Registration Abuse Policies Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 15 June at 14:30 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the   Registration Abuse Policies Working Group meeting on Monday 15 June 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-rap-20090615.mp3
On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#june

All recordings and transcriptions are posted on the GNSO calendar page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/

Present for the teleconference:

Greg Aaron - Registry C. - Working Group Chair
Nacho Amadoz - Registry C.
James Bladel - Godaddy Registrar C.
George Kirikos - CBUC
Martin Sutton - CBUC
Faisal Shah - MarkMonitor IPC
Roland Perry
Berry Cobb
Mike O'Connor
Rod Radmussen
Frederic Felman

ICANN Staff
Margie Milam
Marika Konings
Gisella Gruber-White - GNSO Secretariat

Apologies:
Philip Corwin - CBUC

Coordinator: This call is now being recorded. Thank you.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good afternoon, everyone. I'll do the roll call

quickly. On today's call we have (Greg Aaron), (Faisal Shah), (Berry

Cobb), (Roland Perry), (Frederick Felman), (Martin Sutton), (James

Bladle), (Mike O'Connor), (George Kerikos), (Nacho Amadoz) and

(Rod Rasmussen).

From staff we have Margie Milam, Marika Konings:and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. Thank you.

(Greg Aaron):   Thank you very much. Welcome everyone to our last meeting before Sydney. We're going to meet for an hour and the main section of our meeting will be taken up with starting to look at our list of proposed abuses; however, later in the meeting, we'll reserve some time to discuss Sydney and meeting times after Sydney.

So, if you're Adobe, you can see the list that we've started and I wanted to just start this discussion by saying the list of topics that we discussed going forward will eventually end-up forming the main body of our report.

And so in addition to discussion, we also need to start putting these examinations down on paper. The standard requirements for our working group include putting what the issues are, whatever background we feel is appropriate.

We should note recommendations. We also have to note levels of consensus on each of these items and that involves listing the working group members who subscribe to perhaps a consensus position.

We can also have partial consensus or no consensus positions but we have to put people's names to those various categories and of course, if someone would also like to write a minority view if you differ from a consensus position, that can also be included.

I would like to propose two things. One is I've been working on a template that would help us capture all of these things. I've been looking at what's been done in some previous working groups and if we use a template, we'll make sure that we capture all these things in a fairly regular format.

The other thing is we need to start writing this material as we dive into these discussions. My suggestion that I'd like to throw out to you is that we're going to need working group members to volunteer to take point on each proposed abuse.

And somebody will have to start writing-up material to fill-in these templates and then depending - you may then have other people editing those over time, adding material or adding minority views as we discuss them and try to reach consensus so this is - very soon we're going to reach the work part of the working group.

I'd like to hear if there are any thoughts on this model for generating text for discussion and mark-up. Anyone?

(Mike O'Connor):   This is (Mikey).

(Greg Aaron):   Go ahead.

(Mike O'Connor):   I'm on another completely non-ICANN-related taskforce and we had pretty good success with another approach. I agree with the taking point notion.

One way to generate a fair amount of text in a hurry is to have the call for everybody to write three to five paragraphs on a given topic and just

consolidate them rather than having somebody have a (Bic) point and do a complete dash on their own, let them play more of a traffic cop role and that might be something that the point person could decide on their own but that's just another strategy to get a lot of that text out in a hurry.

(Greg Aaron): Okay. In that model, how did people avoid duplicating each other's work?

(Mike O'Connor): In the first round, we didn't worry about that. By keeping the homework assignments short, we just let the duplications occur and then we sorted it out later.

(Greg Aaron): Okay. Any other thoughts? So let me ask you this: do people prefer to work using documents which can be redlined or should we use a Wiki?

Man: I think a Wiki is easier to access online and for more people to corroborate.

(Greg Aaron): Okay.

(James Bladle): I agree, this is (James). I think that Wikis keep the number of versions being passed around down.

Marika Konings: This is (Marika). I mean, the challenge of the Wiki is to track who's working on what and of course if you have people doing work at the same time, that the redline document is a little bit easier.

I mean you might still want to use it as the place where you posted or provide updated versions but I find a bit challenging to - because you

cannot do "track changes" for example in the Wiki text. You can do strikeout and things like that, but it's not the same as a "track changes" version.

(George Kerikos):   (George) here. I thought you can track changes in a Wiki. I found Wikipedia you can. You can compare a (dift) of two different versions.

(James Bladle): That's right, (George). You can keep a history of the different versions and put them side-by-side by I think not necessarily having the comments marked-up in line.

(Greg Aaron):   And does the Wiki version that we have available to us allow that kind of comparison, (Marika)?

Marika Konings: I think you can go back and forth but I think as (James) said, maybe I'm no Wiki expert by any means but I don't think we can produce a version where you can for example see all the changes have been made by whom or comments have been added which a Word "track changes" document would allow, but I'm happy to check further whether that's possible on the Wiki.

(Mike O'Connor):   This is (Mikey). Usually there's a history page on the Wiki that you can look back at to see the changes.

Marika Konings: Yeah, but I think you can only go one by one though. You cannot just - can you produce a whole overview that shows you the "track changes" over in one document?

(Rod Rasmussen): This is (Rod). Would a Wiki be a good place to start and at some point declare okay, we have enough information here, we can write a version because there's at least some consensus on what the issue is

and then move on to a "tracks" version from there. I've done that before in project development, for example.

(James Bladle): So use it during the draft - at least, the drafting process to a certain point at which point when you get done more to the nitty-gritty, you can redline?

(Rod Rasmussen): Correct.

(Mike O'Connor): This is (Mikey). I've done that, too. That works pretty well.

(Greg Aaron): Okay.

(James Bladle): And it works particularly well for information gathering and getting different ideas on the table, get it all in there and then you can sort it out and say okay, here's our production document for whatever feature we're creating or heavy on and modify it from there.

(Greg Aaron): (Marika), you're someone who produces a large number of documents.

Marika Konings: True.

(Greg Aaron): Would that approach being amenable?

Marika Konings: Yeah, I think if people see the Wiki needed a place where they can store all the information and then they'd have an effort to collate into one probably Word document. I think that will work. It's easier even sending maybe e-mails to one person who then would have to put it somewhere so I think that approach would definitely work.

(Greg Aaron):   Okay, that wouldn't drive you completely insane then?

Marika Konings: Possibly, but as long as people then don't have the expectation, you know, if they start making changes that it will come up the same way as it does in a Word document with "track changes" or that adding comments appears in a different way as well.

I think we probably need to decide on it what stage we'll move to a different document to make sure that people can review it in the way that it's the easiest and productive then as well to make changes and review again collectively who has done what and what changes should be adopted or not.

(Greg Aaron):   Okay. Does anyone else have any comments on the working method?

Marika Konings: Well, one question I would have (Greg) is because you said you were already working on a template and would you envision like posting that template on the Wiki and people working in that or - because we need - depending on how the template looks, it might not be that easy or maybe it is to transport that into a Wiki.

(Greg Aaron):   The template's relatively straight forward. I hope to have it out to the group within a day or two for discussion, but it consists more of categories, information we would need to capture and eventually fill-in.

I think that it'd be easy enough to slap that on a Wiki for each one of these topics, and then as we move to a document version, that would just come through easily enough I think but one of my (assignments) will be to send that basic template around for folks to look at.

Okay, all right, so any additional comments? Is everyone comfortable with creating a page for each one of these topics we'll discuss and then we'll need a leader to volunteer for each one of these abuses.

Start off with, we'll start to gather information and shape the material on a Wiki and then at some point we would move on to a document that we can redline and go from there. Does that sound okay?

Okay. I'm not hearing any nays, so let's give it a try then. Okay, so anyway, let's move on. We have our list on screen. We can start at the top. By the way, this list is about a month old so if any of you have additional items, we can always add to it.

Now, the first thing we had on the list was malware/botnet control, predesignation of the main names to control malware and the example is Conficker. Is everyone familiar with what Conficker was and kind of what this pre-designation of domain names involves?

Okay. I guess everyone is. Okay. So, is it a legitimate use? (George)?

(George Kerikos):   No, I was just agreeing with you because nobody was answering. I would say no, obviously, but there's some overlap. That's the same thing you use generic names, let's say instead of using random names, they used Toronto movies or, you know, Wyoming laundry bag or whatever instead of just random made-up names. That could possibly collide with legitimate people.

(Greg Aaron):   I can comment as somebody whose - I've been dealing with Conficker and about 10 TLDs right now, because my company provides back-end registry services and in some cases, Conficker creates very short

names so short is four characters and that means that some of the domains it generates have already been registered.

Perhaps they've been in the registry for years, you know, people got a domain name a long time ago, so some of them are taken. In some cases, it's hard to tell at the registry level whether the person who got it is a legitimate registrant or not, so that's one issue. (Roland), I see your hand.

(Roland Perry): Yeah, I just wanted to remind the group that last time we had a long discussion about registration abuse being something which can only possibly happen at the point at which you register a domain and no doubt there's going to be in the future some things like Conficker which at the point at which they register some domains, we don't know that it's malware.

So we're kind of looking into the future as to what it is they might be using these predesignated domain names for.

(Greg Aaron): Okay. Now, what we've said is this is for I guess basically known cases where the domains are being used for a vicious purpose. Conficker is one example. There's one other piece of malware that did this which was called (torpig). (Rod), do you know of any others?

(Rod Rasmussen): (Unintelligible) just because, as well, and there's a couple of other malwares out there that have predefined rendezvous points and that they're not using as well but they don't use the algorithm methodology.

They've got just a predefined rendezvous point and then that - or set of rendezvous points - and that can be updated of course on the fly

because they're typically a peer-to-peer model or an IP-based model of malware, so they have - but they have a back-door in them.

It's designed so if those IPs get taken down, they can register a domain name and fire it up - command and control for it from them.

(Greg Aaron): Right, so those - would those be considered command and control or predesignated?

(Rod Rasmussen): Well, I mean, from a - it depends on which AV company you talk to probably, but they're designed so that you can get instructions from the bad guys to the bot so from that perspective, they're command and control.

One of the terms that is being used though instead of command and control is rendezvous point for being able to get new instructions or to find out where the real CMC server is so they might not necessarily command the bot but they will provide access to the command and control center for the bots.

(Greg Aaron): Okay.

(George Kerikos): (George) here. Plus you have cases where the bots can use pre-existing domain names to get things like the current date, like they may look it up on Yahoo or Google so we might decide that this is all in scope but we have to be very careful about what the countermeasures are.

(Greg Aaron):   For Conficker, the countermeasure was that researchers figure out which names Conficker was going to call ahead of time. Each domain name that it could call was basically valid for a day.

So on one day it would call, you know, several hundred domain names and then the next day, it was (unintelligible) that, and the countermeasure was to register or block those domain names.

Some registries got permission to register all those to keep them out of the hands of the bad guys. Other registries simply prevented anyone from registering those domain names.

In other words, if you tried to register that domain name, you would get a failed attempt. If you looked-up that domain in the Whois, it would say it was not available or something like that.

So one approach actually registered the domains; the other approach did not. So, it's a bad thing where I think we're agreed. Question is, what's required or what's a solution or what's a recommendation? Does ICANN have a role in this? If so, what would be next steps?

(Rod Rasmussen): Well, what role did ICANN play in Conficker? Roles, I should say. You might look into that at least as a starting point. I think the two things that would come to mind right off the top of the bat were helping coordinate between registries and especially the CC registries and then also waiving fees for those registries that decided to register the domain instead of just blocking them.

(Greg Aaron):   Okay. Any other thoughts? (James)?

(James Bladle): Yeah, I think, you know, (unintelligible) getting permission to act unilaterally to block those names or preempt those names or maybe even create and augmented reserve name list when those types of situations are detected in the future so that registries don't necessarily have to go through the - when time is urgent - they don't necessarily have to go through the process of making that as a formal request, just having the latitude or the discretion to act as needed.

(Greg Aaron): Okay. (George)?

(George Kerikos): (George) here. I tend to agree that this would be in scope and the point of it, it's properly defined and the countermeasures are clearly limited then I would agree with it.

(Greg Aaron): Yeah, and one of the things that would be in scope would be is this related to waiving of fees or reserved list, some of the things that (James) mentioned.

(George Kerikos): Yeah, one of the countermeasures might be to allow registration but not to allow the domain to resolve the list, you know, additional steps were taken, registered verification, things like that because the criminals want us to give a map to their location. I think authorities would love that.

(Greg Aaron): (Rod)?

(Rod Rasmussen): You know, one thing I would think that ICANN would have a role in or somebody would have a role in here would be to coordinate which security companies might be able to do something with those domains because it's one of the countermeasures that has been used here is

that various entities - Microsoft, all of the security companies - have registered domains to map out the botnet infections and potentially do remediation on them.

That's not something that you would want to just let anybody do. You would want to vet whoever would be able to do that, so there's a coordination role there.

I don't know who would be appropriate to take that on but that would certainly be something you don't want to preclude on something like this by saying nobody can get those domains.

It may even be a government function, I don't know, but that's certainly an issue here for making a creative solution, you don't want to create a solution that precludes somebody from going in and fixing the original problem.

(Greg Aaron):   (George)?

(George Kerikos):   I would just like to add that yeah, you might want also to coordinate with law enforcement obviously because you might have an ongoing investigation in which case a countermeasure might actually interfere with their ability to catch the criminal, so you don't want to interfere with updating. Obviously, the law enforcement should be in the loop.

(Greg Aaron):   Okay. (Mikey)?

(Mike O'Connor):   I like the coordination role a lot for ICANN. The cautionary dimension to this conversation is how active we want ICANN to be

beyond coordination. I think that's a good topic of conversation and I'm not sure I have a clear opinion on that.

But I think that there's huge value in ICANN simply because ICANN is right in the middle of a lot of things as an information clearinghouse and coordination point but when it comes to actual action, I think we've got more debate there.

(Greg Aaron):   (James)?

(James Bladle): Yeah, I just wanted to say that there is a lot of merit to what George is proposing as far as with Conficker, I think there was a little bit of knowledge that was understood when those targeted domains were set-out to be registered.

That may not always be the case for future abuses and we may need to put some of these things under a microscope or observe them in the wild to figure out what the pattern or algorithm is.

But the downside of that though (George) that I see anyway is that involving other parties, coordination through registrars, coordination through registries and now law enforcement, it would tend to possibly slow down the reaction times of all the groups involved.

So I think there's a trade-off there between responsiveness when one group is allowed to act somewhat unilaterally but we might lose something as you mentioned in just observing the behavior of the abuse as it touches multiple types of organizations, so I just wanted to get that out there as a potential alternative to (George)'s proposal.

(George Kerikos):   Right. (George) here. I'd just add that the police might have like a honey pot program where they're, you know, (being able) to deal with the registrar or something or have the back-end so they can monitor the registrations if the criminals were actually going to register a certain domain, so you wouldn't want to thwart that attempt if you blocked it at affiliates or VeriSign, etc.

(Greg Aaron):   Okay. (Mikey)?

(Mike O'Connor):   I just wanted to amplify something (James) just said which is another kind of role or at least an objective for ICANN and that is to speed things up or to put it negatively not to slow things down. Clearly that's a helpful thing in all respects and the converse would be quite unhelpful.

(Greg Aaron):   Okay. Thank you. Anyone else? Okay. I'm going to ask for a volunteer to take the lead on this topic, to be the person who helps gather the information and start putting a section of the report together on this topic. Are there any volunteers?

Marika Konings: (Greg), I would be happy to volunteer putting what has been discussed now on Wiki page for them, for someone to take that down further along the line. That would help to at least get people started.

(Greg Aaron):   That would be much appreciated. Thank you for that. (Rod)? Would you be interested in taking this one on?

(Rod Rasmussen): Maybe post-Sydney, but...

(Greg Aaron):   Fair enough.

(Rod Rasmussen): ...but that's - I wouldn't be talking until mid-July because I'm taking vacation after Sydney, so...

(Greg Aaron):   I was asking you simply because you have some experience with malware and such.

(Rod Rasmussen): Right, right, well not writing it, but...

(Greg Aaron):   Or getting it?

(Rod Rasmussen): Yeah, I've gotten plenty. Yeah, so let's - I'll revisit that on our - maybe live in Sydney and we can talk about that some more.

(Greg Aaron):   Okay, so I'm going to maybe put you down as a tentative?

(Rod Rasmussen): Sure.

(Greg Aaron):   Okay. Thank you. Okay, are there any other thoughts on this malware and botnet control issue? Okay. If not, let's move on to the next one which is name-spinning which is the use of automated tools to create domain permutations.

My understanding of this by the way is not a tool to register domain names but to come up with lists of domain names. One example is often seen on registrar sites where if you search for a domain name, if it's not available, a tool will suggest alternate versions that might be available.

For instance if aaron.com is not available, it might give me a list of other names that I might be interested in such as aaronfamily.com or something like that. Is that everyone's understanding of what name-spinning is?

Man: Yes.

Man: Yeah.

(Rod Rasmussen): I think we could use some more definition on this, whether or not it was actually doing availability checks for each of those fund names and whether or not once it cross that line, it would be categorized as something else, or do we want to draw a very narrow boundary around this and just say this is (unintelligible) an automated tool to generate lists of domains that may or may not be submitted to a registrar or registry for availability check?

(Greg Aaron): Well, that's a good question. On a registrar's Website, they wouldn't tell you that a name would be available unless they've checked it I'm assuming. There would be no point in giving people lists of names that aren't available.

(Rod Rasmussen): I would assume that's the case but it's possible that they're actually submitting them in real time to the registry or they're keeping it cached or they're referencing (unintelligible), you know, lot of different possibilities and I wanted to make sure that the definition on this one is tight.

(Greg Aaron): Okay.

(Mike O'Connor):   This is (Mikey).

(Greg Aaron):   Go ahead, (Mike).

(Mike O'Connor):   I think another definitional dimension to this is which end of the pipe is the looking-up being done on? You know, on one hand the registrar might do that.

On the other hand, somebody might have software on their desktop that's essentially doing the same thing but in that case, the software would have to go check a bunch of domains to see whether they were available so I think we need to understand what's meant in that dimension as well.

(Greg Aaron):   (James)?

(James Bladle): I just wanted to indicate agreement with (Mike) that since this is happening on the consumer side, then that is a different issue than whether it's offered as a service to consumers.

(Greg Aaron):   Okay. (George)?

(George Kerikos):   Just to step back, are we actually in some kind of agreement that this an abuse to begin with? I don't consider this an abuse. I consider this legitimate - these categories, are these like possible abuses, because I'm not convinced all of these are?

(Mike O'Connor):   Yes. These are a list of possible abuses. We haven't made any decisions about them yet, well except for malware we're kind of concerned about.

(George Kerikos):   Is that a live document by the way? Are we able to say yes, no, but you have columns that are blank right now?

(Greg Aaron):   Yeah, we will eventually be updating this and we'll move - well now, we're eventually we'll move over to a Wiki and we'll have to take some votes at some point on the consensus points and so forth.

Now you raise a good question, though. What is the potential problem with name-spinning? Why is it on our list? Did anyone on the call contribute this one to the list?

(Faisal Shah):   Yeah, this is (Faisal). This is one of the ones that we discussed when we were putting it together.

Woman: I think it comes back to (Martin)'s original list, probably.

(Greg Aaron):   Okay. So (Faisal) and (Martin) - why might this be an abuse?

(Faisal Shah):   Well, I think a couple of things. I think the first thing I would say is - well, I think we have to step back a little bit and look at the definition, right, and isn't the definition a predicate act and if this is a predicate act to I guess cyber-squatting or somebody - a name-spinning comes up with a trademark and somebody is registering that trademark, is that then a problem, so I guess that's how we were looking at it.

And if you look at it in the (toxic) of the definition of this group, maybe it does fit.

(Greg Aaron):   (Mikey)?

(Mike O'Connor):   I'm wondering whether the word trademark needs to get in there because I agree with (George). You know, I think if you're going after generic name, this is pretty legitimate whether it's done by the registrar or by the end user.

I think it's when you're constructing lots of variants of trademarked names and checking those that we start to venture into at least (unintelligible).

(Greg Aaron):   Okay. We have a couple of people. I think (James) you were first.

(James Bladle): Yeah, I just wanted to consider that anything that would collide, that the name-spinning itself were to generate lists that were to collide with different marks, I mean that may be malicious. That may be unknowingly.

That may be coincidence or that may not happen at all and I just think that maybe the next one down is cyber-squatting and I think that it might a good idea to separate the generation tools of name-spinning versus the act that would fall under the category.

My thinking is that if we were to leave any type of branding issues of that definition of the name-spinning category, that might be helpful because if we start to co-mingle those, then perhaps we should take name-spinning and separate it and make it an isolated discussion, so just my thought there.

(Greg Aaron):   Okay, so you're saying that - well, the gist is that in collision with trademarks is kind of the prime issue here?

(James Bladle): Well, it is one possible outcome of the use of the name-spinning tool. I think it is also maybe an inadvertent outcome and it may not necessarily be acted upon maliciously.

So I think that saying that name-spinning is an abuse because of that one possible outcome could result in cyber-squatting which is the next category that we're going to discuss in isolation. I think that we need to draw a distinction between those two.

(Greg Aaron): Okay. Couple of people with their hands up. (Roland), why don't you go ahead?

(Roland Perry): Yeah, just jump in talking about trademarks. I know we'll be talking a lot about trademarks in the future but people have rights in names which go way beyond certainly registered trademarks and (unintelligible) I suppose if you had the concept there's a non-registered trademark.

But I know there's all kinds of stuff and they will all be country names in TLDs - new TLDs - for example. Well, countries haven't trademarked their name but they still feel a bit, you know, they've got some rights over it.

So I'd like us to think really hard about whether or not we should always be jumping on trademarks as the only way you cause harm to somebody in a sort of (unintelligible) situation.

(Greg Aaron): Okay. What are those cases? Now country names for example will be taken care of as reserve names, probably in future TLDs. I've heard

that there's some discussion of that, especially at the (gac) and the new TLD process.

In existing TLDs, there's also been reservation of country names back in 2001, or what other cases are you interested in?

(Roland Perry): Well, I'm saying there's all kinds of formerly reserved names. In other words, registered trademarks, country names in this kind of (gac) sense but people had all kinds of commercial interests which are represented by a name which is not necessarily a registered trademark, so maybe mentioning countries was a bit confusing.

But it's possible and a lot of people run a business simply under their own name, sort of (Perry)'s Computers Limited or something like that. Very few of them would actually register that as a trademark.

It's a very expensive and complicated process, but their rights could still be infringed by somebody cyber-squatting exactly that name.

(Greg Aaron): Okay. (George), you've had your hand up.

(George Kerikos): Yes, I'd just like to add that while I don't consider this generally to be an abuse, there could be an abuse if it led to a very high load at the registry if there were like 10 billion permutations and the system was checking each one, and so that could be a potential abuse.

Otherwise, I just don't see it as an abuse per se unless it was a much finer definition.

(Greg Aaron):   There's a little scratchiness there. Can you put yourself on hold - or on mute, rather. (Martin), why don't you go ahead?

(Martin Sutton): Hi, (Greg). Yeah, I'm just trying to cast my mind back to the original lists being formed here and if my memory serves me right, I thought there was a link between name-spinning and the next category, the mass or automated registration abuse.

And I think as an example is where registrars have name check available - name checks on their system - and take some of those name checks and put them through as domain purchases for themselves along with a number of permutations.

So I think that there was some discussions around that as well, but when they're split like this, I think it is difficult to put name-spinning down as an abuse category for the reasons that people have detailed already in that it's something you're checking. Does it actually mean you're going through with an abuse process is I think the question here.

(Greg Aaron):   Okay, so name-spinning not necessarily the real root problem but potentially an enablement, is that...

(Martin Sutton): Potentially, yeah, but the thing is there's a lot of legitimate use for that as well I should imagine. The other thing is that the primary target here is listed as consumers where perhaps they're again linked with that mass or automated registration abuse as where lots of domains and good ideas are already booked by those speculating on the domains and that limits the opportunities for new ideas out in the marketplace.

So I think when talking about them together, name-spinning and the mass or automated registration abuses did have a feel for abuse but as we've split them out, probably we do need to define specific issues regarding name-spinning.

(Greg Aaron):   Okay. (Mikey), your hand's up?

(Mike O'Connor):   Yeah, I - this is (Mikey) - I have just a kind of a process question which is one way we could approach this is to try and get these sort of disposed of now. Another would be to say the sense of the group is emerging but we still want to have a conversation about this and write-up a section of the report.

What are you thinking, (Greg)? Are you thinking that some of these we'll just dispose of before they even get to the report and that this is the conversation that's doing that or are you thinking that we'll have a section and write all this up?

(Greg Aaron):   Well, in the case of this one, I mean there's some discussion about whether it's actually an issue that should be tackled under another type, right?

(Mike O'Connor):   Right.

(Greg Aaron):   So I think we have to figure that out. Right now we're getting a feel of the name-spinning maybe as a subcategory or enabler of cyber-squatting or mass registration abuse, which are perhaps more fundamental issues, so I think that's useful. (Margie)?

Margie Milam: Yeah, I just wanted to follow-up on the comment (Martin) made about name-spinning. It sounded like what he was talking about was domain name front-running and that's sort of a variation I suppose, but the idea being that when someone does an availability look-up and they don't intend to actually register the name, that registrar or someone might go ahead and register the name using that information.

(Greg Aaron):   And front-running is actually also on the list and there's been some discussion of that within the community. There is also an (S-Ack) report about it, so...

Margie Milam: So that's already on the list, then I guess we'll get to that. I just wanted to make sure that we had that covered somewhere.

(Greg Aaron):   Okay, good. Thank you. All right. So I have a choice to make. Should we consider name-spinning under one of these other categories as the tool, you know, is it a tool that's really used in some cases to carry out one of these other abuses or potential abuses?

                  Sounds like it fits under cyber-squatting potentially, especially if brand names and so forth are involved. Might fit under mass or automated registration abuse.

                  Front-running potentially - although that tends to be more associated with particular names that registrants are looking at themselves, typing into a Whois or what have you. (Mikey)?

(Mike O'Connor):   Oh, sorry. I was just agreeing with that approach. I think this is more of a tool that has benevolent and malevolent uses and better to focus in on the uses rather than the actual tool itself. Sorry about that.

(Greg Aaron):   Okay, no. Quite all right. (James)?

(James Bladle):   Disagreeing with (Mike) but front-running, cyber-squatting, warehousing, all of these things can be an outcome of name-spinning but the tool itself is probably not in and of itself an abuse.

(Greg Aaron):   Okay. I'm going to - (George)?

(George Kerikos):   I was thinking maybe we could do like a straw poll, whether this is legitimate or not or a legitimate use or within scope. That might help you or (Rod) at least.

(Greg Aaron):   Okay. Let me formulate a question then to do a little poll. I'm going to type it into the box here. Just a second. All right, so the question is - I'm going to formulate the first question this way: should name-spinning be considered under other potential abuse types? Okay.

(James Bladle):   (Greg), this is (James). Point of clarification: does your question mean that name-spinning should not be considered an abuse in its own right but should be considered a component of these other abuse types?

(Greg Aaron):   I think - my proposal is - I think part of my question is it the real - is it the bigger issue? Okay, let me ask a question a different way. Let me type-in another question. Hold on just a second.

Okay. Here's another question. If you - okay, I'm going to - let's put (George)'s question aside there for a second. Now, if you believe that name-spinning is a tool which might be used by people for legitimate and illegitimate purposes, raise your hand.

In other words, is it a tool that can be used and it can be used for ill or bad? Okay, so looking for (Barry) and (Roland), okay. Just (Roland) is left. Okay. So we've got consensus - unanimous consensus it looks like - that it could be used for good or ill purpose so the question then is what's the purpose it's being used for by someone, right?

Under what circumstances might it be a problem?

(George Kerikos): (George) here, right, and so how do you preemptively prevent that? I would think it would be exceedingly difficult.

(Greg Aaron): Yes. (Rod)? I'm sorry. I saw your name raised there. Okay. So in and of itself, it's not necessarily an abuse. It could be used in abusive ways, so that's our consensus. Question is under what circumstances?

We may have to suspend discussion of this and pick it up in the next meeting by the way, because we're coming up on an hour. We can pick this up at the next meeting which is in Sydney.

We should probably spend a couple minutes talking about the Sydney meeting. (Martin), did you have a question?

(Martin Sutton): Yeah, I just wanted to point out (Greg). I think when I circulated the list originally, just bear in mind that we tried to put down as many thoughts and ideas so that we didn't prohibit discussion about anything and assume ourselves what was in or out of scope.

So I don't think we need to beat ourselves around the head too much on many of these. It is a matter of making some quick decisions on

some of them where we can put them into a clear part and then concentrate on the main ones that cause the most concern.

But I didn't want to exclude anything, so I think it's just worth bearing in mind so that when we look through the rest of these, we could probably decide on some of them fairly quickly, raised hands, etc.

(Greg Aaron):   Okay, very good triage. Are you suggesting that this one is one we can dispense with?

(Martin Sutton):   I would say it is one that can be dispensed with but I would suggest is that we keep all of these (whole) and just relegate some to another list to say we did look at it and this is our decision so that if anybody comes back and reviews any of the work done, we can show clearly the decision steps that were made on those items that we ran through.

(Greg Aaron):   And I think that actually is our intent. We discussed in the report mentioning that we discussed - mentioning all the issues that we discussed. Some of them we will maybe dispense with, but we should note it at least that we talked about it.

Okay, good. All right. So anyway, Sydney, we are scheduled for a morning meeting, scheduled for 7:30 a.m. local time. I am told that breakfast will be provided. There was a question - unfortunately this meeting falls at the same time as the (S-Ack) meeting which a lot of us like to go to.

And I'm not sure frankly what to do about that. One question was should we start our meeting 30 minutes earlier which would mean you could fit in the last 30 minutes of the (S-Ack) meeting.

So I don't know if that even has any value and I don't know what's going to be in the last 30 minutes of the (S-Ack) meeting. Does anyone have any thoughts on the start times?

Okay, hearing none, it's an unfortunate conflict but these always happen at ICANN meetings. I'm going to propose that we meet at the scheduled time which is 7:30 local.

Marika Konings: (Greg), just to note, I think the (S-Ack) meeting doesn't start until 8 so if the registration abuse policies working group would start at 7 and run for an hour, there's no overlap.

(Greg Aaron): Right.

Marika Konings: So there's more (unintelligible).

(Greg Aaron): We were going to meet for an hour and a half in Sydney.

Marika Konings: Okay.

(Greg Aaron): We're currently scheduled for 7:30 to 9 and then the welcome ceremony is at 9. We were also going to keep the last section of the meeting open so anyone from the community could come in, ask questions and we could give them an update.

If there aren't many questions and we don't have many visitors, then we might be able to adjourn early and we could walk down the hall to the (S-Ack) meeting if you like.

Man: Yeah, that sounds really good.

(Greg Aaron):   Why don't we begin at 7:30? I mean, half of us are going to be jet-lagged terribly anyway. Let's start at 7:30 as planned and we'll see how it goes. Can I have a quick show of hands of who will be in Sydney?

                            Myself, (James), (Martin), (Rod), (Faisal), (Nacho) will be there, (Mike Rodenbaugh) will be there. I don't know if the others who aren't on this call, but it looks like we'll have probably close to a quorum at least. Okay, thank you.

Marika Konings: And there should be remote participation available. I think details will be posted shortly.

(Greg Aaron):   Yes, yes. (Glenna) had mentioned she was going to help us with that. We'll have dial-in information and assumedly a speakerphone.

Marika Konings: And the meeting will be recorded and transcribed as usual so even if people cannot participate on the day itself, they will be able to listen to it afterwards, and we'll have as well, or there will be room open normally.

(Greg Aaron):   Yes, yes, so assuming phone lines are clear and we have good Internet access, should be fine. Next question is meetings after Sydney. We did a doodle poll to see if we could reserve basically more meeting time. The greatly preferred option would be to keep the meetings every other Monday.

However, meet for 90 minutes rather than 60 with a starting time of 1400. There is only - there were 14 respondents to the poll. There was only one who said that would be inconvenient and (Rod), I think it was you, and I'm assuming that's because it's 7 a.m. on the west coast where you live.

(Rod Rasmussen): Right, and of course, I've got all the family stuff I have to deal with in the morning, so yeah.

(Greg Aaron):   Now 1430 has been doable for you though so far, is that correct?

(Rod Rasmussen): Yeah. We're going on summer vacation so I mean I've got some better flexibility now, so I could probably do it. It's just that, you know, for anybody on the west coast it's a tough chore.

(Greg Aaron):   This is true. Would you - now you're always of course welcome to join once the meeting's gotten underway.

(Rod Rasmussen): Right, and I've done that. Don't let me stand in the way. I mean, it's not, you know, whatever the consensus is and I'm the only odd man out, I'm the odd man out. It's no - I'll live.

(Greg Aaron):   Okay. Much appreciated. We did have a consensus to start meeting for 90 minutes beginning at 1400 and, you know, join us as you're able and we'll give you a recap when you come in.

(Rod Rasmussen): Sounds fair.

(Greg Aaron):   Okay. I appreciate your flexibility. Okay, so that means we will meet on Monday the 22nd and then our next meeting would be two weeks after

that in July. We'll look at the calendars. As far as I know, we're not colliding with any major holidays or anything.

So we'll pick up the meetings two weeks after Sydney and we'll go to a 90-minute schedule. Obviously we're hoping that allows us to do additional work and accelerate what we've been doing, so I'm glad that everyone has been able to commit to that.

Okay. We are at the top of the hour now, so I'd like to wrap-up. Does anyone have any last thoughts before we go? Okay. If not, for those of you who are going to Sydney, safe travels and for those of you who will join remotely, we look forward to talking with you in a week.

If you have trouble logging-in for any reason, just mail us on the list, myself and (Marik) and others will be monitoring the mail and if there are any troubles, we'll mail back to you with arrangements. So if nothing else, thanks very much for your participation today and we'll talk with you in a week.

Man: Thanks, (Greg).

Woman: Thanks.

Woman: Thank you.

(Greg Aaron):   Good day.

                            END