
COPENHAGEN – ICANN GDD: Security Framework Drafting Team (2 of 2)

Tuesday, March 14, 2017 - 17:00 to 18:30 CET

ICANN58 | Copenhagen, Denmark

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: March 14, 2017, meeting room Hall B4.1 starting at 5:00 PM and going to 6:30 PM. ICANN GDD Security Framework Drafting Team (2 of 2).

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. We have one minute before starting. Just making sure that everybody is here. We have the authors here. That's good to know. Those of you who are on the Drafting Team, please sit at the table. Thank you, everyone, for coming. Let's get started.

This is the Security Framework Drafting Team, session two of two. Earlier this week, we had our session one, which was a private session. And following that, we had a private session for registries only and also TSWG. We have been working on draft of the Security Framework and today, let me show you the agenda I have.

But before we get started with the agenda, what I'd like to do is do a quick introduction of the Drafting Team members. So let's start over there. Go ahead.

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.

ADRIAN KOSTER: Hello. I am Adrian Koster. I am with the Swiss Governmental CERT.

JIM EMERSON: Jim Emerson with the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

BOBBY FLAIM: Bobby Flaim, FBI.

JAMES BEARD: James Beard, Department of Homeland Security U.S.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Cathrin Bauer-Bulst, European Commission.

THOMAS WALDEN: Thomas Walden, U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration.

DIRK BALLOU: Dirk Ballou, U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration.

[GARY]: [Gary] [inaudible], RCMP.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible], ICANN Org.

IRANGA KAHANGAMA: Iranga Kahangama, FBI.

DENNIS CHANG: My name is Dennis Chang. I'm the Director of Programs and managing this project.

ALAN WOODS: Alan Woods from Rightside Registry.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Maxim Alzoba, .moscow.

BETH BACON: Beth Bacon, PIR.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Brian Cimbolic, PIR.

RAYMOND ZYLSTRA: Raymond Zylstra, Neustar.

KRISTINE DORRAINE: Kristine Dorraine, Amazon.

DENNIS CHANG: Anybody behind us who's a member of the Drafting Team?

CRYSTAL ONDO: Crystal Ondo, Donuts.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you very, very much. We love your contribution and support, of course. Let's talk quickly about the agenda here. I'll go through it. First, we'll give you a brief background of the project and project staff, progress, and status, and the scope, and we'll be working on the draft update and then talk about the next steps.

There are some people behind us, it's kind of awkward, but this is for you, so stop me if you'd like to ask any questions along the way.

While developing the Terms of Registry Agreement in the new gTLD program, the gTLD Program Committee of the ICANN Board resolved to include the so-called security checks into the Specification 11 Section 3(b). Sometimes, you will hear this referred to as Spec 11-3(b) and this is why.

The proposal for the implementation of the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs called for ICANN to solicit community participation to develop by framework for registry operators to respond to identified security risks.

In 2015, ICANN formed what we now call a Security Framework Drafting Team (SFDT) composed of volunteers from affected parties to draft a document for the registry operators to respond to security threats. And who you see on this table are the members of that drafting team.

Registries, registrars, and GAC representatives, including the form of the Public Safety Working Group joined this Drafting Team and the SFDT has made good progress in finding common ground and resolving opposing views in the recent months.

The current draft that we'll be working on is a culmination of two years of work and collaborative authoring of the "Framework for Registry Operators to Respond to Security Threats." The collaboration continues at ICANN 58 with four meetings, as I have mentioned. Three private meetings were already held, and this is a public session. Our goal here is nothing more than producing a draft that the whole team agrees on.

So, upon obtainment of this final draft, it will be distributed to the respective groups, and then we will go for a public comment process so that everybody can have an opportunity to make their inputs.

This is the important part. I want to make sure that everybody in this room is aware of the scope of this project. And I made this table trying to make it as clear as possible what is and what is not.

This framework is a voluntary collaborative best practice document and it is not a contractual requirement or consensus policy or obligation that's put on any part. And that's what's wonderful about this document. Everything that you see, the product that this team has created is purely for the purpose of collaboration between the registries and the law enforcement and everybody who's affected.

Now, I'd like to ask my counterparts here, Alan, can you speak to the scope to your constituents?

ALAN WOODS:

Thank you very much, Dennis. I think you've actually covered the scope exceptionally well there. This Drafting Team is as a response to the NGPC clarification and request at, what's the word I'm looking for? Commitment is the word to the GAC that

we would tie down a voluntary process in order to respond adequately and as best as possible to identified security threats.

From the registry point of view, it has been a mammoth task and I thank the PSWG to listening to us and listening to our various machinations when it comes to this because the registries that are represented come from all areas, all jurisdictions, all limitations, etc. So it has been a mammoth task in trying to come to an agreement across the board where people are comfortable at a level setting at a level that people would be able to do effective response but that it can be applied across many types of registries.

I think we're quite optimistic as to where it is right now. The mammoth work even in this week alone, we're very happy with that. Hopefully, we will get through the final discussion pieces today and leave this meeting with the fireworks that Dennis has promised.

DENNIS CHANG: [Go ahead, Iranga].

IRANGA KAHANGAMA: Sure. Thanks, Dennis. Thanks, Alan. I just want to say I'd say thanks to everyone for participating. I think it's gotten a lot of good momentum in the last few months and weeks. I know from

our side, we've enjoyed and been operating in full good faith and look forward to the opportunity to show ICANN, the registries, and everyone that we are looking to engage and work well with you all collaboratively and put forth a document.

Because as PSWG at the end of the day, we just want to advance policies and things that help keep people safe and secure online, and any kind of document or action item that can help further that PSWG is always going to be behind.

Hopefully, this can serve as a model going forward to continue to do good work. I just would echo Alan's optimism that we're pretty close on a document and it's a good, concise text. I think I'm also optimistic that we can get there and, hopefully, we can just work out whatever edits exist and talk through some future discussion points. So thanks.

ALAN WOODS:

Obviously, the one thing which I neglected to say: the next step, as well. Obviously, when we agree, hopefully, today, then we will have to bring it to the Registry Stakeholder Group for their review and I'm assuming it has to, of course, go to the GAC, as well. That will be the next step and then once that is, that's when we envisage the public comment would be that point. Yeah, just to be clarifying on that one.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: I just wanted to echo what Iranga and Alan were touching on. The PSWG has absolutely come in good faith. And this most recent iteration, kind of the reset button on this document, has advanced this so much further than it could have if we were still working with a 40-page unwieldy document. So we absolutely appreciate it and I think it's gotten us close to, knock on wood, assuming we are close to the finish line, gotten where we are.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Beforehand we begin diving into the document, we have a request from Matthias Pfeifer from .berlin: "Just a note. Can you please provide a link to the slides to the list?"

DENNIS CHANG: Yes. These slides I just made for the purpose of us, and I will upload it after we do our meeting along with the documents. All right, then. Let's get started.

We're going to get to work, and I'm going to turn it over to Alan. What we will be doing is working on the document that we have received from the PSWG. It was just delivered yesterday, and I thank you again to the PSWG for working in such a quick time and collaboration. People are just amazed of the collaboration

that they're witnessing through this team. Just amazing. Okay, Alan. Take it away.

ALAN WOODS:

Okay, thank you. We'll get straight into the edits and the noted parts. Basically, I sent this around or it was sent around to the registries this morning, really. We've had a look at it and a few comments came back all on the same things. In my mind and in our minds so far in the discussion we've had, all exceptionally minor things, and we should be able to get through them very quickly.

So, first change that there was a discussion on, and that's purely the discussion, is under the scope where he changed the word "identified" into the word "notified." The discussion that was put out there was that in the NGPC commitment, it uses the word identified but it also does use the word notified.

So unless there's anybody particularly strongly feeling on the registry side that haven't mentioned anything, I think this is one of those positions that we are happy to accept it either way. It's splitting hairs in a way, but either one works for us. So if we're happy, we will accept your change unless I hear any response from anybody in the registry side who has not had the opportunity to say that to me yet. Yes, of course.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Sorry. Notified just doesn't make sense to me, like grammatically speaking. It's not that the security threat was notified. It was identified. We identified a security threat, or noticed. I don't know. Word tense, something.

ALAN WOODS: And that generally was the discussion, as well. Yes?

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Can I [inaudible] try to explain. The idea here was if you look at the Spec 11, it uses the word identified both for security threats that are identified through proactive activity of the registry and for security threats that are notified to the registry by third parties. And since this framework only deals with security threats that you have received notification on from third parties, we wanted to make that very clear here in the scope. So if you want, we could also say notified/identified, although that wouldn't be very elegant. But that's the idea that we're trying to reflect there.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Thank you for the clarification. I would say security threats for which notification or whatever she just said the second way

around, just because at least to external parties, that reads a little bit.

ALAN WOODS: So, remind me of what exactly the way you put there so we can put it into the document straight away.

CRYSTAL ONDO: I totally agree with what she said. I just can't remember what she said.

ALAN WOODS: We're in agreement on something. So, yes.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: I mean, I guess we could say if you don't want to do notified/identified, which even from a German perspective may be bundling it a bit too much, you could do registries responses to identified security threats that have been notified.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think that we might still have this. Yeah. How about the framework addresses registries' responses to identified security threats and to security threats for which it has received notification.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Well, the challenge with that is that it precisely does not address anything you would do on proactive side, right? It's only the responses to security threats that other people have brought to your attention.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: So, because the identified security threats would have been security threats that the registry has found on its own and identified, and so that in theory – and I don't want to put words in your mouth – but I think that including both concepts would address both sides of the coin. The identified security threats, which the registry proactively finds, as well as, basically, referrals. I mean, we could use that. Notifications from law enforcement. So, it's both the proactive and the reactive.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Sorry. I think there's a confusion now because if they all, I don't know, are we assuming on your end that was just about things we received notifications for? Because we always assumed it was anything we found ourselves, anything anyone told us. Reported security threats come in, in many different forms, in many different ways, and we thought this document dealt with all of them. So that's a very different place. I don't think it

matters, but it's more encompassing than maybe what you guys thought this was. Bobby, I don't know if you have.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Could we just use and/or so it's both? So identified and/or so we include all situations.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: I think we don't even need the notified if really it's supposed to cover everything because then it would just cover both the ones you discovered on your own. But then it's just a big misunderstanding on my part because I thought this was really only about the responsive side of things.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I guess I think what Cathrin might be referring to is the additional language included that got put into the footnote and trying to discern between the proactive nature of that [inaudible] reporting and things like that comes out of there.

BETH BACON: That footnote was just to cover the things that we would do as a matter of course, which is a clarification I think from DOJ, who felt more comfortable noting that we would do these things on our own but then this document covers all the other things.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes. There's a comment online in our other B room from Matthias Pfeifer again, .berlin: "Just a note about the language here, a reported and notified security threat is not necessarily a properly identified security threat."

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Beth.

BETH BACON: I understand the level of detail there but I think if you go through the rest of the document, it will cover all of those contingencies. I think that's the whole point of the next four pages.

ALAN WOODS: So, let's. Sorry. Kristine.

KRISTINE DORRAINE: I put a suggestion in the chat that you just change the tense, so registry responses to notifications of security threats. Does that work?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Does that work for you guys?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes, that's good for us.

ALAN WOODS: That works. Okay. So just to read the line again for everybody: this framework addresses registries' responses to notifications of security threats. Okay. Accept and accept. Yeah. We're doing this. Okay. And you're okay with the insertion, then, of the extra paragraph as a footnote as opposed to in the main text? Yeah, great, and accepted. So that's the scope. Let me just change that. Perfect. And then get rid of the discussion because we have discussed. Okay, so I just accept that, too. Okay.

Now, there was an addition into footnote number two. Under the hold the domain name so it does not resolve, this was a suggestion from one of the registries. Applying server hold status removes the domain name from the TLD zone file with the consequence that the domain name will no longer resolve on the public Internet. The footnote then reads commonly known as suspension, the effect will be to stop all DNS services, which are under control of the registry operator without seizure of the domain.

This was a matter of conversation in our session with regards to there were other things that weren't going to be affected by

suspensions, such as WHOIS. So, yeah, I think Maxim was actually...

MAXIM ALZOBA:

Yeah. The reason is, for example, we put some particular domain on hold. He cannot do anything with domain, but you can still look via WHOIS who it was and the registrant address, etc. because we cannot say that it stopped working. It's not useful but you can still see the information about the domain for WHOIS. It's not very useful for bad purposes, but it's useful for enforcement so they can see what was the guy behind it.

Also, we refer to DNS services because it won't stop hosting for this particular party or resolution of [inaudible] he will not stop using his IP addresses because it doesn't depend on us. He got it somewhere else and using it somewhere else. We are not his ISP provider or something. So we stop provisioning of all services we could affect somehow, and it's still visible so law enforcement can look into it and see what was the guy.

ALAN WOODS:

Just to come back, I know this was from the registry side. There's more conversation on our side, as well, so apologies on we're hogging the time on this one but I suppose we are still one full team. What I would suggest on this one. I'm not too

comfortable with the all DNS services anyway as a qualifier. What I would just say there is possibly – an I know it’s a word that keeps coming back in the document – but to stop relevant DNS services or appropriate DNS services, which are under the control of the registry operator.

Therefore, linking it to the prevention of the abuse and not necessarily things that have no effect one way or the other on the abuse. Does that sound acceptable to you to put in appropriate or relevant as a word in there?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah. One second.

ALAN WOODS: Take your time.

ADRIAN KOSTER: Or we could just delete “all” instead of putting in further language.

ALAN WOODS: I agree. It still seems to be all the services. Even deleting the word “all,” it would still read as being all there as in to stop DNS services, that’s probably even just as hard. Yep, Bobby.

BOBBY FLAIM: You can maybe relevant or applicable.

ALAN WOODS: Same sort of thing. Applicable seems, or relevant would make more sense. Yeah. Crystal?

CRYSTAL ONDO: Sorry. I'm fine with applicable but just to make the comment, also, that we have to operate within all the required domain name lifecycles and everything. So, even if you deleted domain, there are some services that are still out there for 45 days and we can't stop that based on our agreements at ICANN. Jennifer's over there. I'm smiling at her. So, just to put that out there, as well. We can't just pull a domain and it's, poof, gone from everywhere.

ALAN WOODS: I think that is the reason for inclusion of this, just to make sure that it's not misleading in any way. It's just the real situation. So, okay, so if we're happy with that, we will accept at that. Oh, that just jumped. So we have no issue with that. No issue with that. And no issue with that. Okay, so moving on. Oh, this keeps jumping. Pardon me. Okay.

So you removed freeze. I don't think the registries had any issue with that. The line under this paragraph. Let me just read it for transparency's sake. It's lock the domain name so it cannot be changed. Although rarely used for security threats, applying locked status means that a domain cannot be transferred, deleted, or have its details modified but will still resolve.

It is occasionally seen as part of an action of where a domain is locked in conjunction with the seizure of its name servers. Unless I'm hearing any issue, then we accept that out and move on.

Transfer of a domain name and probably have a question on the deletion. Perhaps, Iranga, you could talk on that, the first line. Where properly requested, example by an order from a court of competent jurisdiction. That was removed. Can you, perhaps, just give some insight into that?

IRANGA KAHANGAMA:

Sure. I think we just removed that because in the objective, we had put the court order of competent jurisdiction and then we just thought semantically just like all the others were just general description of the actions themselves not necessarily related, so we just took it out.

ALAN WOODS: Yep. That sounds good from my point of view but, obviously, I'm only co-chair. Therefore, I must go to my team and ask them. Yep. We seem good on that one, so thank you for the clarification on that. Accept deletion and just capitalize the T. Moving on then. Is that an old edit?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No.

ALAN WOODS: No?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Was that something [you did]?

ALAN WOODS: That I deleted. So, if you're happy with that, I will accept that change, too. Okay. And then that was also, yeah, it's just format. Perfect. Okay.

Moving on down into unregistered [GGA] type domain names. I will read the entire one, then. Create the domain name. Registering a potentially malicious domain name seems counterintuitive, but when done in controlled conditions, it enables researchers and public safety organizations such as

CERT to take appropriate action [such as sinkholing] on a domain name.

I believe we had a question on that. I'm going to put that over and put her on the spot. Kristine, did you have a question on that one?

KRISTINE DORRAINE:

Yeah. This wasn't so much a question as it's kind of internally, we're not sure if we wanted to keep offering sinkholing as an option. I mean, there could be other options out there. Some jurisdictions wouldn't look favorably upon sinkholing. ICANN really doesn't have any policies around it. It might confuse a given registry that's trying to comply, so we weren't sure if it was going to raise more problems or cause or more concerns if you leave it in there.

It's already up there a couple of times, I think, listed as an option, so it's I think the third reference to sinkholing and I just thought it was a little bit of overkill.

ALAN WOODS:

I suppose the question following up from that, do you feel strongly about having that bracket in there that identifies sinkholing? Is it a sticking point or not? Really, it's just a question for you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I don't think it's a sticking point. I think we just felt the need that when we put in take appropriate action, it seemed kind vague so we just wanted to give it a little bit of context. I mean, I think even if there's another action that you think would be more amenable, we could maybe do that or add others.

KRISTINE DORRAINE: Well, I think as I understand it and others can correct me if I'm wrong, but the reason registries register domain names to themselves, they create domains, is to just sort of generally block them or warehouse them to prevent these. I don't think the typical use is for sinkholing. Of course, it's one use. But I don't know if that's a typical use so that's kind of why I wanted to throw it out but Crystal, go ahead.

CRYSTAL ONDO: I would actually say that when you register a domain to yourself, sure, that's right, but a lot of instances we're asked to register names to a registrar of last resort or other entities for them to use it. And in that instance, sinkholing kind of is the thing that happens. So I'm personally fine with it but I'll let you guys fight it out.

KRISTINE DORRAINE: To be clear, I'm not fighting about it, I just threw it out there.

ALAN WOODS: Again. If we're trying to agree a document that's going to go to both our partner, our respective houses, we need to make sure that we agree on things, as well. So, if there is a question there, I have no major issue with it. It was just, again, to throw it out there. Okay.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: I don't either, I think it's okay by me.

ALAN WOODS: Grand. There's always the suggestion we could put it in a footnote, but yeah. So next. Yeah, just to say that there is a question there of whether or not of it's not well-defined, but it is an example, it's an example to put into it. Beth?

BETH BACON: So, Maxim, we talked about this before in our previous session as a group and it is in the document previously and I think we all have a shared understanding now. So I don't have a personal problem leaving this in. I don't think my PIR is going to tell me to be quiet. So, if we leave it, we leave it. We have a shared understanding, so I don't have a problem with it.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: If I could, it is one appropriate action in the instance. It's not a definitive list of you create it and then you must sinkhole it. It's just a such is. I mean, on its face, it is just one example, so I don't see it as problematic.

ALAN WOODS: Exactly, such as. It's quite clearly an example, so [why don't we just not worry is that] not accepting, accept and delete. Okay, so this was a deletion that. You seem you are okay with this. Excellent, so I'm just [going to go].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: And actually, we moved it to a footnote. Sorry. We didn't just delete it.

ALAN WOODS: No. We're not going to move to a footnote.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No, no, no, the [PII] thing.

ALAN WOODS: Sorry?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The next thing, the thing you just accepted, that was moved already to a footnote. We didn't delete it. Just to be clear. I just wanted them to be aware that we didn't delete that line. We just moved it.

ALAN WOODS: Yes. Moved it to a footnote. Apologies, sorry, yes, very important distinction. And I'm just going to accept the G, which I can't for some reason. Accept. All right, okay. So the accepting and moving to a footnote.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This should be in the footnote. It's just grammatical.

ALAN WOODS: Should. Yes, yes, sorry, I'm, yeah.

JONATHAN MATKOWSKY: Jonathan Matkowsky, RiskIQ. Just a personal comment, just on sinkholing. I think it raises a lot of important issues with respect to WHOIS inaccuracy, the issues of privacy, and when you sinkhole domains, especially if it's a DROP, and the appropriate ways to divert, essentially, traffic, even when the intent is good,

when it might involve trademark traffic, for example, for commercial profit in the security industry, even.

So a framework for sinkholing, I think, is very important. The ethical issues that are involved and what constitutes appropriate sinkholing. Thank you.

ALAN WOODS: Okay. Thank you for the note. Okay. So the next line then, so these are all it seems to be...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just a quick note. You have BB in the footnote, so delete the one B.

ALAN WOODS: It is jumping on me.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Even though bees are endangered.

ALAN WOODS: Yeah. Where has it gone? Where is it? I know. I make myself dizzy here. Where? I'm completely – we'll do an edit.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, no. Do it now.

ALAN WOODS: There we go. Let's be beneficial. That should be B. There we go. Thank you. Yeah. I just couldn't see it. I'm sorry. It's probably what was in there. Okay so it just keeps jumping. Yeah, okay, so this is an insertion from the registries. I'm assuming if it has survived version six, we can accept that through.

So it's registry operators should be sure that they seek any appropriate or necessary waivers. Okay. Accept. Excellent, and again, these are all our insertions, so we shall assume that you accepted them.

So you deleted just this line with regards to the percentages of DGAs and where they shouldn't go above and beyond.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah. We don't need it. That's fine.

ALAN WOODS: Grand, we're happy to take that. Accept deletion. We removed this, again, assuming that – let me just double check so people can see. This is us who deleted that and inserted this line, which, again, I assume you accepted and survived.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

ALAN WOODS: Excellent, and same with the next. These are all ones that we had in version five and that you accepted, so we're just going to accept into version six, which, hopefully, will go to version seven, which is our final.

Okay, this one seems a bit. Okay, [whereas] a request is granted by a court order from court, oh, sorry, within the jurisdiction of the RO. So you left that in. Okay. And you'll be glad to know that we're almost there. One more.

So just to read these differences. Okay, so it's with regards to timing. If and when requests are categorized as high-priority and of a legitimate and credible origin, then as soon as possible and no later than 24 hours of acknowledging receipt, the registry operator can acknowledge the threat and communicate its planned steps to mitigate the security threat.

Do you have any comment on the reasoning for the change in language there or?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It was a DOJ-requested change.

ALAN WOODS: Grand. We have no issue, I think, from that. I just wanted to make sure. No, no, no. I think it's important to give you the opportunity to do that just in case anybody else might have an issue, so I wanted to raise it and make sure.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah. It's literally the same person who [inaudible].

ALAN WOODS: Perfect. No, absolutely not. So accepting that out. The final one and I might actually turn to Brian on this one or Crystal. They can duke it out themselves, but I'll just read the line as it was inserted and then you can have the discussion. That is the very last line. Future iterations and updates to this framework may occur as necessary and agreed upon by all parties.

[BRIAN CIMBOLIC]: Yeah. Thank you, Alan. Two quick things, one comment, and then one request. First, a comment is I hope that as we're approaching the finish line on this, we're not sitting in the room together in one of the next meetings or two to reopen this but with the understanding that sure, security threats are changing and this will be updated at some point.

So with that in mind and I don't think it should be a big ask is just clarifying agreed upon by the parties in writing.

CRYSTAL ONDO: I disagree with you.

[BRIAN CIMBOLIC]: Do you? All right. Jump in, Crystal.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Sorry. This isn't an agreement. There aren't parties to this. This is something that the NGPC asked us to do and we have done it. I agree that we can leave in some flexibility but saying as agreed upon by the parties. I mean, are you going to be here in five years? Am I going to be here in five years? I can't bind the GAC and registries and registrars to doing something in the future. So if we can say that as drafted and we can talk.

I mean, I'm sure we can come up with language that references technology changing and, obviously, this is a framework that might be revisited at some point. I can't think of the language off the top of my head, but in general, I have a problem with that.

[BRIAN CIMBOLIC]: Agreed. Withdrawn. You win.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can you just take, just leave it off or put the period at necessary? Just future iterations and updates to this framework may occur as necessary.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: As necessary.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: From time to time maybe.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: As necessary works.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] mind meld because I was literally doing that.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yep, she was. She really was doing exactly.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I was doing exactly the same thing.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And just for clarity, too. One of the reasons not just evolving technology and security threats, the PSWG members also said that if you wanted in the future to create clarifying documents or things for your respective parties, like a memo to the ROs or memo to PSWG law enforcement, that this is what it was or whatever, that's just leaving some space to visit that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Also, another reason to leave it is that behavioral patterns bad actors might change and, for example, we don't understand that they're going to kill people with DNS servers. Who knows?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Beth?

BETH BACON: So close, sorry. Could I suggest a nod towards the fact that this was created for doing it at the request of NGPC and it in the future would need to come at the request of the community and with respect for the multi-stakeholder bottom-up process?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Who determines it's necessary [inaudible]?

BETH BACON: Yeah. For this particular one. I'm not married to it but.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I guess, yeah, the reason I think, and you can correct me if I'm wrong, but we looked at the, there was a document that the charter, yeah, and so we didn't, but the charter's not official formally accepted and recognized, so we didn't want to go too directly to the letter of that text, either.

ALAN WOODS: Okay, so are we thinking that [inaudible] language is needed or should we leave that slightly more open-ended as it is currently? Okay, well, we can. We're closed.

ADRIAN KOSTER: Maybe we can put appropriate instead of necessary.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Or maybe you could say as appropriate within the context of ICANN or something like that.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Within the context of the changing security or whatever technology. Not threats. [It goes] to the contract. Come up with the words, Alan.

ALAN WOODS: I'm trying. Your wording there doesn't specifically go towards to the deference to the multi-stakeholder community. You don't want that?

BETH BACON: Sorry. I think that what mine was, again, the open-endedness of it all. So it would be future iterations and updates to this framework may occur as.

ALAN WOODS: Appropriate and necessary.

BETH BACON: There's no way that we're going to sell that to the [ROSG].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Why?

BETH BACON: What parties? This is a framework that the community was told to do go do. I mean, we're guaranteeing that everyone in the community has to agree to this now? That just doesn't seem workable.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

ALAN WOODS: Excellent.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can you repeat that on the microphone, as well, please, because online folks didn't hear you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: As appropriate to ICANN or pursuant to ICANN process.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Excellent.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Works for us.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Multi-stakeholder bottom-up process because [inaudible] NGPC of some sort.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Process or procedure.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Multi-stakeholder process.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Bottom-up process.

ALAN WOODS: ICANN process. I think that probably is, okay, so let me read that line one more time, then. So that's future iterations and updates to this framework may occur as appropriate pursuant to ICANN process. Silence is great. So accept insertion and, ladies and gentlemen, that is all the changes agreed and accepted. Yeah, no, I'm checking, Dennis. Dennis is, "Say it ain't so. Say it ain't so."

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: While we wait, I'd like to remind you there were fireworks promised.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: If you really knew your audience, it would have been booze.

ALAN WOODS: I think that's just, yeah. Let's just do.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Save.

ALAN WOODS: Saving.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Save.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And send it to yourself, at least.

ALAN WOODS: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Did you save it?

ALAN WOODS: I've saved it. I'm going to send it to Dennis right now and then he's going to be the custodian of this. It's like the exchange of the DNS keys. Go through a process here. I'll send it to everybody, obviously, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes, it's a good idea.

ALAN WOODS: Okay. I'm going to stop talking now and pass over to Dennis, but thank you. Thank you so much for the PSWG's work this week and thank you to my team. My team? The team of which I work with. Good lord. They have also done an awful lot, so well done.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah. I would just say thanks, too. It's been a pleasure.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, everyone. It's really been wonderful to see because I remember last year around October timeframe, September, do you remember? Oh, my goodness. From there to here, it's just miraculous.

I just have to point out one person in particular that's sitting right here. He came in fresh and just kind of reset as you said it. Reset button because we were so mild and so detailed and he kind of took a fresh look.

And Jim Galvin isn't here but he, I think, deserves a lot of credit because at Hyderabad, he's the one who said, "There are only five things we can do," and he named them. Right? And then boom, we captured it and that really made a difference.

So truly a great teamwork and I would love to see more of this, of course, in other areas. We do want to find another forum or processes or venue where we can continue this collaboration. If it's not this particular Drafting Team, this Drafting Team is done. No, not done. We're not done. Getting ahead of myself.

We will be submitting it to our relative groups, right? And then we will come together one more time and we'll have to finish any comments that we receive and also public comments. Right? So we'll see how it goes. So we'll keep in touch and you guys let us know how it goes with your groups, right? And then we'll probably shoot for another meeting maybe late April. Right? And then we'll see if we can get to a public comment soon. Go ahead. Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

So just to think of clarity for the record. So we're done with the text and you guys are going to be taking it to your stakeholder group and we're going to be taking it to the GAC and we're going to let them comment on it and then there will be a meeting in late April.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah. I don't know exactly but as soon as you guys come back with comments and we'll try to pull together the group again

and as soon as we can do it. And when are you going to the GAC with this?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's a good question because I don't know what the GAC agenda necessarily is. Cathrin, as Chair of PSWG, may have more info.

DENNIS CHANG: There you go.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: No. I think we should just use the list. I mean, we can just circulate it by email. We're going to, I was just imagining in my head how we can provide the clearest possible explanation to reduce the number of possible comments. So I think we've offered today to do a Webinar on it. I think it would be really good to have us explain this in detail and avoid that there's misunderstandings that lead to comments that we then have to deal with.

So we're going to try and make it as transparent and clear as possible but through the list. I don't think we're going to get on the agenda in the GAC again at this meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think that's a great idea and we'll do the same. Do you think it would be helpful to you if you had registries on the Webinar if there are questions? I mean, not, obviously, the legions.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] have the time.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Or in my mine. Not the legions nor me, but probably Alan, our fearless leader. Just explain things and if it would not be helpful, you can say no, but just offering that.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yeah. And maybe as one revolutionary idea, I mean, you could also offer one webinar where we explain this together to our communities and then see whether we need extra sessions.

ALAN WOODS: I agree. I think that would be a great idea. It's been sent to you now but for some reason, my email takes about 20 minutes so it will get to you. It is on my computer. Nobody is going to steal it. Actually, I'm going to blame people like Stephanie if it goes awry because I put it on my Google Doc, so I know you've nothing to do with it but look, thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, everyone.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you, Dennis, for hanging in there.

DENNIS CHANG: Of course.

ALAN WOODS: Absolutely. Thank you, Dennis.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]