
CR - SSR RT Face-to-Face Meeting
Thursday, March 15, 2012 – 10:00 to 17:00
ICANN - San Jose, Costa Rica

Simon McCalla:

... want to run everybody past my thoughts as to how we get this thing out the door and give ourselves an afternoon off, is we spend about an hour now splitting into groups and looking at, there are basically four things that need doing left on the report outside of spell checking and formatting and all that good stuff.

So number one the executive summary needs to be written. What we've kind of agreed in the various discussions, the exec summary will be quite short, later the recommendations quite quickly, because frankly there's no point in repeating the analysis in the exec summary. So we're talking about a page probably maximum for that.

We need somebody to read through Section 4.1 and make sure it makes sense and it's not missing anything. We need someone to read through Section 4.2 and make sure that makes sense. And 4.3 which is the piece we worked on yesterday, still needs another read through and some language tidying up.

So my proposal would be that we spend an hour now, from ten past now to about ten past eleven doing those read-throughs, come back together as a team, and then we will go through on the screen. We may need to move that closer because it's not that zoomed in; but we go through on screen any changes and tweaks together that each of the group is recommending, so we're all happy and comfortable with those language changes. That should take us to about quarter past 12, I would then propose that we probably, Alice, Denise and I just work on spell checking, formatting, making sure footnotes are all looking good. And

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.

then we would aim to publish before 2:00 p.m. this afternoon. Does that work for everybody? Do you think that's achievable?

Sarmad Hussain: I apologize; I have a presentation about the Prague meeting so I will not be probably present the whole afternoon session, but I will try to be as much as possible here.

Simon McCalla: Sure. So I think the substantive work we should be able to get done before mid-day, so anything after mid-day I think is just going to be format and spell check and that sort of stuff. That works fine. And (Inaudible), you comfortable with that?

Male: Yes.

Simon McCalla: Hartmut, you good with that? Cool. I have a (inaudible) – does that work for you?

Male: Yes.

Simon McCalla: Martin? Good. Bill you all right with that? Jeff sorry, whatever your name is [laughter]. Yes, exactly, exactly. Cool. So the proposal would be that Alejandro and I take the exec summary and we'll start drafting that. Who would like to take Section 1 and do a read through of that? I'm looking to you guys over here –

Male: I can do it.

Simon McCalla: Great, fantastic, so just looking for language, anything that looks a bit confusing, doesn't read right, you know anything you feel doesn't support the recommendation properly and that sort of stuff.

[background conversation]

Male: This weaves together – is this wise?

[background conversation]

Simon McCalla: So Hartmut and Anders are you comfortable to work on Section 4.2 together. Yes?

Male: Yes, as I said I just recovered from (inaudible) so I'm afraid I will not be the team leader, but I will try, yes.

Simon McCalla: Are you drinking wine?

Male: No, that's Coke.

[background conversation]

Simon McCalla: I'm totally jazzed, like nice work. That's what I see, thanks for it. Cool. And then so Jeff and Martin and Bill if he graces us with his presence do 4.3. Cool, let's do it.

Denise Michel: And before we break up into groups just one more process question, so Alice has a draft, I think draft text to actually post it on the public comment forum. Has there been a decision for the period of number of days that you want to leave it open for public comment? Normally, the minimum is 30 and it can be up from there, a date to keep in mind is posting for documents for the Prague meeting, which starts June 24th, officially, so June 10 would be the final sort of end date, deadline that we're shooting for to post anything that you want to discuss publically in Prague.

Simon McCalla: So we've had that discussion Denise, I thought we agreed on 45 days.

Denise Michel: Okay, thank you.

Male: Yes.

Male: Through May 1st.

Denise Michel: Right.

Male: That will be through May 1st, so we will have about a month, we better compress our schedule right, like three weeks after the closing of the period to –

Denise Michel: Consider any comments and –

Male: Consider any comments and still publish early June.

Denise Michel: That sounds really good.

Male: Who have essentially made for drafting the response, absorbing the comments?

Simon McCalla: Cool let's do it. So if we meet back at quarter past 11, we'll start reviewing the changes at quarter past 11.

Male: Simon I had a question, let's take one or two that's already marked in the (inaudible). But if you wish me to use reason and observation in the analysis, are we in any case going to prepare everything in advance (inaudible)?

Simon McCalla: That's a good question, we haven't really – we used the word, we used the phrases that the review team allot through the document. Jeff what's your thoughts.

Jeff Brueggeman: I have a suggestion there. Yesterday, I read through and noticed these ambiguities in there, my proposal is anywhere and everywhere we use the review team we shall say SSR Review Team or Review Team with the capital letters, initial capital letters and that on the many places we mention the Review Team on the beginning of the text and then we don't have to repeat it, then we can say "we" later on in the same text.

Simon McCalla: Yes, that's fine. So I think that a good approach agreed. So don't feel like you need – unless you desperately want to make changes all the way through, that's fine, but we can do that on screen very quickly, I mean I can flick through with Alice and Denise and do that later on if you'd like. So I guess what we're after in terms of this read through is substantive content changes, if that makes any sense. And what might work is just scribble them on the printout and then we'll type them up on the screen.

Male: I think proofing is good too, I mean I would deter people catching proofing. It's a big document, more eyes on it.

Simon McCalla: So does this work then if we use, rather than try and make electronic changes and try and merge them across, if we could use the printout and just highlight with a pen and scribble on that, does that work, even if you see a spelling mistake or to your point, Anders, about something that's language wise or ambiguous then do that. Cool. So I've got Version 18 is the latest version is this one is that right? And I have Version 19 out and so the plan would be that Version 19 will be the first draft. This is 18, that's just come out yes.

[background conversation]

Simon McCalla: Cool, let's do it.

[background conversations]

Male: Okay, this is my understanding is very, very easy job, 4.2.

Male: Let's proofread, because I really feel so badly that –

Male: I have a simple –

Male: But I need some easy job really.

Male: Only three pages, here is to see if any is inconsistent, or we can review the wording, this is my observation when you add the we. We should be Review Teams or –

Male: Yes.

[break]

[background conversation]

Simon McCalla:

Okay, so we now have an executive summary here at the front of the report, if you guys want to look on screen.

So the summary covers effectively is a quick summary of why we exist, what it is we're looking at, it effectively talks very briefly about what the Review Team has focused on in the report, effectively a bit of the text from that presentation this morning, you know just to kind of highlight, these are the bits that are good, these are the bits that need improving, these are the bit that you know in summary, these are the bits where we found some need for more action.

We've chosen to put just a draft one note at the bottom of the exec summary just to say that the Review Team will continue to examine some additional input during the public comment period and prior to publication of final report, limiting that entirely to the output of the DSSA because I think they're output will be so relevant to some of this, the back end of this report that it's worth us just taking a look at that and then comment on the progress of the board DNS risk working group. Other than that, the book is closed.

And then we have the 27 key recommendations and the review which are listed in the same format that the JAZ guys did SSAC, so starting from the top and all the way down, and these tie exactly with the ones in the boxes, I've just been through them all, there's lots and lots of recommendations.

[background conversation]

Simon McCalla:

Quite probably, yes. Section 2 is complete, the background to the team, that's all factually correct as well now, which is good.

Section 3 is also complete which is the methodologies and that's done, we're all happy with that.

Big thanks to the boys on my left for going through and doing 4.1. So 4.1 has had lots and lots of tweaks to language to make it more accurate, also apostrophes put in places and so it's really nice and tight text in it, and it looks really good, which is great.

Thank you also to those on my left for 4.2 which is also looking in really good shape, so we've got all the changes tweaked in 4.2, I know this is just rapidly scrolling off the screen.

So it's looking really tidy now, looking really good. So I thank you for that. And then we've got Jeff's changes merged in from 4.3 which Jeff wants to just go through at two o'clock when he's back. And we need a little bit more input on incident management, sorry I was [scrolling] down to it. Oh, there's loads of it, isn't there, loads of it. Okay, as we got your new recommendations and thank you folks for that 25, 26, and then our merging to the top.

So it's really just the last piece to do which is instant response and notification and just a go through of that. We can delete the graveyard because that's still sitting there but there's nothing in there of any worth.

And then we've got a glossary of terms, thank you hugely Alice, she vanished, for putting that together. So that should cover all the terms and these are all hot links as well, so you can link across from the terms to the various definitions of them as well. So the glossary is looking really good. Just a couple of tweaks to the glossary to add in something about ASE and a bit (inaudible).

So basically it's that last, it's that very last section.

[background conversation]

Simon McCalla:

Yes, it's just a definition taken from the ICANN website. I'll take any input you like on this report, provided it's in text.

Denise Michel: So we'll drop in after you guys are all done, then we'll drop in a Table of Contents that's hyperlinked, and then we'll also hyperlink the – you know link the recommendations to the beginning of the section where they can find it, and I assume you'll just want to just drop in a couple sentences in the executive summary, encouraging people to read the findings and the supporting documentation that relates to the recommendations in the report. So it will make it a little bit easier for people to toggle back and forth on the sections that are particularly interesting.

Simon McCalla: Maybe we could do it like one of those teenage circular emails that says now you started reading this, you don't get to the end a curse on your family and everything, you know what I mean. Do you think that will work?

Male: So if I could [pretend] the DNS or the domain name system ecosystem, that makes it (inaudible). I would be much happier with that [than actually starting to change the section].

Simon McCalla: Well, the DNS we're talking about there is the DNS technology, not the ecosystem.

Male: Well no that's the ecosystem. It's the way you find your way through [those meetings]. It's not protocol.

Simon McCalla: That's the protocol we're talking about right there.

Male: No, the protocol is defined in [RFC 1034].

Simon McCalla: Yes, I know, but look the DNS makes [it] easier by allowing a familiar string of letters to be used instead of the [RK9] address; instead of dah, dah, dah, that's effectively translation of address to IP addresses we're talking about. That's not ecosystem. I know what you're saying. The ecosystem is the registration of names and everything that goes behind that.

[background conversation]

Simon McCalla: That's not ecosystem, the operation services technology.

Male: It's not the protocol.

Simon McCalla: Yes, but that definition there is not talking about the ecosystem.

Male: Yes, but they must use the protocol as well.

[background conversation]

Male: I understand and I can comment on the [DNS]. The DNS used to modify who you are (inaudible), and the (inaudible) cannot be in the title – [it must be in the text]. I mentioned [using the line] about DNSSEC, but DNSSEC also is used.

Simon McCalla: Yes, this isn't the latest version of the glossary, apologies for that. Alice – I haven't had a chance to merge Alice's latest version.

[background conversation]

Simon McCalla: I think it would be preferable for me if we could find in the text where we used DNS when we talk about the wider ecosystem and use the phrase the DNSSEC ecosystem would be really useful. And when we talk about DNS it refers us to this here, which is the system, the ecosystem and the DNS system are two different things as you quite rightly point out.

[background conversation]

Simon McCalla: What does that describe there?

[background conversation]

Simon McCalla: I know what you're saying, it's a – the ecosystem to me is not wider than just the service, there's the technology side and then there is the wider piece which is why everyone is here at this conference right now. And that for me is – there is technology, which is over there which is RFC-based, [RFC-extentia] technology and then there is RAAs and registrars and registries and policies and everything else, but you're still part of the domain name system, ecosystem if that makes any sense.

Denise Michel: What if he said which includes, and then list the RFCs and related issues that are addressed in the – or under ICANN’s remit. Would that be acceptable to you.

[background conversation]

Simon McCalla: There is no point in trying to define this one place. Let’s go through the text, it doesn’t take long, I’ve been doing it all morning, go through the text, tell me where it’s ambiguous and let’s disambiguate it. It doesn’t take long, there’s only 48 pages. Just give me some text and we’ll put it into the document. But trying to define it in the glossary is a waste of space because we use DNS a lot through the report, so let’s be specific in the report and it will take us ten minutes to do that. So that’s what I asked for an hour ago. So let’s just do it.

I’m really keen that this goes out the door today. Denise in terms of process, assuming Jeff comes back, because he’s working to go through the last section one more time which is good, it was fair. Assuming that takes 25 minutes, half an hour to do, it’s like 2:30, what do we need to do next to get this thing into a published state?

Denise Michel: Nothing, I mean I can just do just a basic nonsubstantive review just to check for grammar, spelling and formatting one final time. And then Alice has the public comment forum and I can work with our web admin to get it posted in pdf. Did you have something Patrik?

Patrik Fältström: Do you have the accompanying announcement text or whatever –

Denise Michel: Alice has it.

Patrik Faltstrom: Okay.

Denise Michel: I can also add the internal links, and the Table of Contents.

Patrik Faltstrom: One more question now, is there some kind of process step of putting this out there, do you need to notify –

Denise Michel: Yes, that's what I thought I would get it up in public comment forum, and then I'll email some additional suggestions of how to socialize it.

Simon McCalla: Yes, I think for completion it would be nice, I mean I'm keen that people are aware there's an announcement that says the report's available for review this afternoon, if that's possible. Is that –

Denise Michel: So I was thinking it would be good to get the report up, and then as a second step craft a message to all the supporting organizations, advisory committees, also the board and then additional entities outside of ICANN that you want to notify, just a short note saying here it is, we'd appreciate comments type of thing.

Simon McCalla: Would that go out – is that your plan for that to go out this afternoon as well?

Denise Michel: I would suggest doing it tomorrow. There is actually a formal rule that the TNSO passed and tries to enforce that no new material be posted during an ICANN meeting.

Simon McCalla: Okay.

Denise Michel: Just because of their workload, they feel the pressure to start processing things that are posted for public comment. So I would suggest that we work with our web admin and again if there's been a flood of things that need to be done to ICANN's website, their workload may be such that it will go live tomorrow morning. So I just need to work that out, and then I proposed to come back to you on list and say you know, it's live now and here is how I would suggest we start socializing it.

Sarmad Hussain: Alice Munuya has told me that if we send her the file at the end of the day, she will distribute it while we are still here to the GAC members so that they will be able to tell them in person that it's out. So that's separate from their web distribution, she'll send it to all the unit heads sort of and a few people who want to know the report to just make sure it's already – it's already known to be public just waiting to be put up on the website. And coming back to the DNS there is only one place in the whole document where we refer to the DNS as protocol, and it says DNS protocol.

So our definition should be good for the system, and maybe mention that you know all of this is based on the DNS protocol as spelled out in the RFCs. But it's all ecosystem, there is one single instance where it DNS protocol, and it's (inaudible).

Simon McCalla: Okay.

Sarmad Hussain: And by the way what's in the glossary is a description of what the DNS does but the (inaudible) of definition doesn't say the DNS is, it says the DNS does.

Simon McCalla: So it's our thoughts to go with – is your thoughts to go with sort of for clarity in the exec summary, when the DNS is referenced, we're talking about the wider DNS ecosystem as a statement in the –

Sarmad Hussain: I wouldn't feel for making that statement; maybe I would leave it for the glossary, because I mean it's obvious that we're not speaking about the protocol in every single instance.

Simon McCalla: Okay.

Male: But I mean Bill is right in avoiding the confusion. But we did in fact avoid it by only referring to – calling it protocol.

Bill Smith: You can practice it at a very high level, the DNS.

[background conversation]

Simon McCalla: Yes, are you making the changes – you're making electronic changes.

[background conversation]

Simon McCalla: And can we avoid doing that, because 19 is so – can we just – no, no, I understand. The challenge we have, we’re having a document which has now got six different lots and 19 is the live version.

[background conversation]

Simon McCalla: No, that’s fine, I will do that. Let me send you 19. How far have you got?

[background conversation]

Simon McCalla: So there’s probably not that many, there shouldn’t be that many tweaks. I mean is it worth me just doing it, the two of us just doing it together on here?

[background conversation]

Simon McCalla: Maybe mention that, [all in one], sorry. Got it. What was the –

[background conversation]

Simon McCalla: Yes.

[background conversation]

Simon McCalla: Oh, I'm sorry, looking on [form 1]. I was in the wrong place.

[background conversation]

Simon McCalla: Which paragraph, I'm sorry.

[background conversation]

Simon McCalla: Yes.

[background conversation]

Simon McCalla: Yes.

[background conversation]

Simon McCalla: I think this text was copied from the bylaws though, that's the only thing.

Male: Then the bylaws are in effect factually incorrect, because they're not responsible for (inaudible), certainly not the operations.

Simon McCalla: Let's find the document. I think yes, I have a feeling that text has come straight out of the bylaws.

[background conversation]

Simon McCalla: Let's just check. Let's just check. Where did that text come from? The question is whether is a paraphrase, in which case you could be right, this has been misappropriated. Which it was point two you were concerned about, is that right, that one there Bill, the operation evolution of the DNS root name service system.

[background conversation]

Simon McCalla: No, here you go; it's in the bylaws, that coordinates the operation, evolution of the DNS root name service system. But the text, fine, but the –

[background conversation]

Male: Other than in RSSAC is sort of part of ICANN.

[background conversation]

Simon McCalla: Well, that text has been there for [0:20:17].

Male: It's been there for a while, but I haven't really read through some of the forums, but we still (inaudible).

Simon McCalla: No, I can imagine.

Male: And it's (inaudible), no matter what sort of (inaudible). And if we're going to let that slide through, there should be a comment somewhere that says that this team is not going to be (inaudible) factual or factually correct.

Male: Okay, along with sleep, we can always record of dissent.

Simon McCalla: It's a difficult one because that piece of analysis is one of the very first pieces of analysis that came back to the team a year ago that makes up this text.

Hartmut Glaser: He has us back to the bylaws. What the bylaws says is coordinate (inaudible).

Simon McCalla: It's on screen. It's a quote from the bylaws.

Hartmut Glaser: You can always put it in inverted commas and say quoting the bylaws.

Simon McCalla: Like I say here according to ICANN's bylaws its mission is to and then it's there and then with quotes around it. To be fair to Bill there aren't any quotes around this, and the quotes stop at the end of systems. So it does look like it's a... And there's a reason for that. The reason is it to a certain extent a slight paraphrase to don't include those a, b, and c in that text. Does that make sense? So it is technically a paraphrase.

Bill Smith: Yes.

Simon McCalla: So that specific phrase is, so that's a bit of a challenging one. I don't know how we want to capture that. Mr. Chair, an executive decision is needed.

Male: Let me first explore the level of this agreement among those present. Who of you would be comfortable with this statement being as is right now in the text with quotes that attribute them to the bylaws and a footnote or other form of expression of dissenting opinion? How many of you would like, and these are the options and before counting heads or hands, how many of you would totally oppose the text as is? And who of you would not even have that dissent opinion?

[background conversation]

Male: Yes, it's making sure to quote.

Male: So that is exactly the text in the bylaws. Putting it in quotes indicates that it's part of the bylaws, is fine. I would also like to put the (inaudible) not a dissenting opinion, but a point of clarification that this may not in fact be accurately (inaudible).

Male: Or accepted by your parts. This may not be accepted by your (inaudible).

Male: Not accepted by all parties. I know it's not accepted by all parties.

Simon McCalla: I'm trying to think how we can capture that in there.

Hartmut Glaser: To quote straight from the bylaws from the having or rather the introduction into particular, ICANN, quote and so on, and take exactly as it's –

Simon McCalla: On the bylaws.

Hartmut Glaser: And then, yes.

[background conversation]

wanted to just finalize 4.3 5 I think it is which is the very last section on I think it's right here, sorry it's a glossary – [make room] for that in the back. Instant notification, instant response and notification.

Does anyone else have any other tweaks or changes they want to make?

Male: Sort of an impartial –

Simon McCalla: Okay, anyone else?

Dennis Jennings: I'm just trying to write out the paragraph about escrow for [Part] 4.262.

Simon McCalla: Oh yes, thank you, Dennis, that would be useful. And that's 4.2 –

Dennis Jennings: 4.2 62 compliance. Just because we go on about LEAs and stuff, but we don't mention escrow which is a really important aspect of compliance for resilience.

Simon McCalla: Cool.

Dennis Jennings: I'm not going to say anything other than we think it's a really good idea that they keep doing it.

Male: Yes, agreed. I had one on the recommendation six.

Simon McCalla: Yes, thank you, you wanted to capture that, and I was busy trying to merge in their changes so yes, let's do that.

Hartmut Glaser: Removing it first [on the regular basis].

Simon McCalla: Now that you got the basis, you've got some changes and we've got some tweaks. I'm not sure what we can do.

Male: Bill, what parties would respond negatively to this description of responsibility?

Male: And why haven't they reacted in the last 12 years?

[background conversation]

Simon McCalla: I think there's two things, there's the – I agree with you in terms of – so the dissenting opinion is not with the report. The dissenting opinion is with the bylaws, right which is not –

Male: It's not (inaudible), note that this is a direct quote from bylaws.

Simon McCalla: Which we've done.

Male: And let's move on.

Simon McCalla: Okay, cool. Apologies for the paraphrasing in the analysis, it was an attempt to keep it relatively short and if that's caused a slight amount consternation and I think we have improved it [directly enough there].

Bill, do you want to just sit with me and we'll go through those tweaks to the DNS language in here, is that useful?

[background conversation]

Simon McCalla: I think it's in good [stead] to tweak it, and if we can tweak it let's do it.

[background conversation]

Simon McCalla: Yes, I think your concern about it was that if I'm right is that wherever we mention it here, we're really not talking about the RFC piece, it's really more about the wider DNS ecosystem for most of the report, right.

[background conversation]

Simon McCalla: Yes, I'm right with you. So according to this – that's the big question yes.

[background conversation]

Simon McCalla: Only that we've made so many edits to it, so 19 has got a significant body of edits to it. So trying to merge those changes of course might be challenging.

[background conversation]

Simon McCalla: So it's about 50 minutes work, yes. So here's a suggestion, we're waiting for Jeff to come back from his panel, we've got half an hour, would people like a break and want to go for a walk and get a coffee. I'm really happy to sit with Bill and just make those tweaks now to the DNS language while you do that. Does that make sense?

Male: I think that's a reasonable...

Simon McCalla: Take a quick break and then Bill do you want you and I just crack through those and make the tweaks where appropriate. We mention it 171 times apparently in the document – so my colleagues might find a bit of dialogue there to replace, like where it matches 17 to 171 is beyond me. Yes, it looks like it's quite a few. Take a break, can we do that?

Male: Break for 10 minutes, 20.

Simon McCalla: Yes.

[End of Transcript]