

---

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, everyone, for joining. This is the Security Framework Drafting Team meeting with the whole team together here today on the 19<sup>th</sup> of January, 2017.

Today we'll be looking at reviewing the framework that was drafted by the PSWG. What I will do is turn it over to Bobby and Eranga and have them lead you through it. It's about three pages long. What we'll do is we'll turn over the control to you, and you can go ahead and present it as you like. How's that? Is that okay with everyone?

[ERANGA SAMARARANTHA]: Sure. Great. Thanks, everyone, for participating. From the PSWG perspective, in keeping in line what we mentioned in Hyderabad, our goal with this was to just make it very streamlined. We wanted a very short, straightforward document that got all the intentions of Spec 11 captured. This is a draft that we had come up with, and we want to put straight-up in the beginning that it was a voluntary and non-binding document, in that language, to have the caveat the whole document.

Based on conversations we had, we just wanted a couple of high-level categories. I can go through those very quickly. We wanted to list initially the typical registry responses to give a sense of what the environment is for registries when they deal with security threats. As you see, we've listed about six there, and we just gave a brief description so that people will know the lay of the land that we're dealing with.

---

*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.*

---

Next we go to requests. We wanted to just highlight some potential sources of the identified security threats, and we just delineate between public safety authorities. We wanted to reiterate that they're in the proper jurisdiction and that they should be afforded all the due process. We also mentioned that there are other sources.

The meat of it is where we talk about the registry responses. We just wanted to highlight some of the framework, some of the categories that should be considered, including level priority and origin of receipt because we want to respect the fact that registries can have a hard time obtaining their origin. It should be a legitimate one and they should have the ability to discern that. They should also consider the content and the responsible parties.

In keeping align with the PSWG request before, too, we wanted to outline language to talk about high priority and ones that are not high priority but that should also be considered. We wanted to put some language in there to what you had given to us in Hyderabad about – I'm forgetting where I see it – dealing with imminent threat to harm and things like that and caveat that for high priority.

So that's a very high-level overview. We've had a couple of smaller changes and language that wants to be added because PSWG continue to look at this document, but I don't think there's anything game-changing there.

With that, that's our logic. We wanted it to be streamlined. We wanted it to be a short and sweet document, as law enforcement can't handle really lengthy documents that can get a bit onerous with all the other

---

work that we did. So hopefully this is something that we see as a reasonable compromise. Obviously, we can edit and tweak here and there as needed.

So that's the logic we're using. I'd love to hear your thoughts on it. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: I trust everyone has received a copy and had a chance to review it. It's a short document. Okay, Alan, go ahead.

ALAN WOODS: Great. Can you hear me all right?

DENNIS CHANG: Yes.

ALAN WOODS: Perfect. Well, first things first, Happy New Year to everybody. Let me just say thank you very much to the PSWG for their efforts in this. I think we've all received – I think we have received [inaudible] has been sent around. To the extent that we actually also had a good look at it, we've been adding comments on the registry side of it over the past few days as well. We didn't provide our comments and our minor edits yet because we wanted to see perhaps that the PSWG could take us through the document, as will be done today, just so, if we have any

---

comments that are no longer relevant, we don't have them in with no basis. Let's put it that way.

Generally speaking, I think we all received the more streamlined version very positively. I think that, generally speaking, we are quite happy with the language in it. Here and there are a few changes that we wanted to put in. Once we discuss it today, I think then we can provide you with a redline. It sounds a lot worse than it is. It's not really a redline. It's more minor tweaks and edit here and there and a few comments.

So I think, and I propose for this meeting, that if perhaps we could go to the document from the beginning to end in a bit more detail. If there's any questions from specifically the members of the registry side who have raised questions and want to ask questions before committing to comments on the document or suggesting edits, that would be very helpful from my point of view.

Of course, we can have discussions on certain parts as we go along, if you're happy with that.

[ERANGA SAMARARANTHA]: Sure. I guess I'll start from the top. In terms of the objective, that language is mostly taken from the previous round, from the previous draft. The only addition that we've had since is that we wanted to add to the second sentence – "This framework is a voluntary, non-binding document designed to assist registries in how to respond security threats" – a comma where registries have discretion to take a particular response. So that's just something we wanted added.

---

We wanted to keep this objective true to the NGCP commitment, and we wanted to make sure that we fill that obligation. We also wanted to say straight-up in the beginning that it's voluntary and non-binding because we recognized the importance you all had placed on that.

That's all I have for that objective part.

ALAN WOODS:

[inaudible]. I'll just say to the group to obviously feel free, if you have any questions or queries, to pipe up. I know have a list of comments on the document here in front of me that unfortunately you don't see – sorry, Eranga. I just wanted to make sure that people do feel free to ask questions [inaudible]. I can take notes, etc. Thank you.

[ERANGA SAMARARANTHA]:

Actually, I know you said that you didn't want to send your comments without the context, but I think that, now that we see that it's a positive response – we didn't know what your response was going to be before that – if you want to send you comments so that we can have them in front of us, that might be more beneficial. We'll take it with good faith [inaudible] they're coming from. Or if you want to add a little justification, I think it might be an easier way because going line by line over the phone may be a little difficult in terms of going through it all. I don't know what your thoughts are.

ALAN WOODS:

Sure. It's really up the group. If the group has no issues with the comments that they put on already, I'm happy sharing.

---

BRIAN CIMBOLIC:

I made a couple of comments that were on the draft. It's on the registry side. I'm totally fine and comfortable having that document in front of us now.

The only thing I would say is that I can't say that every registry has had a chance to look at it and provide comments, so maybe we're better served once the registries powwow together and are able to have a more complete document of changes and comments in front of the PSWG. That perhaps might be more helpful, rather than doing it piecemeal now, where we've only got a few comments and would have to redo it again when other registries get a chance to look at it.

But, having said that, I do just want to echo what Alan said. I think that this was a huge step in the right direction, and we absolutely appreciate that thought that went into it. It was clear that the PSWG digested a lot of the concerns the registries had and addressed them very positively in this draft.

[ERANGA SAMARARANTHA]:

Great. Yeah, I think from the PSWG perspective, it'd be easier for us, too, if everything was consolidated into one thing. I just hate sending out multiple things to people and having issues with version control for our end. So if you want to consolidate those and send them out, I can also send you some of the updated language that we wanted to do because I guess you're probably the same. We have things trickle in. So we have a couple things, but I don't think it's anything serious. For me,

---

personally, to see everything over paper and just to go back and forth on e-mail a few times may be the way to go.

ALAN WOODS: Yeah, I agree. It is the interest of keeping it, as I said, not messy and making sure that we're representing as best as possible. I completely agree with Brian [inaudible]. So, yes.

[ERANGA SAMARARANTHA]: Great. So maybe we should consolidate those and we can just see what the comments are. If there's not too many gaps, we can whittle those down and then hopefully try to finalize this in Copenhagen.

ALAN WOODS: Great. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: This is Dennis Chang – oh.

ALAN WOODS: Go on, Den.

DENNIS CHANG: I was just going to suggest, Alan – it's really hard to get this group together – that, now that we're here, instead of comments, we just make sure that all your questions are answered. So if you have any

---

questions in the document that you read, this is probably the time to get all those questions answered, at least. Right?

ALAN WOODS:

You took the words right out of my mouth. I was just going to say that, whatever [inaudible] I think now is the time to have any outstanding comments that we have that could lead to more of a rewrite. I don't know. I was just going to invite people to do that. I was just reading the comments there as well myself.

Let's see. I'll just bring up the document. Pardon me.

DENNIS CHANG:

Brian, go ahead. Brian?

BRIAN CIMBOLIC:

Hi. Sorry. One question that is maybe a higher level question, rather than getting into the weeds, on the use of public safety authority throughout the document. Just to be clear, when we say "public safety authority," would that definition be limited to law enforcement? Which, from my point of view, is how I would like to see it defined. I wouldn't want necessarily a third-party entity, someone like LegitScript or someone that has self-anointed themselves a public safety authority, being able to seize on this document and create some sort of argument that we're obligated to follow it because we've adopted the framework.



---

[ERANGA SAMARARANTHA]: No. When we said “public safety authority,” we said “public safety” because we mean law enforcement, but at least in the U.S. we have civil law enforcement where you have consumer protection and you have whatever – like financial investigators and tax investigators and thing like that – who are law enforcement but now criminal law enforcement. But we would assume someone with a legal jurisdiction.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Fair enough. So –

BOBBY FLAIM: This is Bobby.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Go ahead, Bobby.

BOBBY FLAIM: I was just going to say that maybe we can add that word “government” because, when we say “public safety authority,” it’s government public safety authority as opposed to a private entity, which is your concern. Correct?

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Yeah. That would absolutely do the trick for me.

[ERANGA SAMARARANTHA]: Yeah. That works.

---

ALAN WOODS:

Perhaps I could jump in with one question. Might as well. Obviously, when you go to a huge cull of the document – that’s why I suppose I’m cagey; I want to make sure that I read it carefully but also in comparison to what was there before to see what was exactly taken out as well – I just want to make sure that we all are sure of what was taken out and that there was nothing in there that was burning and very, very vital as well from a registry point of view.

One that comes and slaps me in the face ever so slightly was that there was a hope within the document that there would be an, I suppose, educational piece as well as to the role of each entity within the sphere; specifically, what the registry operator can do. There was one line within the document as it now stands where you’re saying that the registry – I should find the actual line – is effectively the top of the heap and that the buck stops with the registry in certain instances.

I think I understand your intention on that. I think the way that it comes across is almost suggesting that the registry still ultimately is the best person to go to. I just want to be clear that it is only in very time-sensitive issues that the registry should be the [inaudible] and the hosting company/ the registrar at times are more appropriate. We fully understand that the registry can take action quickly, but it’s not going to get to the root of the problem.

As I said, that’s linking it back to this education piece. I feel that we have to be careful not to lose some aspects of that – not a huge thing, but

---

just perhaps a consideration when we're reviewing the document as well.

[ERANGA SAMARARANTHA]: Sure. Sorry, I didn't quite follow the specific part of the document that that's in.

ALAN WOODS: I've just found it there. It's in the Responsible Parties on page 44, and at the end it says, "However, the registry operator, as the top of the food chain, can also be a capable party to take measures, at least temporarily, in a timely manner to avert imminent threats."

I think the use of "top of the food chain" doesn't address the actual [routing] situation. I just wanted to make sure that it was limited a bit more.

[ERANGA SAMARARANTHA]: Sure. If you want to propose some language, we can work on that whenever you send comments. That's fine. I'm happy to massage that language. It's not [inaudible] right now.

DENNIS CHANG: Beth, you have your hand up?

BETH BACON: [inaudible]

---

DENNIS CHANG: Beth –

BETH BACON: Sorry. Can you guys hear me?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No.

BETH BACON: [inaudible]. We talked a little bit about this in Hyderabad, and I thought it was a helpful discussion. But I don't know that we ever came to close on it, and I think it's something important that we have a shared understanding about. That's down in the Registry Response section, where you talk about an initial affirmative receipt response within 24 hours. We had a little bit of a back and forth on: at what point is an automated response okay? At what point do you need a human POC? What is that response? "Yes we did receive and here's our plan"?

So I think we may not need to go into the details in this document, but I think, thinking about our needs and also considering the very different resource levels that each registry has based on their size, a shared understanding of what law enforcement needs and desires and what we can offer and provide based upon resources so that everyone gets where they comfortable is something important for us to all think about. Thanks.

---

Maybe, Eranga, you can share what you guys were envisioning there.

[ERANGA SAMARARANTHA]: Sure. Based on what I took away from Hyderabad, too, the way we had crafted that is that we wanted the 24-hour clock to go after that. We wanted a non-automated response. That's why I think we didn't put that timeline. There's no timeline. We don't want to include a timeline on when you actually receive the e-mail and within 24 hours because, if you don't see it within, like, ten hours, then obviously it's less fair for you guys. We wanted just an affirmation that you got it, that it just didn't get sucked into a black hole.

I understand that automated responses work well for you because they're ticketing systems that put it into an actual queue, but that could cause some angst on our part. I don't think we need to get into the level of specificity in terms of how we're doing it, but I think we were aiming for some sort of human response.

So just to say, "Thanks. We got it, and we'll let you know." If you want to tell us explicitly there that you're going to get back to us within 24 hours with the plan or what you're going to do or if you're going to toss it aside, that's fine, too. So we don't want to put the timeline on when they actually send it, but just upon your receipt. Then it's up to you when you receive it, according to your own policies, if you have someone manning it 24 hours or if it's first thing in the morning or what. Once you receive it and respond to it, then that 24-hour timeline would kick in, if that makes sense.

---

BETH BACON: [inaudible] all think about that. Maybe if people have concerns or questions or ideas, then we can put those in when we get back to you guys. But I think that's really helpful. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Are there any other questions?

ALAN WOODS: Actually, just one question. On page – let me just get the page number. Actually, it's on the very first page, one of four. I just wanted to get a bit of clarification. Under Categories of Action by Registries in Response, the end of line 4 says, "Consultation of existing policies may be required to ensure coverage." I just wanted to be clear on that one.

Is that just an acknowledgement that the industry moves forward and that, at some point in the future, that's allowed to dynamically change? Or did you mean something else [inaudible] that?

[ERANGA SAMARARANTHA]: Sorry. I was talking on mute. Could you say where you are on the page again? I missed it.

ALAN WOODS: It's page 1, and it's in the third paragraph. It's line 4 of the third paragraph [inaudible]. It's the end. "Consultation of existing policies may be required to ensure coverage."

---

[ERANGA SAMARARANTHA]: Right. And what's your question?

ALAN WOODS: Sorry. It's just that, in the way I read that, it wasn't clear to me. Is that meaning that, as the industry moves forward, or as threats evolve, etc., we would have to possibly review to keep up with that; with the changes in the industry and the changes in the security threats themselves? It just doesn't seem as clear as I thought.

[ERANGA SAMARARANTHA]: Yeah. That's the intention.

ALAN WOODS: That's what I thought. I just wanted to be certain.

[ERANGA SAMARARANTHA]: Yeah. We can firm up the language if that needs to be done. When I was rewriting it, I guess to address – from you current concerns, too – I tried to avoid very specific language.

ALAN WOODS: I absolutely appreciate that. I just, as I said, wanted to make sure that the intention is there and that we can move on from there. There's no problem.

---

DENNIS CHANG: Any more questions? I hope that means that the language as written is clear.

Brian, go ahead.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Thanks, Dennis. I didn't want to essentially waste people's time by going over comments that are made in the redline on the registry side that I think are pretty self-explanatory. I don't think we need to go through a redline that the PSWG hasn't had the opportunity to see yet. So I just wanted to plant the flag that there are other comments that aren't necessarily comments and potential changes, that those weren't the only concerns that we just discussed.

But as far as questions, for me at least, those are the only questions I have. There are other comments and potential edit, none of which, at least in my eyes, I see as foundational. I think that the spirit of the document remains totally the same with the changes that the registries have exchanged with each other so far.

So I just wanted to plant the flag that there are other small changes and comments are coming, but at least, I think, we've addressed the big question, in my mind.

[ERANGA SAMARARANTHA]: All right. Sounds good.



---

ALAN WOODS: I suggest that we try to figure out a potential timeline to get this back. I think we can discuss with the registries and see how many people want to chime in again and perhaps come back to the group and give an ETA, hopefully not too long. Perhaps we might have to have a brief registry-only meeting as well. So I might be in contact with you over that, Dennis.

For the meantime, just to mirror what Brian said, yes, there are definitely a few comments that we don't need to necessarily go through. Where does that lead us today then I suppose?

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. Let's do this then. I'm really, really happy and excited to see the progress. I can see the closure at the end here.

What we should do is schedule one more meeting in February, just in case, maybe a month from now. Between then, I would like the registry group to provide a comment and then maybe have another revision, if you don't mind, and look at that and maybe have another call a month from now. At that meeting, we'll try to decide the activities that we need to have in the Copenhagen meeting, too.

Does that sound okay?

ALAN WOODS: I think that sounds perfectly reasonable. So, do it.

---

DENNIS CHANG: From the registries group, when do you think you can have your comments to the PSWG?

ALAN WOODS: Always a difficult question to answer. I won't give a hard answer on that just yet, but you've given us an easy-enough timeline to stick by. I think a month wasn't enough for the next meeting. Let me get back to the group, and then I can share with the wider group when we think we would in a position to get that. It's the beginning of the year and things like that. I know everybody is juggling [inaudible] reviews and everything as of today – well, for months, I should say.

So let me get to the group. Perhaps I can just get a poll from within this registry group. Then we can advise.

[inaudible] is pointing out that next week is [inaudible].

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, that's true. The fact that it's a small document is a blessing for everyone. Thank you so much for your efforts there.

Okay. So let's do that. Michelle, if you don't mind – well, I guess I'll tell you which date we should schedule. Expect the same time on the same day of the week. We'll pick the week and let you guys know.

Any other comments?

---

[ERANGA SAMARARANTHA]: No. Like I said, I think PSWG had a couple of extra comments or language changes, too, but I can just send those back whenever you get the registry's stuff. That works.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. Please send it out –

ALAN WOODS: Sorry, Dennis. I was just saying that, if you have them ready to go, it might make it a lot easier if we get them in before we have these meetings ourselves on the registry side. So if you have them, please do feel free to send them to each of us so we can incorporate them.

[ERANGA SAMARARANTHA]: Sure. I think it's two line edits – two or three.

ALAN WOODS: Okay.

[ERANGA SAMARARANTHA]: Okay.

DENNIS CHANG: Thanks, everyone. We'll say goodbye, and we'll see you online.

---

[ERANGA SAMARARANTHA]: All right. Thanks. Have a good day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]