

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

7940 Jones Branch Drive, Tysons, VA 22102  
November 9<sup>th</sup> 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 a 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.