

TRANSCRIPT

Contact Repository Implementation Working Group Meeting

18 October 2012

Attendees:

Luis Diego Espinoza, .cr (Chair)
Isak Jacobsen, .fo
Antoinette Johnson, .vi

Staff:

Bart Boswinkel
Kristina Nordstrom
Gabiella Schitteck

Apologies:

Hitoshi Saito, .jp

Unidentified Participant: Okay. This is the (inaudible) documentation working group meeting face-to-face.

I want to review the request of information we have until now, reading the statements and to correct the statement on line, to keep better—advance version of the document. Then, the purpose of the document is to assist in implement (inaudible) for the engagement and interaction with (inaudible) during incidents of (inaudible).

(Inaudible), do you have any comment about this statement? You can start everything here and say something.

I think it's clear, right? Yeah.

Unidentified Participant: Well, it's (inaudible). Provide (inaudible) services were added to the contact repository of the CCTLD (ph) and channel of communications for (inaudible) response. Two (inaudible) to accomplish this purpose of interaction in case of incidence (inaudible).

I have had doubt here if only would be for specific (inaudible) or we can talk about DLDs. I'm not so sure. Maybe we can give it--

Unidentified Participant: First of all, CCTLDs because in principle, it's in the (inaudible) of the (inaudible). And afterwards, if people want to join, you can easily change it.

Unidentified Participant: Okay. Better to keep it in (inaudible) right now. But I think that the tool will be helpful for our (inaudible). (Inaudible) assistant directory service is the (inaudible) that the stores organize and provide access to information in a directory or map between names and bodies. Basically, (inaudible) like (inaudible) is a contact at the factory basically.

The proposal in this way has tried to avoid the construction of the new system from scratch (inaudible) in behalf of youth and existing one. Then, I tried to put in place the most standard definition (inaudible) for directory depository or directory service.

Then this directory service is not an (inaudible) for this—for the—for this comparable study. It's more like a standard directory service like (inaudible) by any other system.

Then the other part of the (inaudible) depository, the contact. I call it a contact center because the (inaudible) is very similar. It's the group of process that (inaudible) and manage all the contact information through different channels of communication, such as telephone, fax, letter, email, et cetera. This information could be stored and organizing in our directory service.

The process of this information is very similar. But we need this very similar than the contact center—standard contact center—to do than the typical site. Take the name contact center because the similarity of the process is keeping contact information updated. This is the main proposal of the contact center.

Unidentified Participant: I would (inaudible) it will be an entity so it's the entity that runs a group of processes to (inaudible) a manageable contact.

The entity that manages a group of processes to probe and manage all the--

Unidentified Participant: Okay.

Unidentified Participant: --that operates.

Unidentified Participant: Okay. The entity.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible) entity (inaudible)?

Unidentified Participant: Yeah.

Unidentified Participant: The entity group.

Unidentified Participant: The entity debts operates and not a group of processes just processes--

Unidentified Participant: Just processes?

Unidentified Participant: So delete operates processes to and that can be changed to. And then delete that to probe and manage all the contact information through different channels of communication, such as telephone, (inaudible).

And could be stores—this could be stored.

Unidentified Participant: Yes. Maybe (inaudible) because, right?

Unidentified Participant: It should be stored. But it's stored anyway. If you've got B, it should be (inaudible) B and then, A-D, the end of store.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible) okay. I'll look at my (inaudible) directory service.

Unidentified Participant: And (inaudible) this directory service it refers to—okay.

(Crosstalk)

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible) define it.

Unidentified Participant: Okay. Great.

Well, out of the scope of this—of the working group, it's the policy of the repository. It shall include the confidentiality, integrity, and our ability of the formation and governance of the repository. This document shall be the (inaudible) or (inaudible) beyond the scope of this working group.

There's a policy of information I think that we can adopt in this way (inaudible) there's a policy of use of information, talking about security that we can reference in this proposal.

But I don't know. What do you think, (inaudible)?

Unidentified Participant: Sorry, go ahead.

Unidentified Participant: It would seem that the policy of the—since it is out of the scope of the working group, the—we can't really establish what the policy of the repository would be if it's out of the scope. We can only cite examples of what the policy of a repository would be.

That's my thought.

Unidentified Participant: Maybe an (inaudible). I wonder whether that really is out of scope.

Yes, because you want to have some requirements regarding the policy. So (inaudible) structure it a bit differently is say the policy of repository should ensure confidentiality technically in the (inaudible) ability of the information.

Unidentified Participant: Yes, yes. I wasn't (inaudible) about that. But (inaudible) only create a policy following security standards. It's a huge word. Maybe a huge word in the (inaudible) perspective. Could be very standard by the way.

It depends on--

Unidentified Participant: Sir?

Unidentified Participant: I'm using the mike. I can shout without a mike.

It's—I wouldn't say out of scope of the working group, so I would delete it. But say, requirements for the policy of the—yeah—of the repository.

Policy requirements. Something like that makes it easier.

So that's the danger of doing it on the fly. It doesn't matter as long as it's capturing the thoughts.

I would say it should be ensured that the policy for the repository—the policy of—it should be ensured that the policy ensures—the policy should ensure confidentiality, integrity, and availability of information, something like this.

Unidentified Participant: How about the policy should ensure but not be limited to, and then list some of these bullet requirements—some of the bullets. That way we can add in other members once they review it, they could add or they could enhance on it. But if you put not be limited to, then you could continue to add on or take away.

And if you forget something, it would actually give you the language to be able to easily throw it in. So that—but not be limited to is I think is important language to put in here.

Unidentified Participant: Then what does the proposal mean there?

Unidentified Participant: Okay. (Inaudible) Should ensure but okay, (inaudible). Policy of the repository should ensure but not be limited to.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible) No.

Unidentified Participant: Limited to confidentiality, integrity, availability of information governance.

Unidentified Participant: Okay.

Unidentified Participant: Integrity, availability of information and governance (inaudible)—and governance.

[Participants speaking too far away from microphone to distinguish what is said]

Unidentified Participant: Oh, okay. Didn't realize that.

Unidentified Participant: Did you get in and try to edit? (Inaudible)

Unidentified Participant: Oh, okay. Okay.

Unidentified Participant: Okay. Then--

Unidentified Participant: Okay, we can leave it that way?

[Participants speaking too far away from microphone to distinguish what is said]

Unidentified Participant: Should ensure but not be limited to—I'll take out confidentiality, integrity—confidentiality, integrity—integrity, availability—take out the and after integrity, replace with a comma—and availability of information—take out the. Up in the line where it says availability the information and governance of—and governance.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible) It's only about the treatment of information.

Unidentified Participant: Of information, yeah. I agree with that.

Unidentified Participant: And I would say these requirements should be developed (inaudible)--

[Crosstalk]

[Participants speaking too far away from microphone to distinguish what is said]

Unidentified Participant: Yes. But there's a (inaudible).

[Participants speaking too far away from microphone to distinguish what is said]

Unidentified Participant: First time is a very good base in ISO, ISO27000?

Unidentified Participant: Including (inaudible) ISO 27000.

Unidentified Participant: Okay.

[Participants speaking too far away from microphone to distinguish what is said]

Unidentified Participant: That can go as well.

[Crosstalk]

Unidentified Participant: And then, the (inaudible) this is (inaudible) to be defined in the (inaudible) states. These requirements should be defined (inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: Should be defined?

[Crosstalk]

[Participants speaking too far away from microphone to distinguish what is said]

Unidentified Participant: Okay.

Unidentified Participant: --with a G (inaudible) Georgia.

[Crosstalk]

[Laughter]

[Participants speaking too far away from microphone to distinguish what is said]

Unidentified Participant: And then delete Christina (ph).

[Laughter]

Christina: You'd better not.

[Laughter]

Unidentified Participant: And then delete from working group backwards to at to stage.

Unidentified Participant: Stage (inaudible) period.

Unidentified Participant: ISO 3166 or 27--

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible) is my other document. I did this.

Unidentified Participant: Now it looks better, right?

Unidentified Participant: Yes, it does.

Unidentified Participant: Okay. Yes. Many use cases.

First, respond to data requests of contact information. Second, contacts management that have case of (inaudible) new contact information. Update contact. Then the other use (inaudible) the information. Keep up to date. User management. Assign roles according with the policy of the repository. Can we change the name of the (inaudible)?

Unidentified Participant: Policy information received.

Unidentified Participant: Okay. I changed this. (Inaudible) according with the policy of information of the repository.

[Crosstalk]

Unidentified Participant: But I think—I think, Louise (ph), what is probably easier here is that we don't do the minute details right now. But I think (inaudible) is a native speaker. And that makes it easier for here to edit it, say, and look through to see if the grammar. Otherwise, we take up a lot of time.

Unidentified Participant: Because once I sit and I actually read, then I actually (inaudible) start editing at the same time. That's what I do.

Unidentified Participant: We'll focus on content.

Unidentified Participant: On content and the logic—sequential.

Unidentified Participant: Then, okay, we have (inaudible) D section—let me show you. I have proposed scope and this section is about general requirements. Then supporting (inaudible) in these cases, (inaudible) 24/7 provide an emergency point of contact (inaudible) particular sources (inaudible) service under any circumstances.

(Inaudible) shall be provided as (inaudible). The (inaudible) to the repository should be defined by a policy of the repository. The entity thus obtain access (inaudible) include (inaudible) original organization (inaudible) response (inaudible) like first, third (inaudible).

Protect against unauthorized (inaudible) and modification of repository contents. The repository (inaudible) at least three levels of access (inaudible) example, user password (inaudible).

Primary and alternate (inaudible) communication channel not only Internet. Provide interface for difference—different services. Okay, the repository is able to star search the lead contact information in a reasonable manner (inaudible) great and complete. I put it reasonable because it's not possible to keep (inaudible) and complete at the same time (inaudible) 100%. It's not possible. (Inaudible) best effort to keep it (inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: Yes, but reasonably is a lower standard than best effort.

Unidentified Participant: Okay. (Inaudible) can be—we need—we need best effort.

Unidentified Participant: And then put it in, say, best effort. And then we fiddle around with the text to make it work. But reasonable is too low a standard.

Unidentified Participant: Yes.

Unidentified Participant: Okay. That will be something like (inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: Okay, then I will place your in a best effort manner.

Unidentified Participant: Because this makes them expensive.

Unidentified Participant: Yes.

Unidentified Participant: Otherwise, you don't (inaudible).

UP; No.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible) exactly because it's mainly security.

[Crosstalk]

Unidentified Participant: --but it's also in keeping best efforts, the data accurate. That's very costly.

Unidentified Participant: Yes.

Unidentified Participant: Okay. The repository is able to manage better at many levels of (inaudible) that (inaudible). Did you say something, (inaudible)?

Unidentified Participant: Yes. It's (inaudible) down. No, that's up. Down. Yes, the (inaudible) case and scroll down again, you've got more used cases. Scroll down again. Now scroll up again. A little bit more. A little bit more. Support—okay. And visions. Yeah. Now I'm fine.

I was—support the (inaudible) used cases. I thought you were naming them on the general requirements, but you're referring to maybe if you (inaudible) section numbers in there--

Unidentified Participant: Yes.

Unidentified Participant: Yes. I had section number 3 just to make it very clear. Otherwise, you start using (inaudible) are used cases. But they are defined in section number something like this.

Unidentified Participant: Okay.

Unidentified Participant: Because I was confused about used cases here (inaudible).

[Participants speaking too far away from microphone to distinguish what is said]

Unidentified Participant: We can work on trying to organize.

[Crosstalk]

Unidentified Participant: --very structured but then you start referring internally the (inaudible) in two different (inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: Yes. Okay. Sure.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible) external search system can be easily connected to the repository in order to be with the specialized search fields. To allow this, (inaudible) good on (inaudible) standards (inaudible).

(Inaudible) inquiries provide comprehensive, readable, and understandable (inaudible) and online help. Okay, in this case, number 1.

Unidentified Participant: Why do you want this? Understandable documentation online help. Is it that people update their own information? Or what does it refer to?

Unidentified Participant: It's the (inaudible) online help for assistance. For operations—to operate the system—to operate the directory service. Not for the service—well, could be for the service, but (inaudible) thinking about. Like online help for an application.

You have an application (inaudible) application. And sometimes you need some help or some documentation how to use the application.

Then the application to fill out with the contact information, it will be at directory service. Then we have (inaudible) of that to--

Unidentified Participant: For whom is—for who do you want to provide this help? Who is the audience for the help? Is that the contact repository people? Or is that CC community?

Unidentified Participant: No. It's mainly for the contact repository people. Contact repository operators (inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: Isn't that—so the reason why I'm asking it, isn't that a bit redundant in the sense that you've got these requirements anyway in the sense of you operate according to a certain standard. You operate say on a 24/7 and say whomever is going to do it, whether it's internal or external, you always (inaudible) a concern for themselves. Why do you want—why do you require it as—what I try to understand is, why do you require it as a—as the people who send out the RFP that you internally have on line help? If I would want a domain name with you, should I require online help for your own systems, for your systems? That's in fact what you're doing.

Unidentified Participant: Yes, I understand the question.

Well, we can change it. But the proposal is following some system development standards.

Unidentified Participant: That's fine, but it's—if you do it, that you make it extra costly. Because this is for internal use by the contact repository—(inaudible) is the definition? (Inaudible) service?

Unidentified Participant: Yes.

Unidentified Participant: But this—they will be the main users, but not exclusive users of the system (inaudible) the proposal is. Some of the search (inaudible) example. Some of the search--

Unidentified Participant: To be or could be accessible by order (inaudible) or (inaudible). Then (inaudible) need a guide or a manual how to use the system that way. How to access the contact information from outside the contact management.

Well, but we can—yes, we can.

Unidentified Participant: Well, I have a question. If this is a proposal which is going to go out as a solicitation, would not the people who are responding to the proposal in their proposal that they submit for consideration, put in what they're going to do? For an example, we will provide a help—there'll be a help system incorporated in it. Some responders might pick that up. Some may not which would, depending on how the proposal reads once it's received for the evaluation committee, they'll be able to compare components as far as what is worth the value.

So I—that's just how I'm processing this. So do you necessarily want to identify every specific, because this is going out to individuals who are in the industry. They should know what a good proposal – what the details should be.

And do we want to get to the point where we identify the specifics so detailed that we might overlook or forget something? And then they'll say, well, you didn't tell us that we didn't—you didn't tell us that you wanted it or we were supposed to put it in here. And it could throw the system—skew it.

Unidentified Participant: Or the other way around that you over specify that nobody can do it.

Unidentified Participant: Yes.

Unidentified Participant: Yes, I understand very well what you are saying. But this recommendation is part—and essential part of any—any development cycle.

Unidentified Participant: Well, I—but I do understand. I do understand it, but for competitive purposes, if a firm who's responding and they know it was being asked for, they should know that this is a very integral component.

If it was a firm who was—and I'll just use a very crazy example. A firm that just came into business overnight, saw the request for proposal. And said, well, this looks like something I might be able to do, but they don't know anything about the business, the industry. Their proposal would be lacking and it would show itself with the submittal of their document.

So again, it's like you have to be specific. But I'm not so sure that you have to be so specific that it's just like—because there's certain things that an organization should know.

And that's just my—that's just my opinion.

Unidentified Participant: Reading it again is probably the word is (inaudible) for consideration is provide.

Unidentified Participant: Okay.

Unidentified Participant: It should be—you could say it should include.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible), yes.

Unidentified Participant: But provide means that it is given to somebody else.

Unidentified Participant: Yes. And could be true. Maybe not—I need to specify a little bit more here because (inaudible) example of the (inaudible). Nobody asked me for an online manual of help, how (inaudible) management (inaudible).

But if you (inaudible), you must provide the manual (inaudible).

[Crosstalk]

Unidentified Participant: You know that.

Unidentified Participant: --for external entities, it's necessary to provide (inaudible) recommendation (inaudible) for internal use.

Unidentified Participant: And then you have limited the whole scope of it.

[Crosstalk]

Unidentified Participant: I think it has to be there, but maybe not so specified as this. It's too broad.

Unidentified Participant: This is too broad.

Unidentified Participant: Well then, put (inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: Put brackets around it and say who's going to do what (inaudible) so that you (inaudible). So refine the text.

Unidentified Participant: Brackets. Okay.

Unidentified Participant: Yeah. Brackets or collars. It doesn't matter. But as long as it sticks out and so that's limiting scope or make it more precise so you know what to do.

Unidentified Participant: I don't know.

Unidentified Participant: Limited to external parties, that's what you (inaudible) said.

Unidentified Participant: So purpose is to provide externals who interact—who interact with the system.

Unidentified Participant: Okay.

Unidentified Participant: Yeah, then it's clear (inaudible). You know what needs to be done.

Unidentified Participant: But should be there the opportunity. Okay.

This is more graphical. Just case number 1. Respond to data request for content information. Okay. We'll review it.

(Inaudible) entities. (Inaudible) point of view of software development (inaudible). There's an entity of (inaudible) or contact (inaudible) users. (Inaudible) request. It's a kind of (inaudible) to keep all the use of (inaudible) by (inaudible). This was mentioned by (inaudible) by the way. That's (inaudible) notes, okay.

On this case, the actors will be (inaudible) REI. He's (inaudible) response entity that will be the (inaudible) response theme or (inaudible). We mentioned before (inaudible).

And the (inaudible) operator.

Unidentified Participant: Can you scroll up again? Glad that you mentioned the search, et cetera.

Unidentified Participant: Oh, yes. Okay, yes. (Inaudible) here.

Unidentified Participant: Maybe it's an idea—it's either in this text (inaudible) general requirements, I wouldn't do that. Or in the—there is a definition of these roles, et cetera.

Unidentified Participant: Okay.

Unidentified Participant: Because it's—if you look at the use cases—you scroll down again to use case 1—a little bit further down—(inaudible) the actors—it's unclear, for instance, who they are, who will they be?

Unidentified Participant: Then define before the (inaudible) entity and (inaudible) example of the mentioned before.

Unidentified Participant: Okay.

Unidentified Participant: We'll put a note on--

Unidentified Participant: Example. And the same is, who is the CRO? Is that the entity from the first bit? (Inaudible) scroll up again? That's fine. Scroll up again to the initial—up—further up, further up, further up, further up. Contact center. What is the CRO? And what is contact center? What is the difference?

Unidentified Participant: Yes. Contact center is the name of the service (inaudible) what I propose, but we can change the name. But the name of the service (inaudible), they will have

contact repository operator within the contact center. This is my (inaudible), but we can change it to be more specific or more clear about this.

But the contact center, for me, is the process. How to keep up-to-date information, start calling the contact (inaudible). All that function for me is contact center.

Then the contact repository operator is the people working at the contact center, and maybe includes (inaudible) and maybe includes CRO there as well because in fact contact center, now you've defined it. You have defined contact center--

Unidentified Participant: This is the entity?

Unidentified Participant: Yeah. And operates processes (inaudible). And then you've got the contact repository operator because that's really defined. And how does it relate with the contact center?

Unidentified Participant: Contact center.

Unidentified Participant: Yeah, but okay. How—yes, the contact repository operator is the people that works—it's the user of--

Unidentified Participant: So the operator is--

Unidentified Participant: The operator is the person who is front of the computer doing calls and receiving calls.

Unidentified Participant: So he's a person working within the contact center.

Unidentified Participant: Yes. This is what that is.

Unidentified Participant: And it actually it's (inaudible)?

Unidentified Participant: Yes, do it because otherwise, it causes already some confusion.

Unidentified Participant: Okay. Oh, great. This is great. Yes.

Unidentified Participant: Okay. Mark (inaudible) in this way.

Unidentified Participant: I have another suggestion, just as a sidebar. Since we're switching over to acronyms, to perhaps once we finish the document, to create an appendix of acronyms and their meanings. Like CRO is contact repository operator. So in the back of the document or in the front, wherever you want to place it, we would have a list of acronyms and what those acronyms stand for. Just a sidebar note.

Unidentified Participant: Yes. (Inaudible), but the other way, maybe you need to go to the appendix to memorize all the definitions of the acronyms and then go through the document because you will not understand.

Unidentified Participant: Yes, but at least somewhere you need to describe it and say an (inaudible) is just a for assistance. So it (inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: We can make a balance under that because we need that the document should be beautiful (inaudible) memorize the acronyms. But it's okay. We concluded making a balance. And if we need to describe in the section, maybe we must describe some of the acronyms.

Unidentified Participant: Well, all I was just saying was, if you have an acronym, somewhere either as an appendix, you have a list of all those acronyms, or at least important acronyms

that you're going to constantly be writing in over and over again, have them identified as far as what that acronym is standing for.

Unidentified Participant: And it's a good way to check consistency as well throughout your job.

Unidentified Participant: Yes, it is. When you start to edit and write, it helps.

Unidentified Participant: Okay. We can—okay, we can change it (inaudible) vice versa.

Unidentified Participant: We can use it now, but we'll have to do that task.

Unidentified Participant: Okay. Then the process (inaudible)--

Unidentified Participant: It's okay until here?

Unidentified Participant: Okay. Process law. The IRE makes the data request to the CRO according to the specific contact information for a specific (inaudible). Clear with that?

Unidentified Participant: Yes? No?

Unidentified Participant: It—just a quick question for clarification and clarification. Did you—what you've done, you've mapped the use cases identified in the—by the previous working group?

Unidentified Participant: Yes. But we more specification about the--

Unidentified Participant: Yes. Using the (inaudible).

[Crosstalk]

Unidentified Participant: Yeah.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible) and trying to imagine how to work

Unidentified Participant: My suggestion would be because otherwise, we spend a lot of—I don't have the slides in front of me of (inaudible) she checks this against these slides. Because (inaudible) came up with this.

Unidentified Participant: Yes. I don't know. I request him to check it, but maybe. I have included in this document section with the background of (inaudible) here. Contact repository relationship (inaudible) include the background. But maybe it's a good idea because I left a space here to (inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: It's just—I would just use--

Unidentified Participant: I would just use this tool, see where it's necessary. It's a diagram and in order to check the use cases, et cetera. Use only diagram?

Unidentified Participant: No, the other way around.

Unidentified Participant: Maybe we don't need the diagram.

[Crosstalk]

Unidentified Participant: The diagram is a summary of say what is there.

Unidentified Participant: Yes.

Unidentified Participant: So that's more a work flow type of—and so yeah.

Unidentified Participant: Yes, then the—okay. Then the suggestion is ask (inaudible) to review the process flow according with the diagram he built.

Unidentified Participant: Yes.

Unidentified Participant: Okay. That is great.

Unidentified Participant: Because otherwise—I don't mind doing it. But whatever I say is without any substance because I don't have any (inaudible) way for him to check it.

Unidentified Participant: Yes. And this—it was created using the common sense, very acceptable process in any system basically. Then, well, true. Then maybe we can--

Unidentified Participant: I had a question on this section here. And when it came to the validity vetting, the validity just prior to the entry into the system would not be logical for validity vetting would occur prior to entry into the system. Wouldn't you want to verify the data before you enter it in the system?

It was the sequence. It was—I had—you have, for example, C, the operator validates the form information. If the information is valid, it continues. But would—and it's just me with being sequential—wouldn't you want to validate something before you enter it in the system? Wouldn't you want to have a vetting process to validate before you enter it in?

Unidentified Participant: Okay. Yes. I think (inaudible) of information to have some rules about the format of the information. By example, if you are getting an email (inaudible) looks like an email with the arrow in the middle. It's a very simple example. By example, the phone number. Then you can provide the phone number without the country code, by example.

This kind of validation could be made by the operator before getting information. In this way, there's an additional quality of information process that can have more (inaudible) information within the (inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: Well, I guess I'm having a small issue where—it's number C. It's the third step in the process. The validations occurring at the third step.

Unidentified Participant: Yes, yes.

Unidentified Participant: So I just like seeing—logically sequential. I wouldn't address any information that wasn't—the validity of it wasn't put forth up front. I wouldn't have my operator dealing with something that wasn't validated beforehand.

Unidentified Participant: Okay.

Unidentified Participant: And so--

Unidentified Participant: In the order, I (inaudible) this sentence nor did I imagine how (inaudible). But it could be a problem of precedence there.

Unidentified Participant: Because for example, if the operator gets a telephone number using your example, and it doesn't have the area code, the country code, whatever, and the operator is entering and receives a request and enters in the data, then is validated after it enters the data.

Unidentified Participant: I think the sequence is right.

Unidentified Participant: Okay.

Unidentified Participant: The reason is, if you look at the definition again, what we're talking about, incidence response entity, that is somebody—if you really think about it, they notify the incident. They need to contact CCTLD manager.

So what happens is, you've got the IRE. They send a request. So a request with specific information about more CCTLDs to the CRO. Then the CRO first makes—put it in the tracker system. And then the NRIs is the data requested, whether it meets the use cases—

Unidentified Participant: Which is (inaudible), correct?

Unidentified Participant: No, no. No, no. Analyzing the use cases. Whether this request fits within the policy to send out data. That's the first step.

If it does, then they send him a form. And what is the purpose of the form? (Inaudible) form is in access (inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: The form is the way the IRI requests information.

Unidentified Participant: Can request information.

Unidentified Participant: Then you have a double loop. Say you've got the IRI requesting, making a data request?

Unidentified Participant: Well, yeah.

Unidentified Participant: That might be what's confusing me then because something's not—

[Crosstalk]

Unidentified Participant: You sound awkward. The IRI makes a data request. That's the first sentence. Then he makes an entry (inaudible) track a request? That's fine. You put it—you give it a ticket or something like that. Yeah. Then he analyzes the data request, (inaudible) information. So it has to be meet a certain standard. Then it goes back to (inaudible) form. Then you create some loops.

But what is the function of the form? Because you're right. The (inaudible) validation, what is the difference between 3, say, the full sentence—the CRO analyzes the data requested—and the CRO validates the form information? What's the difference between the two?

Unidentified Participant: No, I don't have it. I don't have it right now (inaudible) difference. But it could be wrong.

Unidentified Participant: But I wouldn't say it's right or wrong. It's just that I—when I read it, it didn't make sense to me. It didn't flow. It flowed up until the point of A—B. Okay? And I just really couldn't quite—it just seemed to be out of sequence. And it was C that I thought was throwing me off, because I'm going back to the validation of the form. Or are you creating a new form? Is a new form created?

Unidentified Participant: You're got two processes running. Say, you've got the initial request. That's one. So from the IRE to the (inaudible). That's the first request. Then, the CRO makes an entry. That's fine. Then, again, the analysis. That's fine. And then, the CRO sends something back to the IRE.

(Inaudible)

Unidentified Participant: So what's—say, you've got—that's the way you do it. It's fine.

Unidentified Participant: Yeah.

Unidentified Participant: Well, maybe when—probably. I was thinking about the sensitive information. Then the direction when you request information would be (inaudible), you can have additional validations to finally provide information.

Unidentified Participant: So maybe it's easier (inaudible) say you assume that the, say, it doesn't matter, makes a data request and you've levels of validation needed in order to do something. And that's already available in the initial form. So you've a very lightweight form to do a lightweight request. And you've got a very long form or something like this, but that's to make a more broader request for more private information.

Unidentified Participant: Okay.

Unidentified Participant: Okay.

Unidentified Participant: That's (inaudible). I think the matrix here. This is an exception. It's in the case—sorry—in in the case of sensitive information (inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: Right.

Unidentified Participant: It's part of step—step 3.

Unidentified Participant: Yes.

Unidentified Participant: Then this (inaudible) of interaction. The second (inaudible) the second cycle of interaction would be (inaudible) to request some additional information to validate, again, some (inaudible) information, to provide information.

Then, yes, it could—it looks complex, but (inaudible) I saw in many other models like credit card models, for example. When you request information by telephone, they try to—they (inaudible) like many (inaudible) data. But they don't really need that information to show you or give you the balance, for example. They must do it because this interaction--

Unidentified Participant: It's a check and balance.

Unidentified Participant: Yes. Yes.

Unidentified Participant: All right. So then maybe we need to create another sub—another sub that would—it's just kind of—I understand what you're saying as far as having a second layer of security (inaudible) validation. And that's what was throwing me off there. Because I was—once I saw sensitive information, I made the assumption reading it that it was already validated because you're identifying it as sensitive information.

So I just needed to (inaudible) just how we structured it as far as the formatting the actual text. Because it's not clear as you read it.

Unidentified Participant: Okay.

Unidentified Participant: Going back, I think it would be very valuable is if (inaudible) looks at it, if he understands it, and maps it against the say his maps.

Unidentified Participant: But many of the things in the map is not—well, many of these things is not in the map. Because in the map you saw only a line. But if there's no description, how (inaudible) would be of course. Then could be helpful that he validates. But

against experience in other—in these kinds of systems. And yes, and have something.

But okay, maybe this can take a long time. Maybe we can--

[Crosstalk]

Unidentified Participant: We'll do it because it's the second—it's a redundancy security check validation. And we need to just (inaudible) made out a little bit differently I think.

Unidentified Participant: It's necessary.

Unidentified Participant: Because it is necessary. I'm understanding it now because you explained (inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: I'd put it in.

Unidentified Participant: Okay.

Unidentified Participant: I'd put it here and we contribute.

Unidentified Participant: Right.

Unidentified Participant: Yes. (Inaudible)

Okay, complete—let's complete the case—the use case.

The CRO (inaudible) executes the inquiry of the (inaudible) request to the CR, contact repository. The CRO sends the response (inaudible) request. The IRI completes the data (inaudible) response (inaudible) the request.

Unidentified Participant: Please, slow down a bit (inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: This is the use case 2. I will assume this because this is very standard. Contact management is to provide the web user interface for the front end and for the other (inaudible) to provide language (inaudible) protocol with ISSO. Optional can implement (inaudible) must implement the following specification (inaudible).

Search contacts, create contacts, (inaudible) contact, lead contact. These kinds of operations are very standard in many record systems.

And this (inaudible) from the (inaudible), it's a TLD contact information facilitator.

What I was thinking here is that the contact information facilitator is different—is a different person than contact repository operator, and could be a different person than the (inaudible) contacts.

Unidentified Participant: What do you want this person or entity to do?

Unidentified Participant: They contact information facilitator. I was thinking about the initial collect of this information could be doing using (inaudible) organization, for example, or using an ordered search by (inaudible).

They're somewhere in the middle in this case. (Inaudible)

Unidentified Participant: --add something. Say this is a role, for instance, to collect (inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: Okay.

Unidentified Participant: Because it's very, very unclear what this entity should do.

Unidentified Participant: Okay. For the--

Unidentified Participant: And I have another question, Louis. The use cases say maybe they're as confusing for me. If you look at the report of the previous working group, which—they define use cases as well. They define particular instances when the information could be used.

How would you take—where does that sit in this document?

Unidentified Participant: Yes.

Unidentified Participant: Because now you've got to say that—that's why I asked about use cases. It's (inaudible) maybe that's the part of the policy which I could imagine. But then we need to include in the policy, it can only be used for these specific cases.

Unidentified Participant: Yes.

Unidentified Participant: Yes. These use cases is not the same use cases (inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: That's why it's getting confusing.

Unidentified Participant: These use cases is for the operation of the contact repository by itself.

Unidentified Participant: Then (inaudible) I go deep in the—a little bit deep in the how (inaudible) because in the use cases of the past working group, is more about the use of information.

Unidentified Participant: When can it be used? In which case?

Maybe scrolling up again. General requirement main use cases. That's why I asked. So in fact, policy requirements of (inaudible) and it also includes the policy requirements as a statement is say the policy for the use of the information.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible) Oh, what did you say?

Unidentified Participant: The policy of—the policy for the--

Unidentified Participant: For the use of—yeah, information--

Unidentified Participant: Of information. The policy--

Unidentified Participant: Probably, it's a different thing. Say you've got a set of policies and one, it's a new heading. And that's—it's—that's one of a given, say, the assumptions that you know.

Can you scroll between main use cases because that's different than—can you create a new heading?

Unidentified Participant: Yes. Where? After (inaudible)?

Unidentified Participant: Oh, just—yeah. Just before.

Unidentified Participant: Right above.

Unidentified Participant: Right above.

Unidentified Participant: Between policy requirements as a contact--

[Crosstalk]

--(inaudible) right in there.

Unidentified Participant: Yeah. And that's policy for use of the information contained in the—yeah.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible) cases of the--

Unidentified Participant: Previous working (inaudible). You can just list them.

Unidentified Participant: Okay.

Unidentified Participant: Because then, you have clear say these use cases and find different words (inaudible) say to. Then we have it altogether.

Unidentified Participant: The thing is I tried to—in terms of a developer. (Inaudible) understand what kind of system we need to (inaudible) accomplish, not in terms of political (inaudible) developer.

Unidentified Participant: Yeah.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible) it's important to put the context of (inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: Right. So that you're—so that a reader could follow it. So that a reader could follow it. That's not a designer of the system.

Unidentified Participant: Yes. Okay.

Unidentified Participant: Shall we scroll down again. Say we've got the use case. Again, I think for all these use cases, that's again, probably best process flow, et cetera.

Unidentified Participant: Yes. All the use cases follow the same (inaudible) we show in the first one. The only thing we need to do is to review the (inaudible). There's (inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: Now, my question in reference to the use cases, are these the only situations? Are these the only—will there ever be in the future, others. And that just me thinking. Other than those that have been identified within the document? Because we don't know what the future holds, so I'm just--

Unidentified Participant: The future what?

Unidentified Participant: We don't—I don't know what the future holds. I don't have a crystal ball. So my questions is, specifically, are these the only use situations? The use cases you have identified, are these the only ones?

Unidentified Participant: This is the typical use cases in the system (inaudible) cold records basically. This is very—okay. Maybe you can find other uses, but this is the core. This is the core of the system. This maintenance—and access of records basically.

Unidentified Participant: At the end of the day, it's more about say trusting whoever operates it, et cetera, and that it's solid than anything else.

Unidentified Participant: Yes.

Unidentified Participant: Okay.

Unidentified Participant: Then--

(Inaudible)

Yes. No, no. I found this very simple. The thing is trust.

The other—this case I mentioned here, we'll not go deep into this because it's late and we (inaudible). The proof of the information then—(inaudible) proved information keep up to date. And this not referred to the system. It's more referred to all emails or this kind of contact to keep up to date the information then.

These requirements was literally constructed from a contact center requests of proposal that (inaudible) launched a few months ago for the DLDs (ph). Then, this is a typical process of any contact center that I feel fits perfectly in what we are doing.

Unidentified Participant: Yep.

Unidentified Participant: Even this?

Unidentified Participant: Okay, I have a question here. I'm not so sure.

The process could be capable of—from contact center server providers (inaudible) 1, service agents, 2, I can start (inaudible) agents. This is (inaudible) procedure, but I'm not so sure if we need this kind of (inaudible) procedure in the contact of a story. Probably not.

Unidentified Participant: Then I would remove (inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: Yes. This one.

Unidentified Participant: But all the requirements is about escalation and we—maybe we don't need escalation at all.

Unidentified Participant: Why do you need (inaudible) between business (inaudible) and management software from a third party?

Unidentified Participant: This is for a—in the—these contact centers demands follow some best practices (inaudible) about the planning and use of (inaudible). And maybe for, I don't know, calculation of cost. But maybe not necessary to put it there. I (inaudible) I tell you is something from (inaudible) and I took the things that sounds to me good to be there.

Unidentified Participant: And again, probably best verified before the next call.

Unidentified Participant: Okay. Good. Then we—I can check it here (inaudible) review (inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: In the context of the use cases.

Unidentified Participant: And this sort of one—this is sort of—this is sort of requirement of how—which frequency will be update of information (inaudible) story. We are thinking about three months. And every (inaudible) months will be update information for every CCPLD (ph) for (inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: Let's read it. I'm getting very, very tired by now.

Unidentified Participant: Okay. Yes.

Unidentified Participant: It's quarter past five.

Unidentified Participant: Yes, okay, yes. We will finish then.

Well, let's finish here.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible) scroll down a bit. (Inaudible) in relationship (inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: I include here the (inaudible) model that's standard and (inaudible) story. Limitation and I don't have anything here.

Unidentified Participant: No, but that's (inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: Yes.

Unidentified Participant: And we have (inaudible) models. We had say five options.

Unidentified Participant: Yes.

Unidentified Participant: So we need to do some bit more work there. But that's—say, steering committee's one.

Unidentified Participant: Yes. Steering committee only once, yes. I included the document but we need to—we talked about last meeting about being only the (inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: In place holders.

Unidentified Participant: Place holders, yes. And to discuss after.

And the other thing I want to tell you is, what is the minimal request for information we need to obtain (inaudible) and proposals to start thinking about prices and costs. Because in our proposal, we don't need the governance model, for example.

Unidentified Participant: No, no. but we need—that's one of the tasks of the working group is to come up with this. Say analysis of governance model and recommend one. Say the governance model, et cetera, was structured (inaudible) how you go out.

Unidentified Participant: Then the thing is, I'd like to have request of information for potential providers, the (inaudible) factors about the governance about the funding. We can leave it--

Unidentified Participant: No, we can't. Say the way—the way—if you look at the (inaudible) of the working group, it's—say its activity should include proposed (inaudible) fee. That needs to be discussed with (inaudible) models. And but say—and costs. But you need this. Say description of the system in order to assess cost. So that's--

Unidentified Participant: The point is I want to finish that document to send that document (inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: Yeah, as an idea of grasping some ideas how much it will cost. And then together with the governance model and the funding, that will create the direction.

Unidentified Participant: Okay.

Unidentified Participant: Before we can send out the RFP officially. And there needs to be a—say the—the decision (inaudible) needs to approve sending out the--

Unidentified Participant: The request for—yes. (Inaudible). Yeah, sure.

Unidentified Participant: So but I think say for the next call, please remind me that I do something about governance models and funding.

Unidentified Participant: Okay.

Unidentified Participant: Yeah.

Unidentified Participant: Yes.

Unidentified Participant: And the question is, when do you want to have the next call?

Unidentified Participant: Okay. One month from here is good for you?

Unidentified Participant: Yep. And (inaudible).

[Crosstalk]

Unidentified Participant: One month will be good for me.

Unidentified Participant: One month? Okay. And after that, we try to keep every two weeks maybe.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible) the frequency.

Unidentified Participant: More frequency. You have to keep--

Unidentified Participant: The momentum going.

Unidentified Participant: This okay?

Unidentified Participant: Yes.

Unidentified Participant: Great.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible) fine with me.

Unidentified Participant: Thank you.

Unidentified Participant: Thanks.

Unidentified Participant: Thank you.

Unidentified Participant: Thank you.