TRANSCRIPT

Contact Repository Implementation Working Group Meeting London
23 June 2014

Attendees:

Luis Diego Espinoza, expert
Cristian Hesselman, .nl
Isak Jacobsen, .fo
Antoinette Johnson, .vi (telephone)

ICANN Staff:
Bart Boswinkel
Gabriella Schittek

Apologies:

Hitoshi Shito, .jp

Bart Boswinkel:	Good morning. This is the CRI working group. We have one participant online, Antoinette. Isak is in the room. Cristian is in the room, Luis is in the room and we have apologies from Itachi, and from staff we have Gabi and my name is Bart. For the transcript purposes, please state you name if you use the microphone and use the microphone, please. Thank you.
	Luis, you want me to? Yes? The last couple of days we've had a discussion on the email list on the final report and if possible we want to conclude it today so it can be sent to the council later today. It's already the item of the final report of the client working group is already on the council agenda so that's fairly easy but if possible I want to submit the final report so they can decide on the recommendations of the client working group. If we look at the core of the discussion I think there are two outstanding issues. One is the relation with the regional initiatives. We need to sign off on that and how we want to work it through and the second one is the relation with part of the recommendation we should run or the working group proposes could run -- that's the better phrasing -- something not the secure email but engage to run the follow up. I think it's a secure web email or secure email list as well? And so that's more on I think the original one from 16 June which was accepted but then Cristian sent in some amendments and Luis sent in some amendments on the substance of it. Maybe, Cristian, you sent in a final version or maybe we'll use Luis' one, one of them, we put it up on the screen and run through it and do some editing right here and then sign off on it. Is that a good way or working forward?

Antoinette Johnson:	Good morning. This is Antoinette. I'm not using my computer right now. I'm on my cell phone. So, I'm not able to see. Can you read the points you're making?
Bart Boswinkel:	That would've been my proposal as well.
Antoinette Johnson:	Thank you.
Bart Boswinkel:	I hope you can hear my voice clearly?
Antoinette Johnson:	Yes. I can.
Bart Boswinkel:	Do you want Cristian or your final version? Yours? This will take a few minutes, Antoinette.
Antoinette Johnson:	Thank you.
Bart Boswinkel:	When -- do you recall? You sent it -- ? You can put it from yours. Yes. That's nice. We see in very nice, one of the famous animals from Costa Rica.
Luis Diego Espinoza:	I have two versions here. Antoinette, because you don't have the document, basically we'll try not to modify the text but really review. On the recommendations, we were talking, I included in my last piece, I included the recommendation, consider alternatives such as having the repository hosted by an established specified member of the organization like secure domain foundation to provide the service. Here at this point, written here, replace that with coordination and inter network, we have the content repository such that general TCP repository consumer system and in the use of critical infrastructure stakeholders, this phrase includes the second recommendation but the first one that's supposed to be included in this one, interactivity expands based on our experience and review the fundamental -- no, this is not included in the second recommendation.

The point is I'd like to include the offer from Nom and secure domain foundation because it's a real offer and we saw that in the Singapore meeting and I hear in the working group too, Roy mentioned the secure domain foundation and it could an organization that will start working close with us in this, the ccTLD community. They offered the service with no charge, not only the mailing, maybe the contract we defined at the beginning. I think maybe working so far with Cristian, the issue here is it's about to mention the name of the organization but I suggest to mention because it's a real offer. It's not a possibility or a name that appears on the internet. It's a real thing. We will have it in the meeting in Singapore.

Then talking wide a little bit before we talk about maybe we can include the name in the footnotes. Then mention the organization this way, any number of organizations or any organizations and on the footnote mention by example secure domain foundation. That works for me because it is included in the document. Maybe in a footnote but it is included in the document and the reference to a real offer of service. But we need to act fast because in the version delivered by Cristian I don't see where we can fit that. Can you? Yes? Please. |
| Cristian Hesselman: | So, just to be clear on this, I don't mind mentioning the secure domain foundation, I just think that it should be in the second bullet list, first bullet it says the mail mass service should be hosted by a neutral party such as ISOC, ICANN, or an established specialized non-profit organization. I think the secure domain foundation is an example of the established specialized non-profit organization. If we add over there somewhere such as secure domain foundation then I think we covered it, no? |

Luis Diego Espinoza:	I'm not going to completely agree because the mail service should be hosted by a neutral party such as ISOC or ICANN but we don't have a formal offer to run these. If you want to run it on ISOC you need to start to figure out how to do it.
Cristian Hesselman:	I think we deliberately wanted to stay somewhat vague here because we still need to check with the community about how they feel about hosting this service at a particular organization. We don't know how the secure domain foundation is being perceived.
Luis Diego Espinoza:	We can put it in the document and see what they think about it.
Antoinette Johnson:	If we use the premise and the logic that Cristian has put forth of ISOC and-or ICANN which I do recall moving forward then I don't see what would be the problem with presenting options of approaches to mention the domain secure services, this non-profit. Now, again, going back to what Cristian said, we don't know at this point in time how the community feels within the options presented. So, to present -- and I think I said this in my email to you, Bart. I don't know if you received it or not. One of the objectives we were supposed to present options. This option has presented itself and it is not for the working group to make the final decision of what is disclosed to the community but to present options and let the community, whether it's seen as a community council, I'm not sure how that process works, it will be my first time to go through an entire process, but to at least present all existing options that are known to the committee at the time.
Bart Boswinkel:	Cristian is nodding his head. Isak, you want to interject? No? Maybe as an alternative, I think that captures it. What it currently says is the mail service should be hosted by a neutral party such as ISOC, ICANN, or established specialty not-for-profit organization. The not-for-profit organization could be something such as the DNS Foundation. Do you agree?
Antoinette Johnson:	Yes. But then I raise the question are there other organizations?
Bart Boswinkel:	Let me -- this was more a question for Luis. Maybe this is just looking at the text again and saying if we would change it to something like the mail service should be hosted by a neutral established specialized not-for-profit organization then including a footnote for example ISOC, ICANN, or the DNS Foundation. Then you have them listed. Then you present them as alternatives next to each other and the implementation working group, we listed some as a working group, we listed some of the alternatives we envision and then it's going to be the next one. I'll read the text again. The mail service should be hosted by a neutral specialized not-for-profit organization. And then either you include in here such as or for example, ISOC, ICANN, or the DNS Foundation. You can put them in here or you put them in a footnote. It doesn't matter if you put them in here then it's very clarified. You offer different options and that's for the implementation working group and you list them.
Antoinette Johnson:	As it was read to me, that I feel fits in everything where the such as and you list the organizations all in the same screen so that everyone is on level footing.
Bart Boswinkel:	That's the idea. Then we offer them as alternatives and then it's up to the -- such as -- it also makes it very clear that maybe there are others but these are the three we could think of as a working group.
Antoinette Johnson:	Right. The bullet would read -- what did you say? Could you repeat that language again?
Bart Boswinkel:	The mail service should be hosted by a neutral party established -- or a neutral established specialized not-for-profit organization such as ISOC, ICANN, or the DNS Foundation.

Antoinette Johnson:	Thank you, Bart. I confirmed with my other committee members and they're fine.
Cristian Hesselman:	That would be my point of view, the role of secure domain foundation in this context. At the end we will agree with the proposal but I need to let you know. The offer from secure domain foundation comes in different moments where the mail service was subject to deliver and I'm not sure but I think they offer more than the mailing list. They can provide a little bit more. I do remember, at some point we were thinking about as it's possible to provide these services because they are running what we really need as a considerable repository for -- the reason we didn't use it was because the cost was too high and one of the findings in the survey was because we felt it was for many of the ccTLDs to be part of the repository. We tried to find a different solution because that was very expensive. But in that moment, it was for us an option. I think secure domain foundation is an option now. At the end -- the first -- just let me finish. At the end, the recommendations started with the very secure mailing, running by ISOC or ICANN or anywhere and then the second recommendation is we expand based on our experience and founding model of reiteration. This is a process in the way we can get at the end the content repository in a complete way or as a complete service, including the contact centers. And then the order recommendations and for me it's important that the order of the recommendations that will be taken in that order and they can say there's -- there are options. And the third recommendation is coordinating with the other content repository but this recommendation was taken into account since the beginning of the working group and it's in the reports and we were talking about this interaction. It is for me a kind of light recommendation because it's not a recommendation with real results. My perspective in this was the offer from secure domain foundation could be a recommendation in this list of recommendation in addition to other ones, not as a possible host for the mailing list. But the offer from secure domain foundation and in that way, mention ICANN, ISOC, I can see I probably would prefer to mention the DNS organization before secure domain foundation because I've been there for more time. I don't know if they want to run a mailing list for this service because they're already running something similar. But I explain this because that was my way of perceiving this on the paper.
Antoinette Johnson:	Having explained it that way, if my memory serves me correctly, I thought ICANN would consist of a cost. Is that correct?
Bart Boswinkel:	Could you repeat it again?
Antoinette Johnson:	This decision was made to utilize ISAP or ICANN that would result in a cost, correct?
Bart Boswinkel:	No. That is not the case. It is done in order to ensure hosting
Antoinette Johnson:	Okay. The reason I'm asking the question is listening to what Luis just shared, I'm trying to visualize the difference between being a domain name service offer that was put forth by Mr. Norm as perhaps it could be predictive to our funding model as well. There seems to be a difference in that there's cost involved and Luis takes us through that process with the working group, that there were costs involved in doing certain things and this new offer has come, been presented to the working groups that it does not entail any cost. It would be a no cost service. With the potential to offer other additional services at no cost because of their non-profit standing. So, where we went through the process in the funding model of the option, also the new offer from Norm, could that information be replaced there? Because there's a need for the community to know that -- what transpired. There's a possibility that there's an organization that's already existing that's built with security issues and they do this and they even offer to the overall community to host services for the content repository. I think having to listen to -- I'm hearing

the push back and forth. The conclusion in making light of connecting it with ISOC and ICANN, maybe there is a need to have it as a separate bullet but to say why is not targeted to ISOC and ICANN. What makes it different? I'm hearing that it's different.

Luis Diego Espinoza: I was thinking about this actually. If possible we can ask a recommendation at the end of these recommendations, at the end of the indices. And saying that to be considered, a host, the repository having hosted by a specialized organization and for security domain recommendations because I saw in that line, in this way we have not lost completely the part about the cost in the main recommendation. It's about the cost but we can mention the possibility. At some point if ICANN or ccNSO wants to pay the cost of that, they can do it and we can put it on the recommendation. It's a possibility. In fact, we analyze all the services provided by the -- and this is what we need. The only thing is the cost. If somebody funded if possible and simple then maybe in less scale, particularly if the domain is offering something in there because it's an offer, then I can suggest a new recommendation included in the possibility to have the repository hosted by a specialized organization and not necessarily non-profit. There are a number of organization, commercial organizations, it's a possibility to have these services running on a commercial organization or a foundation. What do you think about that?

Bart Boswinkel: Let's take a step back. I think leaving the text as it is and think about the sequence of based on the results of the survey on the next step. I think everybody and that's as far as I can see from the email, my recollection is everybody agrees we should start very simple with a secure email list. In order to -- and this the most important part -- is to build trust among the community that it works. And we need to do it fast. From that sense it's time we start working. The issue is you've got competitive initiatives like the center email lists. They're starting to build it and you want to avoid duplication and competition among these initiatives. That's the first step and the first recommendation and that's also explained in the document itself. And say there is a layout of the landscape. That's the first step. Do we agree as a group on the first step?

Antoinette Johnson: I agree. Then the second step, because now what I'm hearing the issue to be is mailing list versus actually an option of consideration for a content repository. And also -- so, that would suggest where the push is coming from, the push back.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. That's why I'm backing it a little bit. If we establish that's the first recommendation, that's the starting point, the second point if you look through the documents and the way we've been discussing it is that because it's -- then you take the next step in looking at expanding it because going back to the original recommendations and all the work you put into it is you start looking at a broader kind of service and this is where something like the trusted introducer may come in at the end where something like the DNS Foundation may come in at the end. Maybe they do secure email already. I don't know. So, taking the step back to say -- Okay, you've got the sequence of events will be start with the secure email list, then go into an iterative process to expand the kind of service once it has its body because the real thing is we need to start quickly and we need to get in as many people as possible and that's easy with a very simple service. And then you start building trust and then you go into the next step and the next step would be -- Okay, step back, take the next step, and build it out and that's the recommendation to the council is we offer them a kind of roadmap and in that roadmap in say the s3econd step is there are different alternatives like going for trusted introducer, go to maybe the community itself wants to expand it, or go to the DNS Foundation. Maybe the DNS Foundation already provides something like a secure email list. That's fine as well. That goes back to what we just discussed is the secure email list should be hosted by somebody. You don't

want to say you want somebody and that -- sorry. Let's focus on the secure email list. The secure email list should be hosted preferably by a not-for-profit, well-established organization. That could be ICANN for example and to make clear what we meant as a working group, that could be for example the ISOC or ICANN and ICANN is by some perceived as not neutral. But that's for the next working group. Maybe I don't know whether the DNS Foundation also provides -- maybe they could provide secure email list services. But that's something for the implementation working group to seek out. If we capture this and I think we've almost -- because if you view what we just discussed around the mail service should be hosted, this is where we captured the first step. I think we agreed more or less you could live with it the way we re-edited that sentence around the mail service should be hosted by a neutral, specialized, not-for-profit organization such as ISOC, ICANN, or another third-party and maybe -- I don't know if the DNS Foundation does it.

Then we go back up, scroll up, and we expand based on user experience and review the funding model iteration and maybe go into a more into the content repository and then you say for example as provided by a trusted introducer including what it is, introducer or intruders, or the DNS Foundation, then you captured all the points in a logical sequence and I think it captures your thought and it captures your thought as well.

Luis Diego Espinoza: That's a process I like because it's part of the idea. It's good.

Bart Boswinkel: You lay it out as a kind of roadmap. What I suggest is based on this text I don't mind typing it in when we do it and send it round once more today and if everybody can agree that say by 3 o'clock this afternoon local time. So, that's 2 PM UTC. You sign off on it and then I can still send it to the council. After this meeting. And that's more or less a yes or no because I think we're running out of time. If you agree because that's fairly easy and I think the final point -- Antoinette, do you agree with this approach?

Antoinette Johnson: Yes, thank you. And, Bart, if you get that typed up and sent to me I can probably have my response back to you within an hour.

Bart Boswinkel: So, that would mean it's 2 PM UTC and we are one hour ahead of UTC so that's 3 o'clock this afternoon our time.

Antoinette Johnson: I'll bring it around to you.

Bart Boswinkel: That's 2.5 hours. That should work. Now I think if we've captured this spot, then the next spot would be to -- this thing about the little bits about the regional initiatives, that surfaced fairly recently. I think Cristian mentioned it. You see initiatives for example with incentive. So, the regional organization for Europe, that they're starting a secure email list initiative as well. And that's already dealing with it. That's to avoid you have two competing initiatives at the same time. That's why maybe as a general remark it's C Corporation with already existing or future initiatives.

Luis Diego Espinoza: I think it's very well resumed in the third bullet. Could we -- where we already have repositories such as the ccTLD repository -- very well defined. What we can do is as an example of center as we are adding an example to the second bullet, I agree with that, yes.

Bart Boswinkel: Then I think in my view at least, but I leave it up to you, I think we've captured, we've found a way through the different interpretation of what we had in the draft final report but I leave that up to you.

Luis Diego Espinoza: We have 20 minutes. Why we not try now to approve it?

Antoinette Johnson:	Right now?
Bart Boswinkel:	We can do it right now but Antoinette can't read it.
Antoinette Johnson:	I can pick it up if you send it to me and someone gives me the opportunity I can see the email. I can't go into the Adobe room this morning.
Bart Boswinkel:	No and we don't have an Adobe room. If you want to -- we can use the rest of this hour to agree on the text. That's no problem at all. But we need to send it to the list anyway. I'm not saying we're not using this time but Antoinette needs to read it and go to the computer. We can do it right now, no problem at all.
Antoinette Johnson:	Let's do it right now. Can someone send it to me electronically?
Bart Boswinkel:	Yes. We will.
Antoinette Johnson:	Thank you. I have another comment I'd like to make, please, piggy backing off the other comments I think it's important that organizations or entities have already started work if it's regionally, if it's non-regionally. I think they should all be mentioned so that information is up front. So, I do agree with the last recommendation that was put on the table so that everyone is clear and it's transparent.
Bart Boswinkel:	Absolutely. But the unfortunate thing is we're not all aware of all these initiatives.
Antoinette Johnson:	Absolutely. That's understood. But as far as to the working group's knowledge, you know? That should be mentioned.
Bart Boswinkel:	I fully agree. What we'll do right now is say in this room to get Luis, Cristian, and I will finalize the text, then we'll send it online and then you should have it by the end of this hour. In 20 minutes you should have it. Thank you.
Cristian Hesselman:	Nothing else?
Bart Boswinkel:	No. We can start work now.
Antoinette Johnson:	Good bye, gentlemen. Good bye, support staff.
Bart Boswinkel:	Alright. Bye.