

**Information Sharing and Analysis Organization (ISAO)
Standards Organization (SO) Public Meeting
LMI Headquarters**

7940 Jones Branch Drive, Tysons, VA 22102

November 9th 2015, 7:30 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Read-Out: The “How”

HEIDI GRAHAM: First on the agenda is Mr. Daniel Knight who had the “How” breakout session.

DANIEL KNIGHT: Thanks, everybody. Thanks so much for being here to hear this out. Also, a huge thanks to the participants today. I tried to stress over and over again that the goal was not to redo anything from earlier sessions but to go a little deeper. To see if anything has changed in their environment that might have them change their perspective a little bit. And as I pointed out, really to all you because you’re the participants, that I’m going to take this back and have a lot of fun digesting it because there’s a lot of good comments.

We tackled some—quickly—the process, the collaboration, composition, and formation. One of the nice things I saw—or interesting things coming from a human perspective—is there was a huge focus on standards working group success being driven by decorum. The actual interpersonal skills that we’ve developed at this period of our lives that make us successful. That needs to be in place for the working group. Go back to Rules of Order—something along those lines—to make sure that successful people are brought together for success and not others. We want collaboration and openness, but there’s got to be a balance between getting things done and doing it in a cordial manner.

An interesting concept that came up regarding voting. Someone likened it to an eBay—almost the idea that the clock ticks down—this is how I’m inferring this. The clock ticks down and perhaps you have a real time tally of where the vote lies. So if you feel strongly enough about swaying the vote one way or another you would actually participate. Lest you see the outcome preordained because of your lack of activity. So that was an interesting twist on the vote.

Leaders, in the classic sense, were also seen as key to success to the standards working group. Heard some comments, saw some notes about expertise in the standards working group. But it seemed across the board people were more focused in quality leaders—people who actually can drive towards a goal; wrangle the participants to make sure the outcome is achieved; regardless what the outcome happens to be, but can make things happen. And so it was interesting that there was less technical—less reliance on their technical prowess versus just good clean leadership.

Regarding the enduring or short-lived question, I thought it was nicely posed when it was referred to as strategic or tactical. That’s something certainly worth further consideration. I did, however, notice that nobody thought of short-lived—or it felt like no one thought of short-lived as separate from an enduring working group. So, it was almost a conclusion from the start that the short term working groups—short endurance working groups were a sub-working group. That’s something to make sure we’re on track with as well.

Another key point was knowledge transfer. There was a lot of concern for the ramp up of new

participants, making sure you don't have to re-hash old processes, procedures. So almost like a, "Hey, we went through that before and here's the white paper on it", or the data point that's sitting on a resource electronic or otherwise so new members can get up to speed and participate quickly.

On the aspect of disqualifications, we had a lot of across-the-board-type responses. On the commonality side we had criminal background, cybercrime, things like that nature, but we were less conc—we had less cohesive response regarding corporate interests. For example, someone stacking the deck to a particular advantage one way or another. So I think that's going to take a lot more consideration and deliberation on how those are structured.

So, that was it. Those are my summary notes. Of course I'll be able to do a lot more work on this aspect. Again, thank you so much for participating. It takes effort to stand up there and think hard and I appreciate you guys doing that for us. I think Natalie's going to be here next.

Read-Out: The "What"

HEIDI GRAHAM: So Brad, the floor is yours.

BRAD HOWARD: Thank you.

HEIDI GRAHAM: You're welcome.

BRAD HOWARD: I don't know if I need the microphone but maybe so. Alright, I'd like to echo what Daniel said. Thanks for the participation. It was all incredibly valuable stuff. This is going to make for very fertile information for the working groups to be able to succeed in addressing what standards are going to be needing—needed to come forward.

Let me give you a couple of observations of the—of the three sessions. The passion was absolutely evident. And here are people from different organizations, different backgrounds, all coming together in a group to work four topics I had suggested up. And they worked feverishly, excitedly, throughout all of the 60-70 minutes and sometimes and even beyond. I had to, at the last session, order a "pencils down" because people were still up and scribing. Everybody had an opinion and I don't mean that in a negative way. I think it was very positive. They shared ideas across the board but it was—it was the teamwork of the folks working together to come to contribute those ideas, issues, best practices, ideas that heretofore we had not really absorbed. There was a lot of information and material that came out above and beyond that was in the DHS workshops and we are incredibly grateful for this opportunity to have this information. The one—one complaint that I got was that the sessions were too short. Folks were really getting into the rhythm of the brainstorming and opportunities to perhaps lengthen those in the future for more information will definitely be considered but I appreciate—appreciate everyone's contribution.

So, some of the items that came up and there were differences of opinion, so I'm going to say one thing and I can tell you in a follow-on session there was a comment or a thought that conflicted with it, but....

Funding. Funding was a concern. How do you start up an ISAO? How do you maintain an ISAO? Do you need seed money? How do you prime the pump? And on the other hand, it was mentioned in dialog that, "No, you really don't need money. What you need is time. People can contribute and volunteer their time and you can get this up and running without either the seed money or at least a great

contribution or thinking ahead.”

Wanted to know who certifies and how. Self-certification? If so, how is it recognized?

One of the questions that was written up that we’ll definitely address is, “What’s the purpose of an ISAO?” And you’ve seen a variety of documentation that has come forward from the Executive Order, from DHS workshops and beyond, but that was an interesting question.

Criteria. Criteria across all topics and all subjects. There needs to be identified criteria of—for example, what is certification and what’s the criteria for it? What’s the criteria for information sharing standards? What must people take a look at?

There was a comment that the best way to start an ISAO was to start local, and small, and grow it, instead of trying to create a large entity in the very beginning and then maybe have those ISAOs of either like or sometimes separate requirements grow together into a larger. But start small and then grow it.

Interesting in one of the questions that I had, “What’s required to create an ISAO?” And the answer was very simply, desire. Which I think really hit the nail on the head.

One of the last comments that I was able to capture—and believe me all them were—are very important and all of them will be looked at by Daniel, and myself, and Rick, and Dr. White’s team when we get back. But one of the questions was “Who owns the information? Does the ISAO own the information or does the contributor own the information?” And that was along the lines of, if something is provided to an ISAO how is it then managed from release to the—to the Great Unclean Internet, for example.

So, all of these are excellent. As I’ve said, I’ve got about 48 pages that Marieme, here at LMI, is going to put into a mail tube and it will probably arrive before I get back to San Antonio. But again, my heartfelt thanks. You all did a great job today and I appreciate your time and your energy very much. Thank you.

[Applause.]

Read-Out: Meeting the Urgent Need

HEIDI GRAHAM: Alright. Thank you. And next we have the Urgent Need breakout group. Natalie?

NATALIE SJELIN: Well, I’d like to thank you all, also. Our breakout session was not as dynamic as potentially everything else that you had been accomplishing. Which wasn’t so great for the first group that was here in the morning, because I’m sure you were thinking “We’re sitting and we’re writing. This is not fun.” But then the very last group was very happy after they’d been on their feet all day to come in and sit and relax and to reflect on all of the things that they had been going through throughout the day and then being able to kind of add to the dynamics of what we were trying to capture in the Urgent Needs. So, thank you all very much for the input. To be perfectly honest, we have a stack of input about this high that we’ll be going through and that was all of the great ideas, and thoughts, and efforts that you put down on paper for us—for us to go through. So, yes, thank you, thank you very, very much. I appreciate that.

A couple of things that came out of the session that I just kind of wanted to reiterate (and for some of you, I don't think that the question had been asked or answered). So, in our group, of course, we were gathering information to provide best practices that we would be able to push out as quickly as possible in order to fill the gap and the need of those ISAOs that are actually standing up right now and what do they need to know in terms of how to accomplish this or some of the best practices that would carry across all of the sharing organizations that would be really well-received from a new organization. So that was the intent and the purpose. One of the questions that came out of that was "Well, when do you actually expect to have a product to be pushed out? What was the goal?" So our goal is to provide this as quickly as possible, but not later than the February 2016 timeframe. So, we're looking to provide some sort of initial best practices. It won't be complete. It won't be the end all be all, but it will be an initial start of things that a brand new ISAO can look at to utilize as they stand up.

So having said all of that, just a couple of things that came out of the sessions because we did take an initial recommendation and we had some time to talk about things at the end of the session. To break it up a little bit, just some of the good comments that came out of this in terms of looking at where we can find some of the best practices, what lessons learned we actually need to be addressing and some of the suggestions. So, some of these topics included looking at established organizations (information sharing organizations that are out there) and looking at them as potential models to start our assessments and looking to them for some of their practices to apply to best practices. So that is one of the comments that came out of where we could possibly find some of the best practices that we're hoping to build.

A comment that came out of this was—in order—everyone wants something very, very quickly and we recognize that there's an urgent need for that. However, the comment came that this (actually building an ISAO that will have robust capabilities) may take some time. And so, there's going to be an evolution of capability in those ISAOs and so we want to recognize that yes, we need to do something very quickly. However, the very robustness, the capability-driven piece of that is probably going to evolve over time.

And another piece of that was that members will potentially play a great role in driving the capabilities of each individual ISAO. So depending on what their members are really looking for, it may shape what an ISAO will look like in some given point in time.

Some other great concepts that came out of this were that we talk about incentivizing folks to share information but also with that there are decentives that can drive people to not share.

So some of those concepts kind of came out and of course data analytics is a critical issue and that continues to pop up. What folks really need to know in terms of the operator level in an ISAO and how does actionable information drive what that person needs to know: what capabilities should they actually have.

And I heard it in another session as well: the criteria. Establishing good criteria in each and every piece of what it is that we're trying to accomplish is going to help us in a number of different efforts, to include guidelines that we're trying to put out (to really make them clear and concise). And also, it's going to help us with a number of our trust issues. So, putting out really good established criteria in terms of what it is we're trying to accomplish is going to address some of those other things that we're having issues with.

And also, some places where we can start looking to put together statistical tools, where we can identify where folks can go for certain tools and utilize those as a best practice.

So, those were just some of the things that came out of the Urgent Needs session. And again, I would thank you all very, very much for contributing and being part of this and I hope your handwriting is really legible because I do have to wear these [indicating her glasses]. No, thank you very much.

[Applause.]

Audience Q&A

HEIDI GRAHAM: Thank you. I'd like to reiterate what all of the moderators said: that we asked you to gather information in many different forms; to provide us information in many different ways today; and we appreciate you doing that in all of the different ways that you worked today.

We're going to give you an opportunity now for some open discussion time. First off, I want to acknowledge that the time that we're going to give you is probably not enough for everybody to have an opportunity to say what they want to say. We're going to have a more open discussion time in future meetings but we thought it was really, really important to gather as much information from you as possible and give you a chance to get to know each other in a more structured way. Before I start the open discussion I'd like to ask for consideration of two ground rules. One of them is: when you're up at the mic please limit your comments to a minute so that we can provide everybody an opportunity. It's not my nature to, but I will jump in at the minute in mid-sentence wherever you are and let you know that the minute is up. Also, I'd ask, if at all possible, as you're providing your comments and your input, please phrase them in terms of a recommendation or a solution so that the folks in the ISAO SO can take on those recommendations and those solutions and get better.

That said, if you have a question, Rick, Bryan, and Dr. White will be available to answer questions if you have them. So, the mics are to the far corners in the middle of the room on the right and the left. If you would like to go ahead and speak, please feel free to go ahead and approach one of the mics. I'll check first if we have anybody in the South conference rooms. Okay, so I think we have everybody here and we'll just go ahead and alternate from one mic to the other. Would anybody have anything they would like to share with the large group?

JIM MCCABE: Hi, Jim McCabe of the American National Standards Institute. It's more of a question than a comment, really, about the timeline because I've heard, you know, you got all this data from here today. You're going to go back and analyze everything that was from the prior workshops, and you've got an aggressive timetable to get something out in terms of preliminary deliverables end of February and then there's also a call for additional data, I think. Is there anything more you can talk about in terms of what those deliverables might be and more specifics around the timing of when things are going to happen? (Just because the holidays and stuff are coming up.)

GREG WHITE: I'll go ahead and see if I can take a shot at that. Deliverables: yeah, a bunch of stuff. We hope, as it was mentioned before, primarily—the major thing obviously standards, but templates, guidelines, processes and procedures, all those kinds of things. Now that said, we harbor no illusions about how long it's going to take to develop certain standards. We know that there are going to be—you saw like you said that aggressive timeline. We fully recognize that there are going to be certain topics—certain standards that are going to be developed that are going to be more complex; that will take more time; that will not be completed by not only February, but it might not be completed in that first year because the discussion will need to continue. At the same time, we think that there are some

other things, especially some best practices, some guidelines, maybe some templates that can be used (as Natalie mentioned) for organizations and entities that are trying to form those ISAOs right now that we can get out soon. So those are the things that we anticipate getting out in the February time frame. I don't anticipate seeing a lot of standards being mentioned in February. You're going to see some of those—if you will—easier ones that will come out shortly after that in that time frame that you saw. But the one thing we don't want to wait on is to get everything together—one big package—and then say, "Here it is! Here is the entire set of standards, the templates, the guidelines. Boom! Publish them at the same time", because people can't wait. There are, like I said, entities forming ISAOs right now and we want to help them so that they may not go off on a tangent somewhere that they're going to have to come back from later. I don't know if that answers the question.

HEIDI GRAHAM: Alright, who would like to go next?

ERIC BURGER: I'll follow up on Jim's question because I'm not quite sure, I guess. So what I'm hearing is that for February, we're basically going to say, "Hey, we talked to a bunch of people and this is what they're saying." We're not doing any standards, right? We're not doing—because when you say a template or, you know, processes and stuff, that sounds like a standard which I would think you'd probably want community review. Or is there no plans for community review for that? That, you know, you kind of just churn out right when you get—when you think you've got something you can give people.

HEIDI GRAHAM: Sir, if you wouldn't mind stating your name and organization.

ERIC BURGER: Sorry.

HEIDI GRAHAM: Thank you.

ERIC BURGER: Eric Burger. Georgetown University.

HEIDI GRAHAM: Thank you.

GREG WHITE: Okay, let me—let me—obviously I didn't do a very good job of answering it. What we're talking about for February is: we're going to go through—cull through all the information that we received today, the data call that is going to be coming up. If you remember that rough timeline that was shown in the early part of the day, by February we're going to try to have—we're not going to try-- we're going to go ahead and stand up a number of the different working groups. We're going to identify those working groups and have them stood up and have them starting to meet. Well, there's no way they're going to be able to have a standard created in one or two meetings that they might be able to have before the February second open forum. So, we don't anticipate a lot of standards. We don't anticipate any of the standards. What we think we may be able to find or identify are probably more best practices, probably guidelines on how, "Okay, so you want to start up an ISAO. Where do you start? What's step one?" Those kind of documents. Those kind of guides to help an organization or a group of entities that want to form an ISAO. Those are the kind of things that we anticipate having by the February time frame.

HEIDI GRAHAM: Alright. Who'd like to go next? I'm going to take the microphone to my left if that's alright, sir, and then we'll follow up with you. Thank you.

SCOTT ALGEIER: So, thank you. Good afternoon. Can you hear me?

HEIDI GRAHAM: Yep.

SCOTT ALGEIER: Great. Scott Algeier with the Information Technology ISAC. I appreciate the clarification about the timeline because I had—I was the one who had those questions earlier in the morning, so that's great. Thank you. Regarding the working groups, what's the next step in identifying—how do we identify what the next working groups are and who's on them? When they meet? Whether we're focusing on the right areas in those working groups? What's the next steps in establishing and creating the missions for those working groups?

RICK LIPSEY: Thanks very much for the question, Scott. The intent is, coming out of this initial public meeting today, we are going to combine the analysis and synthesis of information from the previous workshops (that I alluded to earlier this morning) with what we received today. So, the session that you were in with Brad Howard was really focused on the "What". We're going to take a look at that "What" and put that together with the inputs that we get from the earlier meetings into some logical buckets that make sense: "Okay, this is a logical basis for a working group"—informed by the discussions held in Daniel's room that were talking about the process and the nature of the working groups. That's how we're going to package that. So I can't tell you what that is today, but that's what we're going to be working on for the next several weeks. Then we'll go—we'll initiate the process of a call for nominations for leadership positions on those working groups to get them formed and running.

SCOTT ALGEIER: Thanks.

RICK LIPSEY: You bet.

HEIDI GRAHAM: So thank you. As I pass the mic to my right I'd ask the speakers to go ahead and state their name and organization clearly and speak clearly into the mic so that we can get a great recording of this session. Thank you.

ROGER CALLAHAN: Roger Callahan. I'm representing the FS-ISAC and it's more of a question. The question I guess I'm looking at is, "Is there a description of what the analysis process is", right? Because as I look through at the challenge you have, right, there's 23 comments on the docket. There was workshops all over the place, you know, with huge amounts of text available. There's been lots of—there's lots of reporting on what should ISAO metrics look like, you know, maturity models, et cetera. So, I'm struggling a little bit to understand what is the analysis process you're going to use, and is it focused on identifying what those tiers are, or how is that going to be developed?

RICK LIPSEY: The analysis process is still in development, frankly. So, the guys have built a framework and a tool to help with that. I'm certain we're going to evolve that as we go based on the discussions that we have here. To be clear, the purpose of the analysis and the synthesis is to try and make the information that has already been pulled together through previous meetings, and through what we're getting in this meeting, and what we're going to get in the data call accessible, and that it is accessible to the working groups. So we're putting things into logical categories to allow—to be able to provide that in a distilled way to the working groups. So if we have comments on—reflective of ISAO membership: "What are considerations of who should be members of ISAOs? And what types of memberships should we have?", we're going to try to collect all those comments and suggestions and concepts into a bucket that we're going to hand to a working group that is then going to step through the process of developing

statements of principle, policies, process flow diagrams associated with ISAO membership.

GREG WHITE: In terms of the tiers—is that the second half of the question? I was going to go ahead and start talking about that one. We recognize that—I mean, if you take a look at the existing ISAOs that are out there, including the ISACs, we anticipate in especially the comments that we’re receiving from DHS that there’s going to be a tremendous proliferation of entities and organizations wanting to form ISAOs. They’re going to vary tremendously in not only the type of membership, but the individuals—what information they’re going to be willing to share, and so on and so forth. One of the things that we’re working on right now (and I talked to DHS, and we talked to some other folks about, and most likely we’ll have a data call on this as well), is I want to start establishing some use cases. Some descriptions of—can we identify the different types of information sharing organizations that will be created? Can we envision this and—take a shot at trying to envision that and from those use cases that we develop and the different types of information sharing organizations, how will they share information? What kind of information are they going to be interested in sharing? How are they going to share it with the government? Will they not share it with the government? Will they share it with the other entities? So on and so forth. Develop those use cases and use that to help start up a conversation on, “Okay then, now, here’s some different potential use cases that we’ve identified: different types of organizations, different types of information sharing that may take place ultimately. Can we start creating a tiered structure around that?” And I’m not sure if tier implies a hierarchical. I’m not sure if it’s as much a hierarchical as its multiple categories of Information Sharing and Analysis Organizations. So, a lot of work to be done on that. It will also, as Rick mentioned, everything is going to be done in the open. So we’re going to be doing some work and then we’re going to be putting it out there for public comment. So we anxiously anticipate: a) the things that we come up with, and b) what you’re going to be telling us. “Did we miss it? Did we miss the mark on these? Did we forget something? Did we not include something? Did we have a comprehensive set of use cases or did we just not think of some possibilities?”

BRIAN ENGLE: I was just going to join in on that comment. One of the things that was really interesting in the sessions (and I think it’s something that we can definitely consider when we think about the aspect of tiers) is that there were a number of things that were brought about that are sort of questions. And I’ll just take the case of self-certified versus certified: is that an answer to a question, or is there a set of criteria that actually delineates across different tiers? And I think we’re going to have the ability to look at a lot of those types of things that have multiple answers or divergent opinions, and see how they actually fit into tiers of different types of sharing organizations. And that’s just the process that working groups are going to have to go through as they kind of break that down and match those up to the needs of sharing organizations as they either exist in their formation or exist today or as they form throughout this process. And also looking at the existing structures of things like the ISACs and seeing where those types of things are working really well and where we can apply different principles to emerging organizations. So, just to summarize that, I think it’s a really powerful opportunity to take some of these things that we have as questions and not look at them as “Yes/No”, but look at them in varying degrees of, perhaps, maturity, or things that can be tackled in tiers of different types of organizations.

GREG WHITE: And if I can add one further comment on that: this is going to have to be done in parallel with some of these other things. Because we do not want to establish the working groups, have them go off for six months doing a lot of great work, and then say, “Oh, by the way, you need to consider this tiered structure.” So these tiers—we’re going to need to have a skeleton (at least) of the tiers when we form the working groups so they can keep that in mind as they develop the standards, processes,

procedures, so on and so forth.

HEIDI GRAHAM: Alright, so you've been patiently waiting. Thank you.

DAVID TURETSKY: David Turetsky, Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld. What impact, if any, do you anticipate the passage of the information sharing legislation by Congress might have on your work plan, on your definition of groups, on your timelines?

GREG WHITE: Okay, I'll go ahead and jump into that one there. Good question. Don't know. To be honest, we are obviously—we're cognizant of the issues that are going on—the things that are going on up on Capitol Hill. We fully recognize that Congress may pass some bill that may impact what we're doing in this information sharing and analysis effort. And if and when that occurs we will obviously have to deal with it because while we—if you notice the intention here was to not. . . . To go back to some of the earlier diagrams, to go back to the Executive Order: the intent of this Standards Organization is not to create regulations, not to suggest to Congress any kind of bills that need to be passed, not to do any of that. We're separate from that. That said, if Congress comes along and passes some bills related to information sharing, we have to follow the laws. So, they will have to be considered and we'll have to see how that will impact anything that we have done or are doing at that time. If that sounds like I'm tap dancing, yes, because I simply don't know what's going to happen in Congress. Will it pass? We know something's passed in the Senate. What's the House going to do with it? What's going to happen in Committee? I don't know. My crystal ball is too murky to be able to tell.

HEIDI GRAHAM: Sir, before you respond to that, if I may, may I check and see if there's anybody else who would like to speak? And then I'll go ahead and pass the mic back to you.

DAVID TURETSKY: Let me just finish the question.

HEIDI GRAHAM: So, is there anyone else who would like to speak?

[Silence.]

HEIDI GRAHAM: Sir, go ahead please.

DAVID TURETSKY: I was just going to finish up by saying, respectfully, I understand where you're coming from but, respectfully, my suggestion, in the spirit of suggestions and recommendations, would be that you have some sort of plan in anticipation, because you have very tight time tables. There are some pretty momentous things that are included. I don't know what the answer is on what the impact—you know, how to organize the impact. I think it is very, very clear there will be (if it passes) a major impact and so, respectfully, I just suggest that you come up with a plan internally to anticipate that so you'll know what to do. I don't have any specific suggestion for you now. That's all.

GREG WHITE: Absolutely, and I apologize if it seemed if I was being somewhat flippant in my answer. In my other job as the Director for the Center for Infrastructure Assurance and Security, we are actually heavily involved with various congressional offices and know what's going on with some of the bills. So we are tied into—we have our own lobbying folks up in DC for our own purposes and those folks are tied in very strongly with certain offices and so we are keeping cognizant of what's going on, what's being done, what is being said, what's going on behind the scenes, so that we are not caught off guard but I guess we're just not ready to make any kind of statement about how that's going to impact us at

this point.

HEIDI GRAHAM: Alright. Sir, to my left.

KENT LANDFIELD: Kent Landfield from Intel Corporation. My question is we've done this work today. How are you going to communicate with the group in this room going forward? We don't have a website. We don't have e-mail other than one e-mail address (and that was really through DHS, initially). So, when are we going to see some infrastructure around the ISAO Organization so that we can start collaborating?

RICK LIPSEY: Thank you. Excellent question. So that's at the top of my hit list. I would like to have that already in place, but the truth of the matter is we've been focused on putting together the event you've been participating in today. So, building out that website if what's next for us. In the interim, the answer is that we've established the ISAO@lmi.org box. So I'd encourage you to use that. Feel free to contact any of us individually. We have your e-mail addresses through the registration process that we had today. So until such time as we get that web presence—that public presence up and running that's how we're going to do things initially. And the Twitter account. We have the Twitter account.

HEIDI GRAHAM: Alright, sir, you have the floor.

JAMIE CLARK: Good afternoon. I'm Jamie Clark from OASIS which is where the STIX and TAXII standards are being handled. DHS gave us the adoption agency custody over their babies and we're going to try and help bring 'em up. First of all, thank you to all of you for taking this on. A lot of work in 60 days and it's helpful to have some structure for what we're doing. I come from "standards planet", not "beltway planet". And following up on what my friend from Intel said a second ago, let me just mention a cultural issue which I noticed today and has been present in other similar projects. Because this isn't our first rodeo. We did it with SGP. We did it with NSTIC. We did it with ebXML with some of the people in this room 20 years ago. As soon as you can, please move the dialog into dialog. Notice that when the gentleman asked, "How do we communicate with each other?", you said, "You can talk to us by e-mail. Just to us. And we can talk to you." No vehicle for talking with each other. I work for OASIS. If I get up and say, "OASIS wants this. OASIS wants that. OASIS has an opinion. . ."

HEIDI GRAHAM: [Interrupts.] One minute.

JAMIE CLARK: . . . my members will kill me. It needs to be about what the members want and you need to turn that around. Thank you.

HEIDI GRAHAM: You're welcome, sir. Thank you.

RICK LIPSEY: That's a great observation and great input. Thank you. Obviously, it is our intent to create a platform where we can have that type of dialog that we're talking about.

JAMIE CLARK: Hopefully before most of the decisions are reached.

RICK LIPSEY: Obviously! [laughter] It goes without saying, thank you.

GREG WHITE: And through the work groups. The working groups will definitely be a collaborative environment with a lot of information sharing going between the members of the working groups. Not

only is the working group going to be collaborative, we recognize that not everybody will be able to be a member of every working group (or may have the time) and so there's going to be an opportunity for the public to comment on what it is that the working groups are doing as well. So we do want this to be very open and very collaborative. We just don't have all the mechanisms in place right at this moment.

BRIAN ENGLE: I was going to jump in because one of the things in the comments that came out that I think is noteworthy for us to realize is that this process somewhat started with an Executive Order, and it sort of has started today, and then it's going to have another "sort of" start in February. We're in a project now that is going to have people joining mid-stream, and mid-stream is always going to be a new and different place. So, I think it's really incumbent upon the working groups to be able to sort of encapsulate to date and be able to make the things that are sort of reached, not just significant decisions. Because we don't want to have to do another workshop and rehash and capture what we captured kind of things, right? So I guess I'm sort of reiterating for the record here or whatever to make sure that our working groups really think about that process and they think about time capsuling along the way so that people that jump in midstream always have a way of sort of seeing what's been arrived at to this point.

HEIDI GRAHAM: Thank you. Do we have any other comments or questions?

[Silence.]

HEIDI GRAHAM: Okay. I'm going to wait until it's just uncomfortable just so that anybody that wants to share will have an opportunity.

[Silence.]

HEIDI GRAHAM: Alright. Last call?

[Silence.]

HEIDI GRAHAM: Great. Thank you. I'll pass the floor to Dr. White for closing comments. Thank you, everybody.

[Applause.]

Closing Comments

GREG WHITE: Well, I'm not going to take a long time here. I just have a couple minutes and I'm going to keep it to a couple minutes. So it looks like we may get out just a little bit early. Rick will have a few comments right after I'm finished here. First of all, I want to thank everybody for being here. Thank you for your interest in this very important topic. Thank you for your willingness to help out, to help us specifically with this effort and move this effort forward. I would also like to thank LMI for the opportunity we have to meet here in this facility. It's a tremendous facility. A great facility and thank you Fire Eye as well as SAE for lunch and for breakfast today. We had a lot of people, as was mentioned. This is Day 40 and so we didn't have a lot of plans in place before 1 October when things started, so things have come together fairly quickly and I'm very appreciative of LMI for taking the reins and making this happen today.

When I started this morning I mentioned, if I recall correctly, I had two real goals—two purposes in mind for this meeting today. I wanted to: a) use this for an opportunity for us to introduce ourselves to you so you can get to know us a little better, know some of our plans, some of our thoughts. Obviously, not everything is set in stone. We are going to be flexible on this because we have a lot of work to do. We're gathering data even as we speak here on the information. Hopefully, you had an opportunity to get a little bit better feel for who we are and what our plans are and how we're going to be moving forward.

The other thing was we wanted to be able to receive some feedback and some information from you folks. Now, we fully realize and recognize that there have been other efforts. There have been some other efforts. There have been some other meetings that have occurred. There have been public comments that have been out there and we want to assure you that we have diligently been going through all of that material. That said, we recognize there may have been some duplication of efforts and that's okay as far as we're concerned because it has provided us an opportunity. Today, there were, I'm sure, undoubtedly, individuals who were at the meeting today that were not able to participate in the other meetings or in the public comments that have occurred. So, they've had an opportunity to join in with this effort. And then, as was mentioned—as Brian mentioned, there's going to be people jumping in at all sorts of different points along the way, so this was valuable in that respect. It was also valuable for us to be able to talk to you folks. As you all know, there's the transcripts that are out there. The public comments are out there. But a lot of what's going on—we benefit a lot from those sidebars, from those informal conversation. From being able to meet with you folks face to face and ask, "Okay, you made this comment here. I just want to make sure I understand what you really meant", and we have those informal conversations. That's tremendously helpful for us. So, we're very thankful for you to be here—very thankful for that opportunity.

We will be posting notes. We will be posting, as Rick mentioned. As soon as we get the website and other methods to communicate with us, we'll be sending e-mails out about that so that you do have multiple ways to get in touch with us; that you have opportunities to download the things that are being—our calls, our data calls to provide comments for that so we can continue with that open, collaborative process that we promised. Rick mentioned the ISAO@lmi.org. At this point, that's probably the best way to communicate with us, so send us an e-mail there. Twitter, whichever you prefer. We monitor that Twitter. Everyday we're looking at that to see what's going on.

We look forward to working with all of you. We're very excited about this effort. This is an extremely important effort for the Nation. I'm sure you all recognize that. We all understand how important this information sharing task is to the cybersecurity of the Nation and how important cybersecurity is for the overall security of the Nation. So, we look forward to working with all of you. We're excited to be here. We're excited to be part of this effort. And I want to, once again, thank you all for participating. Hopefully we'll see some of you in San Antonio. Rick.

[Applause.]

RICK LIPSEY: So, I had to take a minute to share with you a little bit about my son. I'm very proud of my son. He was the valedictorian of his high school class and as he's getting ready to go off for college he tells me he's going to major in engineering and I thought, "Wow! This is great." So I ask him, "Is this electrical engineering or computer engineering?" He was like, "Dad, I don't really want to do that. I like robots. I like building stuff. I want to do mechanical engineering." I thought, "Wow, I kind of missed the boat in passing something on to him." But I'm very proud of the fact that he is attending Rice University.

So, we talked earlier today about the challenge that the Nation is facing in the cybersecurity realm. There were some comments that were made at Rice University pertinent to that challenge that I think are pertinent to this challenge and I just wanted to share that with you.

[Recording of President Kennedy encouraging the Nation to stay the course to go to the moon.]

The short version is, we choose to do these things not because they are easy, but because they are hard. And that's what we're facing here. That's the challenge in front of us.

Okay, so if you're like me at the end of the day like this your brain hurts and you want to give it a rest and so we've got opportunity to do that. If you're up to more dialog with the people that you've met in this room, we're going to convene down the street at The Hilton. So, if you go out our main entrance from LMI make a left and it's the second building on your left. You'll go past Hilton's Worldwide Headquarters and the Hilton Hotel there. We got the main bar reserved and so we hope that you'll join us out there. I would love to share a beverage with you and continue the conversation there. If not, please get in touch with us and we look forward to working with you in the future. That's it. Thank you all very much. Have a great day.

[Applause.]