggestion is have two webinars, before and after. Okay. That makes sense. So let's see if we can do that. If everybody's agreeable, we can and should do that. So we don't have to make that decision right now.

So our task on hand is this announcement document. Anybody have suggestions on how we should proceed at this moment? Is there any questions on the formatting of the document or (inaudible)? All clear? No suggestions? Okay. Let's see. Here's what I suggest, then. We're missing Alan and Irango, our leaders right now, and Theo too. What I would like to do then, is break for now and then have you go off and individually think about the sections that I've gathered, that's probably

what you need to think about it a little bit, now you know what's on hand. And have you go ahead and enter right into the document and start editing. And I'm not asking you to do that now, but after we break, you can go ahead and do that. And then in a couple of weeks we can resume as a team, but in the meanwhile, we have a couple of weeks for individual edit and work offline, or online. Go ahead, Brian, do you have a suggestion?

[AUDIO BREAK 00:36:44 – 00:37:14]

I see. So, I kept it in editing mode, because it's an initial start, and everything on here is what I wrote, and I'm not sure if that was a good starting point. But I agree that we should probably switch to suggestion mode. Do you think we should do that now? Or maybe give it a few days, so maybe it gets fleshed out. So, I feel comfortable leaving it in edit for mode now, because as you can see, we have not filled this out yet. It's an initial thing. What do you think?

[AUDIO BREAK 00:37:50 – 00:38:14]

UNKNOWN: And I do enjoy the leading brand thing.

DENNIS CHANG: You guys are so funny. Okay. Let me see if I can do that now. Okay. I think I did it. Did that work for you? Yeah, okay. Yeah, I see it, I see you -- anything awaits. That's good. Now, what else? [AUDIO BREAK 00:39:33 – 00:40:09]. Well, let's see. This is the comments. I see next step. What about 'may' instead of 'will'? SSDT may consider. Maxim

agrees with the 'may'. But doesn't that kind of suggest that SSDT will not consider some of those comments? Actually, don't we have to consider all comments and make decisions accordingly? That's a question to you guys.

BETH BACON: Dennis? This is Beth.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, go ahead.

BETH BACON: I agree. I think we have to, if we're putting it out for public comment, we can't be selective so we have to say yes, we will consider it. Doesn't mean we have to accept it, we can say we can do this and do it really bad. But I think that we have to keep it 'will'.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Do you agree, Maxim? Thank you. Deletion of comment (inaudible) I agree. Let's see what else people are commenting on. I don't see any other comments. Does somebody want to suggest the word for the purpose? I have an opening statement here, with a dot, dot, dot. That was to indicate, please add some good words so it's clear what we're asking for. Go ahead.

[AUDIO BREAK 00:43:05 – 00:43:40]

Yeah, that was my initial (inaudible), but it seemed like there were some of us were eager to get onto it together. I was trying to accommodate. And let's see, Maxim says, could we change to comment mode instead of edit? Didn't I already do that? Maxim, are you still able to edit now? Let me see if I can correctly set it.

UNKNOWN: Dennis, it's correct. I think Maxim just needs to reload it.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, I see. Okay, please reload, Maxim. And it's okay. It's easy now, okay. So, I think Brian is right. I think that we came into it thinking about should we do a public comment or not. Now that we have decided that, then how should we do it? And I laid out the format for you, so now you're familiar with the sections and the type of language, the purposes and all that stuff, so, I think we should break. And then continue to work online, so kind of digest this and come back and you can make all the suggestions that you like. What I'd like to do, is, Brian - Brian, Alan, maybe the selective some of you is to make you editor as well, if you're okay with it so I'm not the only one who is accepting the changes. So that's a suggestion too. And Iranga, probably. Everybody okay with this?

So, continue working on it individually, and Michelle, if you could, let's set another meeting a couple of weeks from now. Thank you, Stephanie. We will regroup, but in a couple of weeks let's see how far we can get, maybe we can wrap it up in a couple of weeks when we

meet next time. Everybody good? Everybody saying goodbye? Thank you. Same time, same place, two weeks. Bye now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]