

Should WG11 prepare a Second Edition of the *Incident Response Guide*?

Issues for consideration



Should WG11 prepare a Second Edition of the *Incident Response Guide*? Issues for consideration

1. There is obviously conceptual merit in expanding the Incident Response Guide (IRG) to include foreign jurisdictions, but is there a pressing need?
2. For context, the original IRG drafting team looked at a comprehensive approach to world-wide jurisdictions when we were first scoping the IRG, and one of our drafting team members spent a fair amount of time cataloging the laws in 100 +/- jurisdictions; while interesting, it was not possible to add value in the same way as the drafting team did with regard to the US jurisdictions, so the not-too-difficult decision was made to abandon that dimension.
3. The biggest challenge will be the scope of any expanded summary. It would not be feasible or for the most part even all that helpful to collect the laws of say 100+ jurisdictions, so where does one draw the line? Clearly there are some obvious candidates: EU/UK; Canada; various Asian countries; Brazil and perhaps other South American countries.
4. Bottom line: this presents a very interesting opportunity for WG11, but the devil will be in the details.
5. Rather than trying to anticipate and solve all of these issues, perhaps the best approach would be incremental. Should a Brainstorming Group be formed to dig into, and think further, on this issue? Depending on the results of that process, the Steering Committee can make a much more informed decision on the merits of the proposal.
6. If such a brainstorming group, and then ultimately a drafting team, is formed, is it critical that those actually practicing in the areas that comprised the jurisdictions be part of a brainstorming group and later a drafting team?