

**Fast Flux PDP WG Teleconference
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 20 May 2009 14:30 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Fast Flux PDP WG teleconference on Wednesday 20 May 2009, at 14:30 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:
<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ff-20090520.mp3>

Present :

Present for the teleconference:

James Bladel - GodaddyRRc - Working Group chair
Greg Aaron - Afiliis Ry c.
Paul Diaz - Registrar

(no constituency affiliation)

Rod Rasmussen
Randall Vaughn

Absent- apologies Observers -

Kal Feher - Registrar
Joe St. Sauver
Jose Nazario

Staff:

Marika Konings
Dave Piscitello
Glen de Saint Gery
Gisella Gruber-White

Glenn Desaintgery: Are you there?

Coordinator: The recording has been started.

Glen Desaintgery: Thank you very much indeed. I'll do the roll call.

We have on the line James Bladel who is the leader of the group, Rod Rasmussen, Paul Diaz, Randal Vaughn, Greg Aaron. And for staff we

have Marika Konings, Glen Desaintgery, and Gisella Gruber-White who will very often be taking over the calls from me.

James Bladel: Thank you Glenn.

Glen Desaintgery: And we have apologies from Kal Feher said that he can't be on the call and I think that was all for today.

James Bladel: I have an apology from (Joe St Sauver as well. He responded directly to me.

Glen Desaintgery: All right. Okay.

Marika Konings: And I am just paging Dave to see if he's joining. No response yet.

Glen Desaintgery: (Well I just have it from Calfera).

James Bladel: Okay, well good morning everyone and welcome back to those of you who were in Barcelona last week. As you can tell by the proposed agenda that I sent out earlier this morning, it's essentially the same To-do list that we addressed last week although there has been some traffic on the list regarding the final sections that need some drafting work.

(Rod), with you on the call, would you be willing to carry the load without Dave and walk us through Category 4? We've kind of deferred this for a couple of weeks now and I would prefer that we not kick that can any further down the road.

Rod Rasmussen: I'm certainly willing to talk about it. I don't know if -- I'm getting in my car right now so I can't really walk us through.

James Bladel: Oh, okay.

Rod Rasmussen: If there's any questions or comments, I can certainly address them.

James Bladel: How about I start us off with 4A and then if there are any questions, we can jump in there. Is that acceptable?

Rod Rasmussen: Sure.

James Bladel: Okay.

Rod Rasmussen: Sorry for the kids fighting in the background but they're only play fighting.

James Bladel: No problem.

But the response that was submitted for comment 4A was that there need to be strict laws in place to allow registrars and hosting companies to (unintelligible). And there was a fairly lengthy response. I guess the first question that I would have is, is this comment introducing new information or is it addressed elsewhere in the report? And that question is directed at (Rod) or anyone else in the group that has an opinion on 4A.

Rod Rasmussen: Yeah sure. I think -- sorry about that -- I think that it's probably clarifying or trying to clarify other points in the paper and bring them forward.

So we kind of took on the aspect of trying to answer the question with -
- rather than referring to the document on that one is actually doing a
direct answer I think on it.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: I'm sorry. If I could pose the question a different way before we go too
deeply into this. Our calls for legislation, does the group feel that's
appropriate to include that in the report?

Rod Rasmussen: Legislation, no, certainly not within the scope that ICANN can
actually do anything directly about. I think we're just trying to answer
the question as it was posed because I don't recall exactly how we
answered at the time. But I think we did -- I think (we went to reference
some) existing legislation that kind of answered that question as well if
I remember right.

James Bladel: I think (Rod), that you and Dave appropriately mentioned here that
ICANN is not a legislature - legislator. And any legislation might be --
(it'll be) created would fall outside the scope of ICANN. So I think that
that's an appropriate inclusion of that and perhaps that really might be
the limit of all we would need to say on this topic if we wanted to keep
it brief.

There are certainly other valid points in response to comment 4A but I
think that the first and foremost is that this is not within ICANN's
purview. And I think that you guys have captured that fairly well in the
first two sentences.

Any thoughts from the group? Disagreements?

Randal Vaughn: Those two sentences look good to me. This is Randy.

James Bladel: Okay. Greg? Paul?

Man: Yeah, I agree James it looks good now.

James Bladel: Okay. Well let's...

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I just have one question because there was I think a question from (Joe) on the list to provide a bit more details on the Ryan Haight Online Pharma and Consumer Protection Act to get some more details on that safe harbor provision. So I don't know if anyone has that information or would be able to share that with the list because it might be helpful to include that here as well.

Rod Rasmussen: I think that's what I was referring to as the other legislation.

Actually James you might be able to get access to that (unintelligible) over to (Ben Butler) (unintelligible) given the APWG a presentation on that. I haven't heard back from him on a couple other things, but I think he might be out right now or really busy, either way.

James Bladel: I think he's on vacation this week but I can PING him, I'm sure.

((Crosstalk))

Rod Rasmussen: ...your legal counsel, (Christine), I think, was a big part of that as far as the efforts to get that (unintelligible), you know, doing some lobbying

around there (unintelligible) what have you of it. But anyways I know that within the organization over there, there was some internal knowledge about how that would work still.

James Bladel: I think I could reach out to them and I would be willing to do that. The question I would have in response to that is -- and the results of our work with, you know, the U.S. government and, you know, therefore has a limited jurisdiction and certainly not within -- as we mentioned the first two sentences -- not within the scope of ICANN. Does that warrant including it or maybe we can mark it as a reference or refer to it and then put a footnote in the annex or...

Marika Konings: Well I think one of the questions was and I must say I had to look as well at this Act and I think (Joe) did the same thing. And to neither of us it was obvious which provision provides that safe harbor. So one question would be is the reference correct here? Can we make sure that indeed that Act has that kind of provision so if we refer to it, it's actually the correct information? So and if not...

Rod Rasmussen: Right.

Marika Konings: ...we might, you know, not need to include it. Or if it's correct we might want to discuss in it how we refer to it and indeed with those caveats that it's, you know, particular country it applies there and it's not, you know, for ICANN to develop that kind of legislation.

Rod Rasmussen: I think that the real - the point of putting that in there at all was to kind of answer the question (unintelligible) directly saying, "Well, there is some legislation. There is an example of this out there." So (unintelligible) happens to be at least one.

But that - and the question is, does that really apply? I was - my comment there was based on the presentation that James gave the APWG where he specifically mentioned safe harbor provision. So we're trying to track down exactly how that worked, you know, because it wasn't clear from the actual language in the law.

Several of us went and reviewed it and wasn't clear where that appears. So clarifying that would be important if we're going to include that. I think it's important to include a reference because there actually is something there that is directly (unintelligible). That was my point.

James Bladel: I will take it as an action item to reach out to our legal team and get some clarification on that - whether that language is applicable. I'll post their response or (unintelligible) what their determination is back to the list and then we can decide whether or not we want to include a reference to that or whether we feel it's (unintelligible). If it's a wild goose chase, we can mention that as well. So but I'll try and get some clarification on exactly what that law says, what may or may not apply.

Okay, moving on to B, C, and E are consolidated comments because they're -- I believe there was a good deal of overlap between these three. It's substantially addressing the idea that DNS activity should be monitored, suspicious behavior should be reported. Fast flux, we should adopt or at best consider measures that make fast flux more difficult to perform or economically unattractive and develop an accelerated domain suspension process.

And looking over your response Dave and (Rod), I just wanted to first pose to the group, does anyone feel that these comments are

addressed within the report and the existing language need to be addressed or modified or should be expanded upon?

Any thoughts on that?

Man: I believe the answer is actually trying to address limited contractual relationships that ICANN has. I think that's kind of an important issue that, you know, ICANN only has certain abilities that fall within their contract with the registrars and registries. At least that's what I'm getting with that first sentence.

James Bladel: In the first sentence of the response...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yeah, the proposed answer there. You know, I think the important thing is there are limitations based on contractual relationships. And since Dave and (Rod) engineered that, I think they're trying to communicate that. And I hate to second guess you guys.

Rod Rasmussen: I think that's essentially the point. The - and to answer James's question, I think that all this (unintelligible) is essential to the entire (unintelligible) and our report. So it's in the report already. In various places it's covered. Again I think we took the approach of answering the question by -- or (unintelligible) all together with trying to answer directly within the response.

But I don't know that there's anything in there that we mentioned that wasn't already mentioned somewhere else in the report.

(Unintelligible) certainly taking the approach of, "Well, I'll just refer them to section blah blah, section wah wah or whatever."

(Unintelligible) or we could do this or add (unintelligible) most of the, you know, (unintelligible) was covered in the report (unintelligible) might help clarify things.

We're not try -- I don't think we're really trying to introduce anything new here. The concept is -- do you have a (unintelligible) response to the question.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you (Rod). Does anyone recognize anything in this that is not addressed within our report or maybe we did not address it thoroughly enough and we should go back and touch those sections?

Okay, we'll take silence to indicate that there's general agreement with Rod's assessment that the report addresses these in various sections and does so thoroughly. The question then to Marika, do we need to find those specific areas and go through this point by point? Or can we just make a comprehensive statement that these comments are addressed throughout the report?

Marika Konings: I guess that's for the group to decide. Of course it's nice to be able to point exactly to where it's addressed but as (unintelligible) quite lengthy of course it's a tedious work as well. So I'll leave that up, I mean, to the group.

You know, maybe when people actually review the whole report and have a read through maybe they can take these documents with it and basically note down where they feel certain points have been

addressed so that way I can incorporate it. But I'm happy to leave it as well if the group feels that it has been covered in various parts in the report.

James Bladel: I can probably find an instance or two for each one of these comments and then post that to the list and then we can also say, "This is addressed in section whatever and in other areas." And we can -- that way we don't have to engage in the scavenger hunt that you were talking about where we're reading through the entire report looking for any mention of these topics.

Because I think (Rod) is correct in that, you know, this is to some degree these three comments summarize or provide a synopsis of many topics that are discussed within in the report. And maybe we can just point the reader to those topics and then indicate that there may be other places as well.

Marika Konings: That would be great. And when you do that it probably would be helpful if you just, you know, give the section or chapter number because, you know, normally in the final report I think we're going to take out the line numbers and they're changing anyway because we're still editing the report. So I think it would be best to give either the section number or the chapter or refer to it in that way. That might be easiest.

James Bladel: Okay. I will do so - section and chapter.

Rod Rasmussen: I think the question is general enough that a general section is really the answer anyway. I think that (unintelligible) Dave or somebody was making a comment (unintelligible) clearly (unintelligible). We're going to assume they only looked at like the

executive summary or the like (unintelligible) detail (unintelligible) their comments based on what they assumed was in the report or was not in the report.

So a lot of these (unintelligible) seems like questions that were supposed to be addressed in the report anyway. Just trying to make a (unintelligible) response.

James Bladel: (Rod), you were breaking up just a little bit there but I think what I heard you say is that some of the folks may have formulated their responses without really seeing or gathering that these topics were covered pretty thoroughly throughout later parts of the documents. Or they were perhaps commenting on the first instance of this topic without reading it.

Rod Rasmussen: Correct. That's basically just the way I just said it, yeah.

James Bladel: Okay. I was having some difficulty hearing you. It might just be on my end.

Rod Rasmussen: It could be mine too. I'm driving down the freeway.

James Bladel: Okay. Moving on to Comment D, which reads, "Registrars should undertake more diligence when registering these domain names. Registrars (unintelligible) create an environment that invites abuse. And they do not maintain adequate staff policies to prevent it."

The response here was -- I think there are some things that are new here. The response would be additional measures to mitigate malicious registration may reduce tax, however, the development of

policy and agreements is outside the scope of this working group. Fast flux hosting is just one technique (unintelligible) to tax. And the working group will forward this comment on to the Registration Abuse Working Group.

So (unintelligible) questions on that comment.

Man: I think there's also an aspect to 4D which is about business practices and accreditation. And I think the person who wrote the comment is basically saying he or she would like to see certain registrars devote minimum resources to certain things. That is something that's outside of the things that we mention in the answer. It really goes to the question of who gets accredited as a registrar.

Rod Rasmussen: And it goes to what their requirements are to be a registrar as part of the RAA perhaps.

Greg Aaron: I think maybe what we could do is...

James Bladel: Greg, can I ask a question?

Greg Aaron: Yeah.

James Bladel: As the chair of the Registration Abuse Working Group, do you feel that this fits or is this a dodge for this group to recommend that the questions or comments be redirected to that group? Or what are your thoughts on that? Is that an appropriate inclusion?

Greg Aaron: Well in my opinion fast flux is not a registration issue. It's a use issue. But the problem is that criminals go and buy domain names. That's the

problem that the person is trying to deal with. And I don't know if this is frankly a very clear-cut issue.

James Bladel: Does this comment specifically out these proposed remedies to the problem of fast flux? Or is it just more of a general statement on the anti-abuse efforts of registrars?

Greg Aaron: I think our proposed response is correct in saying that the development of policy and agreements that deal with malicious registration is outside the scope of the group. I'm going to defer on saying whether it's outside the scope of the RAP because we haven't gotten that far yet.

James Bladel: Okay.

Greg Aaron: I mean I have no objection referring it to the RAP because this is going to come up in some form in that group, that issue in general -- have access to domain names and bad guys registering them. Yeah, I don't know how it's going to turn out yet. We'll have to work through the process.

James Bladel: Okay. I agree.

We probably shouldn't speak on behalf of what will or will not be (unintelligible) to that other group. And I think that you're correct that making sort of overarching statements about registration abuse is outside of the scope of the fast flux PDP. You know, there may be some connection or relation or dependency but this particular comment is inviting us to go in a different direction.

Greg Aaron: Yeah, there's -- let me just circle back to something. The person is asked about registrar qualifications and resources. My question is, is our response addressing that?

James Bladel: It may not be. I'm trying to remember, do we refer to things like the APWG, registrar's best practices, documents anywhere within the report at this point? I know we talked about it but -- and that almost gets back to that as a...

Greg Aaron: I'm pretty sure we do. We do discuss -- and actually best practices is I think also a recommendation that we've made, that that would be further explored.

((Crosstalk))

Man: And I think that comes...

((Crosstalk))

Rod Rasmussen: ...of dealing with -- one of the ways of dealing with fast flux is getting it less impactful is to actually have more resources at the registrars looking at these things -- reports as they come in. And that's a valid way of helping handle the problem, so in that respect the question is dead on. (Unintelligible). We didn't really answer it from that perspective.

James Bladel: Well we do site the APWG report on registrar best practices starting around line 300 and provide the link as well.

Rod Rasmussen: Okay. So that might be a way of addressing this one and say, "Well one of the things that we're recommending is that registrars look at and adopt policies within that," which include things like, you know, that are monitorings of abuse reports and things like that.

James Bladel: There's a section in the report and I apologize Paul if this is the same section you were referencing but the section of the report that answers one of the charter questions of what can registrars do to address fast flux.

Paul Diaz: Yeah, that's the section.

James Bladel: Yeah, okay -- and if so, how? And I think that probably, you know, we can take a look at whether or not that language needs to be changed but that's probably where we hit this topic most head on.

Man: I just got a quick question. This is (unintelligible). Is there any location where we make recommendations to ISPs -- I know this is outside our scope -- but for fast flux, how to monitor for it, how to prevent it?

James Bladel: There is a recommendation on line 269 to encourage ISPs to monitor their networks. I think that we refer to them also occasionally as hosting providers.

Man: Yes, hosting providers will be fine, yeah.

James Bladel: Yeah, I don't know that there's one centralized place where that's - where we consolidate those for those audiences to kind of take away a to-do list of recommendations. But there are references throughout the report.

Man: Just for the sake of fast flux I think we probably need a category for ISPs, Web hosting providers, and any generic hosting providers. That could also be a registrar because there's a lot of them out there.

James Bladel: Can I make a recommendation and just for discussion on the group that when we address the incomplete sections for recommendations and next steps, if we can defer that question until then and then I think that will give us a really good opportunity to develop those thoughts.

Man: I like that.

James Bladel: Get them included in that - in those sections for recommendations. Because I think you're correct that we couldn't really develop policy to govern those types of organizations. But I think it's appropriate that we make some recommendations if we see that they can make a difference.

Man: Very good, very good recommendation. Yes, I agree.

James Bladel: Okay. So let's see, that kind of takes us through 4D and I notice we're halfway through our time. The only thing more concerning than using up the entire meeting on Category 4 would be to not use the meeting on Category 4. So I just wanted to press on here to 4F, which looks like some more discussions relative to registrars building detection mechanisms, technical criteria for fast flux and then reporting that to appropriate law enforcement or other governing bodies.

The proposed response was that we discuss the challenges in distinguishing fast flux and how that was not necessarily a

straightforward, technical undertaking. And just giving the second part of your response here (Rod), there was -- this was the one that references the Mannheim formula. So I think that we discussed the appropriate list of including at least a reference to the Mannheim formula in our report. But I'm...

Rod Rasmussen: Right. There was -- I don't remember who -- I think that was (Joe)'s action item to try and write some language around that to include it in the report and then we could (unintelligible) whatever that is in the report find the answer to this. Because I remember this was the plan of attack for that.

James Bladel: Okay. So do we have a link that we can include for a reference to that report? And is that taking it down a rabbit hole? Or is that -- does the group feel that that's an important component of our response to this comment?

Man: (Joe) did offer text James on the 5th -- excuse me, the 8th, the 8th of this month, 5/8, came in in the early afternoon. And he does have a link in there. I'm not sure in his response (unintelligible) helps. You know, just looking at this question - or this particular one overall - I mean I feel that the answer for I guess it's 4D that we just discussed referencing registrar best practices covers at least the first half of the particular commenter's, you know, point.

I would also underscore look who the commenter who. You know, somebody whose reputation precedes him in a very negative way. And so, you know, while I don't want to totally dismiss out of hand things people say, this particular character is just that, a character. And, you

know, I'm not sure that we really need to twist ourselves and contort ourselves trying to come up with a response.

So I mean, perhaps if we can all pull up that, you know, (Joe)'s response-- it's unfortunate he's not here today -- and defend what he wrote. But I mean the whole Mannheim formula thing I think he's trying his proposal in response to Marika actually is it seems reasonable enough to me.

He's not saying we must use Mannheim and whatnot. It's presented as a, you know, a way to help identify these things with the recognition that once you recognize it, human beings have to, you know, make some decisions about what to do.

James Bladel: I have a question and I apologize I don't have the original comment up in front of me, but did the commenter raise the idea of the Mannheim formula or was that raised as part of our response?

Rod Rasmussen: Part of the response. I think they raised the, you should be doing something to automatically find stuff (unintelligible). Sorry about the fire truck.

James Bladel: Well I -- that raises an interesting question of do we want to include the Mannheim formula as an example of what a mechanism might look like or -- you know, I know that we discussed the challenges of discriminating between, you know, (unintelligible), fast flux, registrations and false positives for (unintelligible) fairly thorough throughout the document. And I'm just wondering if we should or should not introduce this new variable of the Mannheim formula as a, you know, possible (unintelligible) that we could apply to things like

that. And I'm saying that without having fully read the Mannheim formula. So I will throw myself at your mercy by saying that.

Rod Rasmussen: Well I think we had this discussion a bit when we were - because we were like - we were asking what happened to it because they've got to edit it out. It was actually in the report for a very long time. And then through whatever process of, you know, (unintelligible) what have you, it's disappeared.

So it was a very strong - as I remember it - a very strong sentiment to have it in there as an example of how might do it and again with the caveat. It can't -- it's not foolproof and you have to have human, you know, interaction to make a final decision. I think there's a very strong sentiment to have that in there as, you know, as an example. (Unintelligible) best one we came up with as far as a formulaic approach to the problem. And even that one wasn't good enough and I think was part of the point as well.

So you know rely on full automation (unintelligible). So that - this question actually spurred a, "Boy, what happened to that? We need to get it back in the document" discussion, which is why (Joe) went and wrote that piece. So separate from the question, we wanted to get that back in the document.

The question you can just -- at that point, you know, answer it (unintelligible) talking about registrar best practices and then perhaps referring to the section wherever the Mannheim ends up to be used as a specific example and just site that and move on. I think that might be the best way to handle it.

Marika Konings: The question I asked (Joe) as well because he suggested the language but we probably need to find another place where it's suitable to insert that. To comment on what (Rod) said, the formula is still there but it is all linked through to the study that's included in the annex that I think Randy provided.

So it's mentioned in there but it's, you know, (unintelligible) deep hidden (unintelligible) links and stuff like that. So, yeah, (Joe) provided a (unintelligible) so people are invited to comment on that and also invited to provide a suggestion as where will suitable to include that in the report.

James Bladel: Okay.

Thoughts from the group on how we're addressing that or Marika's proposal? Do you feel that that's a -- would be sufficient for this comment and to link through like that? Hopefully we didn't lose (Rod) to the fire truck.

Rod Rasmussen: No I'm still here. I'm trying to figure out what you just asked so...

James Bladel: Propose that (unintelligible) -- sorry, I was reading one part and then trying to listen with the other part. But you were proposing that we incorporate some language and reference this formula and leave it at that. Is that (unintelligible) as response for a...

Rod Rasmussen: Okay. So I think yes we need to include it in the body of the document something about the Mannheim formula, equation, whatever it is. And then refer, you know, for this for the answer to this question refer to a combination of registrar best practices -- which was kind of

the response to the previous ones -- plus, you know, the reference to where the Mannheim ends up within the main body of the document and then that should cover it.

James Bladel: Okay. Thoughts from the group? Is that...

Man: Yeah, that makes sense James.

James Bladel: Okay. All right. Moving on to 4G. We're almost done with Category 4 here. I think that the gist of this comment is that performance among registrars to respond to this is inconsistent or varies widely. The response was that that's just one of the subjects that kicked off this working group. This is referenced in the APWG and it doesn't say so but I'm assuming something like that would be referenced in the issues report as well.

And that one of the outcomes of this group is to better understand the issues and make recommendations on how to address them. So what are the - what are we proposing as far as a response to this particular comment? I think it starts to hearken back to some of the other earlier comments in Category 4 which are addressing, you know, what registrars should do and what their minimum abuse capabilities should be and so forth.

I think that this is - has some overlap to some degree with that. It just is essentially saying that some -- if you go back to those earlier comments when we say that not all registrars have appropriate abuse capabilities. It's kind of the same way of saying that registrar abuse efforts are inconsistent in their performance. Am I missing something? Or are these sort of saying the same thing in different ways?

Man: Yeah, I think the same thing in different ways. I mean the initial comment to this question was, "No, duh!" So that would be an appropriate response but I guess they're professional about it so...

James Bladel: And it has the advantage of being a very short response.

Man: Yeah it does. It's short. But yeah, it gets back to the same stuff again.

Greg Aaron: I would propose that we fold this particular comment in with the other comments that are referencing things like the APWG as far as registrar best practices and abuse capabilities and candidly that we just leave it at that. I think it's saying a lot of the same things.

Man: I have no objection to that.

Man: Yeah, no objection.

James Bladel: Okay. So Marika I think that that would be our preferred response to this particular comment is to integrate it into the other comments. And if it needs a couple of sentence changes or wordsmithing, I can help do that. So the response to the other comments for I think it's 4B, C, and E can be tailored to encompass G as well.

Marika Konings: Okay.

James Bladel: Okay. Then moving to question H, you know it's a healthy discussion on the comment 4H, not to be confused with the organization out here in Iowa. Well this is a similar variation of the same theme which is that shouldn't - the working group should encourage registrars to adopt

best practices designed to curtail the harms caused by legitimate uses of fast flux hosting.

I think the only -- I think something that is noteworthy in this comment is the (unintelligible) with the word "hosting" which then expands registrars to include ISPs and Web hosting providers which is what we were discussing earlier. So my proposal would be -- and (Rod) stop me if this is counter to your and Dave's response -- but that we also fold this comment into that group and possibly see if there's anything that needs to be included in the recommendations in next step section where we're making encouragements - or recommendations to ISPs and hosting providers.

Rod Rasmussen: Remind me what our response was.

James Bladel: Okay. The Fast Flux Working Group concurs with this comment. The Fast Flux Working Group encourages registrars and registries to adopt best practices to curtail all forms of abuse not just fast flux. I think that the - the only thing that I think is particularly a differentiator with this comment is that they - at the end they say hosting, which that could mean with fast flux hosting but could also imply ISPs and hosting providers.

Rod Rasmussen: Right. And I think that, you know, the response - our response to the question is really kind of a recommendation that we need to -- (unintelligible) talked about we need to put in a recommendation section. So, yeah, I don't see anything wrong with that. And our response really could be part of the recommendation section (unintelligible) yes we (unintelligible) section number is done.

James Bladel: Okay. And actually looking at your response here -- I just lost it so I got to pull that back up. One second here. But looking at the response for 4H, you know, looking at that Marika where (Rod) and Dave has listed numerous best practices or recommendations, I think that that could form the core of a response to all of Category 4 and possibly a good chunk of our recommendation section as well.

Man: There we go if we would have started at the bottom and worked to the top we would have solved 4 and 9 all at the same time.

James Bladel: I mean this is really good that we captured this language because I think it has utility beyond just this comment.

Paul Diaz: Yeah James with this (unintelligible) while I agree. I also supported Greg's suggested tweak of the second sentence. The Fast Flux Working Group encourages registrars and registries to adopt recognized best practices to curtail fast flux as opposed to all forms of abuse. You know, keeping it more focused on the issue we have here and not potentially, you know, opening - expanding our mandate.

There was also the -- you know, Greg had raised -- in the very last bullet point when we talk about the use of the word "compensation" or "compensating a registrant" that could be, you know, kind of an awkward thing to raise. I agree I like the bullets that we have at the bottom and can form the foundation for our Section 9. But I think we might want to, you know, be careful about talking about compensation.

You know, what exactly that means. It could be very different for different people. And if we keep the word in, I just think we're probably going to need some sort of clarifying text around it. Or it may be better

just to leave it out -- that particular part, compensation leave that out in the final text.

Marika Konings: Paul just to comment because I think in the version I send out like with the overview of all the comments I think I already incorporated Greg's suggestions. So I'm not really sure what everyone (unintelligible) see the ones that you're talking about because I don't think...

Paul Diaz: Yeah I was reading it off the mailing list. Thank you Marika.

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...have any problem with that either.

James Bladel: That's an excellent catch Paul and I think that...

Paul Diaz: Give Greg credit. He caught it. I was just echoing his comment.

James Bladel: Yeah, so, and basically since there were some comments from Greg on the list I just wanted to give you an opportunity to make sure that you were -- that Greg was okay with some of the changes that it currently reads. Did you get the boot Greg?

Greg Aaron: Hi this is Greg. I'm sorry. I've had to take another call. I'll rejoin you in a minute.

James Bladel: Okay. No problem. But I think that Paul what you're pointing out and what Greg has recommended makes a lot of sense and (Rod) it sounds like you agree.

Rod Rasmussen: Yeah I'm fine with that. The comment on other forms of abuse (unintelligible) that'd be great so you know you sort of have to say that.

James Bladel: Right.

Rod Rasmussen: (Unintelligible).

James Bladel: Okay. Well that wraps up comments. Are there any other comments for Category 4 Marika or is that the end? There's no 4I, I don't believe so...

Marika Konings: I think that was the end.

James Bladel: Okay. So well that was kind of like going to the dentist. It wasn't pleasant but we're through it now and we're better for it. Unfortunately we only have about ten minutes remaining so what I wanted to do was jump into (Cal)'s response if he had Section 6 and then Paul and I did Section 9. We didn't have a forum last week and Category 4 was a pretty involved category.

So can we make the recommendation that we -- maybe Marika start a list - a thread where we discuss, you know, all of the remaining sections, Category 6 and Category 9, and just kind of gather support or changes on the list so that we can have an abbreviated call next week and get right into the drafting for Sections 5 - Section 5-8, 5-9, Section 8, Section 9.

What does everybody think of that approach? Or if you have another idea that can keep this moving along and possibly get us caught up to our schedule I think we're all open to that as well.

Man: I think it's a good idea James. I mean based on the discussion on list already when we posted ours, in particular 9, we had more discussion about Dave's initial observation that a lot of the forthcoming things that we have to address are more clarification or amplifications of things we've already said in the report and therefore it's just nod your head, yes thank you very much, and move on. And I think we're going to get through 9 very quickly. So if we can do it on the list, even better.

James Bladel: Okay. I'm almost envisioning something like a -- forgive my terminology here -- but something like a survey or a ballot where we summarize or consolidate the comments and propose responses for Section 6 and Section 9 into a single document and post that. And that, you know, essentially say, "Here's your opportunity to change the language or indicate you agree with this list as it stands."

And then, you know, if anyone has any -- if any of those turn into lengthy exchanges involving, you know, multiple parties and multiple responses then I think we can take that onto the call. But really wanted to conserve our call time for the drafting activities that are coming up and see if we can't get some agreement on these last two sections on the list. And I think Paul you're correct in pointing out that Section 9 should be a very large but quick thumbs up, thumbs down type of a review.

Rod Rasmussen: Works for me.

Marika Konings: Probably the easiest because looking at for example Section 9, the number of comments that received the same response. And probably the easiest would be indeed to post that on the mailing list instead of --

because we did before like a bit of a survey type thing in the beginning of the -- we had the initial report.

But it makes it more difficult to provide specific edits which might be easier if we just have an email on each of these -- although it will of course give you a lot of email so that might -- people might like that less. I'm happy as well to take these two sections out and put them in a Word document so people can look at it in that way. (Unintelligible) the preference would be.

James Bladel: Well you know, possible the categorization document that you currently have, if we could copy and paste the - and consolidate wherever possible. For example, I think there's several instances in Section 9 where we have one arching response that addresses or comments simultaneously...
Is anybody else hearing that? Okay.

Man: That was good music.

James Bladel: Yeah, that'll wake you up.

Man: That will wake you up, right.

James Bladel: So I think we're just looking for ways to expedite and be efficient in responding to these. So I think Marika made a good point. We don't want to go to the point - to the degree where we're putting together a point-by-point survey and then tallying responses.

But I think more so that we would just send out maybe one message with the responses for Category 6, one message for the responses for

Category 9 and then start those two conversations. And then clearly discuss them as two sets on our next call so that we can move on to drafting.

Marika Konings: Okay. That shouldn't be a problem.

James Bladel: And if you wanted to include that as a grid similar to the way that you did with the categorization document with just those two sections, I think that might be helpful to folks to just kind of see them organized that way.

Marika Konings: Yeah, I just hope that the formatting doesn't go off on the email. I guess it depends on how people have their settings. I'll try to do that and if people have problems I can always send them a separate Word document or something like that so...

James Bladel: Sure, or an attachment. That would be fine too. Okay so then our plan for next week is to provide a cursory review of Section 6 and Section 9 and then dive into the drafting. And if there are no other -- I have a couple of action items here and then if there are no other points of business today then (unintelligible) couple of minutes early.

Okay. Well thanks for your help everyone and I appreciate everyone's thoughts on comments Section 4 and let's keep it moving and let's try to stay active on the list.

Man: Thank you my friend, take care.

Man: Okay James, see you.

Man: Bye-bye.

James Bladel: Bye guys.

Marika Konings: Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks everyone. And Marika if you need anything, just give me a call.

Marika Konings: Okay, will do. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thank you.

END