

## **Transcription ICANN Durban Meeting**

### **DSSA Working Group**

**Thursday 18 July 2013 at 11:00 local time**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#jul>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/>

Mikey O'Connor: All right, then. This is Mikey O'Connor and I think we're finally ready to roll. If there's a need to start a recording if that could get started now? If it's running that's fine. And I think what I'll do is I'll hand it off to - Kristina, do you want to call the roll or shall we just go around the room and then ask folks in the - on the bridge to (unintelligible)? Okay.

So for anybody who's actually here for the DSSA as opposed to being left over from the ALAC cake fest would like to participate in this meeting please come to the table because I can't see you back there and that way when we do the roll call you can speak into the mic.

So we could start at that end and just walk your way around the room, key on the microphone, announce who you are even if you're not a member of the committee that's fine. We're just doing a roll call for the transcript. Go ahead.

Luis Espinoza: Luis Espinoza from Costa Rica. I'm a member of the working group.

Rick Koeller: Rick Koeller from CIRA, member of the DSSA.

Jim Galvin: Jim Galvin, member of the DSSA from SSAC.

Jacques Latour: Jacques Latour with CIRA, DSSA.

Don Blumenthal: Don Blumenthal, Public Interest Registry, DSSA, SSAC, probably some other stuff that I don't remember.

Jörg Schweiger: Jörg Schweiger with DotDE and the co chair to the DSSA for the ccNSO.

Mikey O'Connor: Mikey O'Connor, I'm with the ISP Constituency and an IXP in Minneapolis and GNSO Co Chair for the DSSA.

Kristina Nordstrom: I'm Kristina Nordstrom from the ccNSO Secretariat.

Bart Boswinkel: Bart Boswinkel, ICANN staff.

Julie Hammer: Julie Hammer, DotAU and SSAC member of the DSSA.

Mikey O'Connor: All right - oh and Olivier and just joined us at high speed. You want to log yourself in there?

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Log in. Olivier Crépin-LeBlond, ALAC Chair and Co Chair of the DSSA.

Mikey O'Connor: Cool. Let's - it's nice to see everybody again. It's been a long time since we've met as the DSSA. And I think we have sort of a pretty short, pretty simple agenda. This is basically the brainstorming session about where do we go from here.

And I don't have much to kick that conversation off. Many of you were in the conversation with the Board DNS Risk Management Framework Committee that just preceded this so we have a little bit of context for this.

But basically just maybe to set the stage a little the DSSA - oh, I'm going to stop myself and see if there's anybody on the bridge who needs to chime in. Sorry, I left you totally in the lurch. Anybody on the bridge?

Okay.

Coordinator: At this time we have no participants on the bridge.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks very much. So we have to sort of do this in ICANN meeting increments. At the meeting before Beijing, as the Board committee really got going, we started to put ourselves on hold awaiting the results of the Board's work. Our original plan was that we were going to convene in Beijing, listen to that work.

The work was going to be at a place where then we, between Beijing and this meeting, could figure some things out but it was clear in Beijing that that work hadn't progressed far enough to do that so we essentially put ourselves on hold for another increment. And now we're here.

And this I sort of a - given that so much time has passed and given all the events that have taken place what should we do now? And the co chairs and the staff leader team met on - via teleconference about two or three weeks ago and sort of arrived at several options. One option is the declare victory and wrap ourselves up option. We've got a pretty good report that's already been published. It's been out and back from public comment.

Another option is full steam ahead, fire ourselves back up, get back into the work. And those are the sort of two end points on a pretty broad continuum. And I guess today's topic is mostly a fairly informal, pretty unstructured brainstorming session about where we feel we are and what we feel like we ought to do next.

And I think with that prelude I'll just keep an eye on the queue and see where people are at. Anybody got any thoughts?

Jörg Schweiger: Mikey? So this is Jörg Schweiger for the record. I would like to add another option here. And the third option would be something right in the middle so basically the co chairs feel that the group is getting a bit tired, put it that way.

And it might be an option to (refresh), to go back to our chairs to get - once again get support for the certain mission that has to be chartered and basically calling for a consecutive group or a new group or just a group that is being amended by other people and new knowledge. And that would be a third option.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay, I'm going to do my usual mind mapping thing and at some point if we get really excited we could project it on the screen but right now it's too complicated to get all that going at the same time so I've duly noted that and we'll carry on.

I can but I'm...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, no I'm thinking about pushing it up to the Adobe room, which I can do too.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, no, if we'd had enough time to set the room up we could have done...

Jörg Schweiger: So while the two guys are going on with that discussion - to fill the time and set - try to set clear what we are looking for. I think within the teleconference the co chairs had it became clear that we haven't had consensus on how to move on. So basically what we are really looking for now is to solicit your

input, to give us your thoughts and probably some direction on how we really should move on.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Jörg. So that's it. Any thoughts?

Rick Koeller: Could we just do a quick review of what the original mandate was so that, you know, so what was the full mandate because I came in mid stream and review again, you know, so I'm certainly aware of what we've produced. But I'm not sure if there's a gap.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm scrambling to the charter; if somebody can get there quicker than me. But to replay the bidding of formation of the group this group really came to being after the Brussels meeting which I think it was Rod Beckstrom got up in front of the ccNSO and other places and sort of used some pretty - you want to do it? You do it. Bart...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Let me give you a bit of the real background. It happened in Nairobi. And what happened is the chairs of the - say of At Large, ccNSO and GNSO got together and sent a letter to, say, to the Board and to others. They were very concerned about the statements made during the Nairobi meeting by Rod Beckstrom in front of the GAC.

As a result, and during the Brussels meeting, the - say, the ccNSO and others and all the leadership agreed to start what's called a join - a real joint working group. And so all the SOs and ACs were invited, not all participated and some participated say more as individuals like SSAC so some people from SSAC got together. So there was first a drafting team to set up the charter.

And at the end I think by November, December 2010 all the supporting organizations so that's the - in this case for this particular case the (NRO)

acting a SO, the ccNSO and GNSO subscribed to the charter and participated in the working group. SSAC sent individual members and At Large supported and participated in the working group as well as such.

And the - say, if you look at the charter that was adopted by all the parties there should be a - I will call it (stop taking) all the current state of affairs regarding risk, identify issues as they were and come up with recommendations how to address them.

I think one of the issues - and the working group started, say - I would say the first year it was very, very active which resulted, at the end of the day, in a report that was published.

One of the issues that the DSSA and the Ops DSSA has seen is that the environment has changed completely. The original idea is that the community should take responsibility for the risk analysis, etcetera, because there were these statements by the CEO of ICANN that dynamic has completely changed. So that's - but that's the real underlying theme here.

Now if you look what the working group has produced to date the question - it covers partly the mandate but it's a matter of, say, one of the questions for the DSSA and for the Ops DSSA is given the change in environment and we've done part of our mandate is it good to - we started with, I think, a working group of 40 people and you can see the result where we are right now.

And it's a question, are we not wearing out? We've done what needs to be done in the certain way. We've produced, I would say, the working group has produced a very, very useful tool for the community. And the next step is, if you want to use that tool and really apply it then you run into all kinds of issues most - the most, I think, the first major issue is the expertise of the current working group, is that available?

Or do we have the experts on the current working group to really do the analysis that is required? And the second one is the number of participants in the working group. Say, people are still subscribed but I don't think they have the bandwidth to really take on that job of doing a full analysis.

So the question is is the DSSA, as such, satisfied with what they've done knowing that, say, the original mandate was crafted in a certain time and era which where the environment has completely changed. And then secondly is what we've done - say, declare victory to quote some of DSSA people and say this is it. Or do you want to really go into the next step but then the question becomes is this working group - is the current membership equipped to do it?

And shouldn't there be a intermediate step that the SOs and ACs should be informed where we are? Because to date the SO - or the Ops - or the DSSA has reported back but has not sought any guidance from the participating SOs and ACs should they continue. And so just - we have a dialogue with them say is it still necessary what we do. Because if you take the next step that could take quite some time.

So that would mean that, say, from the start, say, from 2010 until now, there has never been a real exchange of views with the SOs and ACs whether we should continue. And because it's a bit like a cocoon, we're moving on in the cocoon and that could go on for another three or four years that means everybody has forgotten why this all started.

Rick Koeller: Thank you, that was excellent. So Rick Koeller for the transcript. My view would be in - given the change, given what we've produced and change in two senses, I guess, you know, how can this have evolved positive since Beckstrom made those comments the work of this group.

But the current state of ICANN's risk capability is in question. I think they're at a point in time where they're trying to mature. They've appointed a risk officer.

We probably should maybe do a report back to our SOs and so on and then wrap it up. And wait for ICANN through their risk officer, or any other sort of means, to figure out what next generation of this kind of committee they'd be looking for.

That make sense?

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Rick. I think that's great. I finally dug out the charter and I thought I'd just throw that on the screen to remind us essentially there's the list of bullet points that we're supposed to deliver. And what I'm doing now is just sort of recording little notes in here because my computer has completely closed up at the moment.

But the course that you're outlining is pretty attractive to me because it gives us a pretty substantive piece of work to do but a very short piece of work to do rather than trying to fire up the whole three-ring circus again I think, you know, acknowledge what's happened, acknowledge the need to rethink where we go from here on both sides is really healthy.

Rick Koeller: I think the challenge really is risk management is an ongoing effort. And you need process and we're lacking the process. I mean, we as a working group have developed tools and process suggestions but they're not ingrained anywhere.

I think we'd be wise - not that the DNS risks have diminished any, you know, which is an important part of this function. But I don't think organizationally there's a functioning risk management regime at ICANN right now that we can actually help.

Mikey O'Connor: Good stuff. Thanks, Rick. Go ahead.

Luis Espinoza: Luis Espinoza for the records. I think the same way. The risk management or the risk - risk analysis management is on a way system to be - keep up to

date and to be in some of operative function in the organization or within the organization. Then I think the job done by this working group should be the base or the kickoff of (unintelligible) for a risk management area or department that can handle the space.

The other thing I want to say is really this tool or this risk management is - could be helpful not only for ICANN by itself, helpful for other organizations, other parties in ICANN. Maybe, you know, these tool is well done can be adopted for some CCs, can be adopted for, you know, for some gTLDs like a part of their own risk management.

Then in that way it would be helpful for many people. I think it's a good thing to try to deliver this document to the community and to be adopted for anyone who want.

Mikey O'Connor: I want to come back to you and ask the question, so how would - I like the idea a lot, I mean, we've put an awful lot of work into that document and those tools. You got any ideas of how we can go ahead and do that? Could we carry it over to the ccNSO and say here you go or? Luis, you got any ideas or, if you were to imagine yourself on the receiving end of that what would be the best way to find out about it, what kind of package would it be and that would be the most useful?

Luis Espinoza: Sorry. A few years ago there's training from ICANN to (unintelligible) given by (Delta Risk) that provides some risk management tools in a very practical way. I was talking just a few, you know, spreadsheets that do not (crowd) at the end of the spreadsheet you will have a very good base of a risk management plan.

Then in the way we can compare this - this work in some practical document that can be available and adaptable to any organization I think would be helpful.

Mikey O'Connor: That's a lot, that's a great idea. Olivier, I think you're next.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thank you very much, Mikey. It's Olivier for the transcript. On the subject - on the question that you asked with regards to what is next I think it's - and if we were to close the group or wish to close the group the charter has actually got this covered.

In Section 2.3 we have the different deliverables so the work plan, the reporting and then 2.4, final report, and it says, "Upon its submission in each of the SOs and ACs..." It's submission, sorry. "Following its submission..." So I gather it would be the submission of a final report, "...each of the SOs and ACs shall discuss the final report and may adopt the final report according to their own rules and procedures. The chairs of the SOs and ACs shall inform the co chairs of the DSSA Working Group accordingly as soon as possible after the submission of the report."

So why am I touching on 2.4? Because further down in Section 5, "That there is closure and working group self assessment." And that says, "That the DSSA working group shall be dissolved upon receipt of the notification of the chairs of the SOs and ACs as for seen in Section 2.4 above or as directed jointly by the participating SOs and ACs."

So I do believe that a final report needs to be sent to the SOs and ACs and then the SOs and ACs will need to decide on whether they wish the group to continue to change, recharter it or whatever. But it's the different SOs and ACs that need to make that step forward.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Olivier. And it seems to me that that dovetails pretty well with what Rick was saying and so maybe what we do is we use the final report drafting exercise as the way to encapsulate the summary of changes in the circumstances and so on and stuff that you outlined and leave the door open for them some sort of next step reconstitution through that process. That make sense?

Sounds good to me. Jim.

Jim Galvin: Yeah, so Jim Galvin for the transcript. Can you say that again just one time? Want to see if you can repeat it to make sure I got it.

Mikey O'Connor: You know, I'm heavily relying on the transcript of this call. If there's no recording of this I'm toast. But I will give it a try.

So what Oliver laid out was that in our charter there's a process by which we write a final report, we deliver that to our respective ACs and SOs. The ACs and SOs review that and then the chairs of the ACs and SOs tell us that they've accepted that report at which point we end or not if they decide not to accept it.

And so if I add Rick's idea, which is this notion of encapsulating the changes that have happened since we began and, you know, the arrival of the Board committee, etcetera, etcetera, we could take our initial report, put that additional material around it, present that to the ACs and SOs for review. We could present them with our suggestion on a way forward, which is, you know, combine the streams. Let them react and tell us what to do.

That's not exactly the same. I'm testing you.

Jim Galvin: Yeah, so the piece - what concerns me about that sequence of events is - I like all that but the piece that's missing is I think it's appropriate for this group to make a recommendation on what they think the next step is, not go back and ask each of the other groups to tell us what to do.

Mikey O'Connor: I meant - if I didn't say that I meant to, he said through a coffee-induced haze. But...

Jim Galvin: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: ...absolutely, I think we need to come up with some ideas that we put in that final report.

Jim Galvin: Okay so to play back just a little bit sort of the middle of what you said there we take the initial report, which we've done, you know, finalize it and we put a cover letter on it that says, you know, this is what we got to, this was the original scope. This is what has happened since we've gotten to this point. And then we have to state what our advice is and what we think the next steps are. Okay.

I haven't yet spoken on my bias about the next steps. I've been sort of listening to everything else going on. When we're ready I'll speak my bias.

Mikey O'Connor: Well and it may be that we don't talk a lot about that today. I think, you know, clearly if we were to do it that way then we would kind of go back into full DSSA mode for a while working through those recommendations. And, you know, I don't know that we can just arrive there today. Maybe we can.

But, you know, I like the three chunks that you lay out in the cover letter approach. That aligns really well with where we've been going.

Bart Boswinkel: So - this is Bart for the transcript. Just to recap so I understand it as well is that we need to finalize the report, that's one step. Second, the - we need to work on the cover letter. The cover letter contains, in fact, three elements; one is referring back to the charter to lay out the process.

Secondly, it's, say, what has happened in between and that builds up into recommendations and these recommendations are probably at the level of, say, it's up to you now, this is what we've done and we advise you to get this implemented on way or the other or made available.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm so jet lagged and brain dead that I think there's plenty of discussion to have about the recommendations in sort of a (rump) session at the end after the Board committee. Julie and Don, maybe, I can't remember, anyway a gaggle of us stood around and sort of came up with this notion that the Board committee kind of feels like they're at the end of their work or at least very close to it.

If I'm to channel Jim Galvin, and I think I tend to agree, if we say that we're sort of at the end of our work. Then we map out some possibilities as to how both groups feed into some process that follows. And we could even sketch out some ideas about what that process could be. So there - I think there's some substantive work that could go into formulating that cover letter.

In terms of your idea about finalizing the report, I'm not - I don't have a lot of appetite on hammering on that nail much more. You know, we hammered on that pretty hard. I think it's in pretty good shape. If we unbutton that report and start working on it again I don't think there's any energy in the group to do much there.

So I think more in terms of putting sort of packaging that report up as is rather than trying to revise it much.

Bart Boswinkel: What I meant with finalizing.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, okay. Julie and then over to you.

Julie Hammer: Mikey, just based on the discussion that we had with the Board committee too, something we might want to think about is whether this group, as a group, wishes to provide feedback to the Board Risk Committee on the report - on not our report but the report that's been done for them by Westlake.

And whether - or whether we want to provide comments back to our constituencies for the SOs and ACs to provide (unintelligible). But we know that the Board Risk Committee are keen to have our feedback.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, that's a really good point. I think there's at least two questions in there. One is the timeframe, it depends a lot on what they do in terms of the public comment. And then the other is whether - I think whether we want to try and hammer out a joint statement.

And that might be a very useful exercise because even though, you know, I'm pretty shattered today. You have to understand that I'm grieving for all the work that we did that got shattered by this process and so I'm not thinking very clearly; don't have much motivation right now.

But as I recover from that grieving - this is just a personal statement so if I'm weird today just take it easy on me. But I think it would be good for us, as a group, to try and do that because we're very deep into this and bring a lot of expertise to it and I think could provide really good nuanced feedback to that process and would be hopefully very helpful to them so I think that's a good thing to consider.

There and then Olivier and then Jörg or maybe the other way around depending on how you guys are feeling, go ahead.

Luis Espinoza: Yes, Luis Espinoza for the records. Thinking about the - what could be helpful for the organizations to adopt from this management plan I think the - you can extract from the document the metrics of risk where you have the threats and the mitigations but metrics could be a very helpful thing because most of those threats is very common in this community (unintelligible) that easily. If it is (unintelligible) could be helpful.

And the other thing I can say that could be helpful is all the process that this working group has followed to (attack) this risk management (unintelligible) of

every task it could be helpful to provide the kind of guidance in the way that could be very useful too to bring some very practical problems from this risk management plan.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, that's - that's sort of where I'm headed is that there may be one more deliverable besides this encapsulating of the report, giving feedback on the Westlake stuff, is packaging the material that we built in a more practical accessible way to distribute.

You know, not a lot of work but some work just to make that - because there is a pretty big body of useful stuff in there. And it would be a shame to lose the value of that just because we funk'd out right at the end and sort of said oh this is too hard. So, you know, I would accept that as another possible thing that we ought to put in the mix of stuff we do as we wind down. It's a good - really good idea.

Which of you guys is going first?

Jörg Schweiger: I just wanted to comment on the idea of writing a formal statement from the DSSA what we think about the work that has been done within the DNS RMF. And I kind of oppose it because some of us have been asked personally to deliver some facts and some thoughts what we think. I would gladly do that.

But then the DNS RMF they had been seeking, in a formal way, input and this input could have been given at this very meeting. And I wonder if each and every constituency that is represented in the DSSA could really agree on the feedback and then we together could agree on feedback.

And that this wouldn't be a feedback where once again substance is missing because we just come up with something that is - this is not harming anybody and we're just the lowest baseline we can agree on, right? So...

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thank you very much, Mikey. It's Olivier for the transcript. And I think we've reached the point at this time of the week - I'll just give you an insight into my own thinking. At the beginning of the week there are a lot of things that I want to do. At the end of the week there are a lot of things that I have to do.

And we are in the position in the DSSA where personally I would want to do what is being suggested here which is for this working group here to review the Westlake report, etcetera, and the Board DNS Risk Management Framework.

However, looking back at the charter that this group has been chartered for it has to do, it doesn't - it can't do things that it wants to do, it has to follow the charter. And it doesn't say anywhere on the charter that it has to review the DNS Board Risk Management Framework. In fact, it says the opposite.

Two point one and two point two give us the scope of activities and the objective that (unintelligible). I would therefore reluctantly but having to abide by the charter say that we'd have to report back to our SOs and ACs. And if they decide to charter us to do something, think ah, before you close down give us your point of view on the Board DNS RMF then fair enough. But I don't think that we can do that ourselves.

Mikey O'Connor: I hate it when people read the charter and pay attention to that stuff. Go ahead, Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: In addition, if we look at say, the underlying principles and the way it's drafted the DSSA can't go out by own to respond to a public comment. It has to go through its - the SOs and ACs. And it hasn't been requested by the SOs and ACs to look at the Board Risk Framework Management. So that's reinforcing, in fact, Olivier's argument.

Mikey O'Connor: So that's a pretty strong trio of comments that sort of says, well that's a great idea but maybe not kind of a non-starter. You okay with that, Julie?

Julie Hammer: Yeah, yeah, no I was just reminding what was asked of us so I do agree that based on that comment that it's probably not appropriate. But we might just get that message back to Bill that we have - Bill Graham - that we've discussed it and that the DSSA feels it's not appropriate as an entity for it to comment.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I think that's right. You know, we're a project and suddenly we're starting to behave like a function and that's probably not a good idea. Good discussion though. It's good that somebody is less brain dead than me. Way to go, Olivier.

Any other thoughts? I mean, I'm sort of counting on the recording, you know, I'm going to recover and then listen to the recording and see what comes of it. But, Jim, go ahead.

Jim Galvin: This is Jim Galvin for the transcript. I think what concerns me - it almost sounds like you're moving to wrap up here and I kind of want to take a step back and say I think we need to examine, while we're sitting here, exactly what our next steps are and what we're doing.

We've been thinking about what our next steps are going to be for quite some time and we left ourselves with a specific question at our last meeting before Beijing and I guess that was Toronto wasn't it, where we expressly decided we would wait to see what the output of the RMF was then we would decide what we were going to do next.

I think that we need to make that decision. I'd like to put that discussion here. We've put it on the mailing list too and nothing has happened. Which I think speaks to the apparent apathy in this group.

And so I think what I'd like to do is put a specific concrete proposal on the table and see what happens. We've already talked about the process that we could use and so the only thing that's left is what would be the recommendations in the letter that we would put around the document.

We didn't actually assert it expressly but I will agree with you, Mikey, that I think we take our document as-is and call it final. We might do an editorial pass over it or something or whatever kind of cleanup but, you know, you just take it as-is and declare it done.

I think that what we propose, and we hand back this final report, what we propose back to the chartering organizations is that, yes, we have not completed our charter.

We believe that two things are possible; one is that it would be reasonable to simply stop at this point and not go further and not complete the rest of the charter, which would be to execute on the framework that we have developed, the risk management process and do that.

Another possibility would be to execute on it but rather than making that choice explicitly we would like each of the chartering organizations to take a step back and reexamine whether that's a useful thing to do. And if they're going to do that it should not be in this group as it's constituted now. This group would like to end with this report as-is and push back and say if you want to do the execution then you need to reconstitute another group that does it.

I think that's the only possible outcome from this. I don't think this group can stick around and even offer to do the execution of that framework and that's evidenced by the apparent apathy that we've now had for at least six months and certainly leading up to the decision that we made in Toronto.

So I think that's the only possible thing. And for the couple of people here that might be very interested in wanting to move forward I would offer that they should push to get that charter of the next working group put together and lead that group and go forward with the work there.

So to summarize and bring it down to something concrete I think we declare that we're done, we're not going to finish our existing charter and that the groups reexamine whether or not finishing our charter is the right thing. And if they want to do it they do it with a different group. So we're done. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I think I'm pretty close to the same view. You know, I think the session that we had right at the end is that we're done, the Board group is essentially done. Something needs to carry on. There are members of our group that would probably want to help move that forward but that this group as constituted is out of gas. Go ahead.

Kristina Nordstrom: Hi, this is Kristina. I just wanted to remind you to say your names before you speak so that the Adobe people know and for the transcript. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Sorry and I'm the worst violator of that. This is Mikey O'Connor for the transcript. Sorry about that. Was there somebody else that wanted to get - Bart, go ahead.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, say follow up on what Jim said. It allows also individual SOs and ACs to carry on if they wan to because this is, say, as it was created this is a very, very heavy vehicle to do stuff having all the SOs and ACs doing it and working together.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: I think it's Olivier and then Jörg. Or Jörg can go first then Olivier can arm wrestle or we could...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Going first.

Jörg Schweiger: So, Jörg Schweiger for the transcript. I fully agree with what Jim's been saying. And (unintelligible) that proceeding in this way would give us the opportunity to, in a certain way, make sure that we did not produce shelf-ware and that the results we've been producing are going somewhere.

For sure that they have to be acknowledged, they have to be accepted by the SOs and ACs but if we really product something with a certain quality then (unintelligible) something of that will be very well received and will be used within the different constituencies.

Mikey O'Connor: Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thank you very much, Mikey. It's Olivier for the transcript. So the next steps that I would suggest based on Jim's request, number one, identify material for final report. Number two, polish material into final report to make sure it's all linked up together and it's got an intro, date, whatever - all the hoo-ha and the lights and stuff and whistles around it.

Number three, send report to respective SOs and ACs with a cover letter summarizing the assets that they have at hand so they don't just file it in the cylindrical filing cabinet or the virtual one that is bottomless.

Number four, include in the cover letter - now this is the optional one - and I think we might wish to decide at that point if we want to go into yes or no. Include in the cover letter that there is the belief that this working group has the in-house knowledge to provide a brief comment, brief being the key word in that sentence, on the Board DNS Risk Management Framework consultant report and would be ready to provide its point of view if asked to do so.

And number five, include in the cover letter that outside the suggestion if the charter was to be completed the workgroup would need a new call for members. If the charter was to be completed, in other words, if the SOs and ACs would want their group to continue working, the work group would need a new call for members and an updated charter to be examined.

Mikey O'Connor: How on earth can you be that effective this late in the morning?

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Cake. Olivier speaking.

Mikey O'Connor: Thank you. Mikey speaking bewilderedly. Jim, and am I missing anybody?  
Jim, go ahead and then if there's anybody else.

Jim Galvin: Jim Galvin for the transcript. Your Step 4 about offering to respond to the Risk Management Framework, what problem are we solving by seeking work? That's a serious question. I mean, we all laughed off mic but...

Mikey O'Connor: Olivier, you want to take a shot at that?

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thank you very much, Mikey. And thank you for this. It's Olivier speaking. Thank you for this, Jim. I think that that comes in the spirit of volunteering and being a bit of a masochist.

Jim Galvin: Which is fair. So Jim again. What I offer is - I mean, there'll be a public comment period. I mean, is there - the specific casts the question into something more specific, what can this group - why is having this group respond, you know, what problem is that solving since the public comment period certainly allows for each of us to comment individually as well our respective organizations to comment. So, you know, what is the value is having us respond?

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thank you, Jim. Olivier speaking. Point taken.

Mikey O'Connor: And this is Mikey again. And I guess the other point is that, you know, formulating that response is going to a boatload of work. I mean, it's going to be really hard to come up with consensus views on that I think. So...

Jim Galvin: Apathy notwithstanding.

Mikey O'Connor: Apathy notwithstanding is - it's going to be - whew. Any other thoughts? I mean, I'm sort of feeling like we've got a pretty good corpus of a direction to go forward. Go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thank you very much, Mikey. Olivier speaking. So in the interest of moving forward are we scrapping 4?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I'm getting nods around the table on that. But if you could push that little list - that thing along to the list that'd be great. Otherwise I can pick it off the transcript if you're overwhelmed. I'm seeing you copying and pasting, that's good. Jim, go ahead.

Jim Galvin: So Jim again. Just to get into the transcript and document what is hopefully the obvious but just so that we're all on the table here. So the action here is - I feel like we've come to some consensus here but clearly we don't represent all the DSSA and we haven't for some time so in fairness it has to go out to the list.

And we somehow have to declare consensus on these action points and our chairs will do that presumably in relatively short order. I'm guessing we don't have to put an action point on that - an action timeframe on that. When the Ops team meets again we can figure out what that is.

But I'm guessing that we're looking at issuing a final report with a cover letter in a relatively small number of weeks on up to our respective organizations and then we wait for a decision from them for an appropriate amount of time.

So it's entirely probable that this group could be dissolved in whatever formal action that takes or reconstituted in time for Buenos Aires.

So I'm seeing nodding heads just for the transcript. Okay just wanted to state all that. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Nicely done. Thank you. I'm looking around the room for any last words. No last words? Thanks, gang. This was a great - oh, more words, go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thank you, Mikey. Olivier speaking. It's been fun. Thanks everyone.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, this is a great gang. Thank you very much.

Julie Hammer: Just as a final word being a very latecomer to this group but still having had quite a bit of observation, can I acknowledge the unbelievable amount of work that Mikey did in this forum, also the co chairs that I observed but in particular Mikey.

Jim Galvin: So, Jim for the transcript. And we should absolutely, you know, include reference to that in our cover letter about the work and where we are as we send that out just so thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, gang. That didn't help me tears so I think at that point I'll end. Thanks. We're adjourned.

END