

**Fast Flux PDP WG Teleconference
TRANSCRIPTION
Friday 17 October 2008 15:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Fast Flux PDP WG teleconference on Friday 17 October 2008, at 15:00 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-fast-flux-20081017.mp3>
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#oct>

Present for the teleconference:

Avri Doria - NCA, GNSO Council chair, Interim chair
George Kirikos - CBUC

Registry Constituency
Greg Aaron - Afilias

Registrar constituency
Paul Diaz - Networksolutions
James Bladel - Godaddy
Kal Feher - MelbourneIT

Wendy Seltzer - ALAC Board liaison

Observers - (no constituency affiliation)

Joe St. Sauver
Dave Piscitello
Martin Hall
Jose Nazario

Staff:

Liz Gasster
Marika Konings
Glen de Saint Gery

Coordinator: We are now recording.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Glen can you just go through and call out the names so that we have the - recording has the list of the names of the people that are here at the beginning?

Glen Desaintgery: Yes, certainly Avri. We have Avri Doria who is leading the group, Joe St. Sauver, Dave Piscitello, George Kirikos, James Bladel, Martin

Hall, Jose Nazario, Wendy Selzer, Paul Diaz, Greg Aaron and Kal Feher.

And from staff we have Liz Gasster, Marika Konings and myself. Have I missed anybody?

Avri Doria: Okay thanks and I want to thank all of you for putting up with my restarting it and thank you in advance for putting up with me over the next couple weeks while I try to bring it to a close.

One of the first things I wanted to bring up was the fact that I - you know I saw George's mail about the Adobe view tool. It's not something I've used.

I don't know if it's necessary for this group and that's really for you all to tell me. I didn't want to try to acclimate myself to it in the last ten minutes before the call.

And what I basically said in my email, if it's just a question of having a queue of who's going to talk when, I'm used to working without it for that. If it is something that we absolutely need because as I said the work culture of this group requires it then I'll learn how to use it before the next meeting and add it back in then.

But people should let me know. Does anyone want to speak on the use of the Adobe tool at this point?

George Kirikos: George here, I just wanted to point out that it's sometimes useful to chat in that while somebody else is talking and it allows people to you

know make side notes on what was said without interrupting somebody.

It also let's everybody know who is on the call, people drop in and drop out and it's hard to keep track.

Avri Doria: Okay, but just so - they have to have joined back to show up, right? There's not an automatic that everyone that's joined the call is automatically listed there.

George Kirikos: True. But most people are.

Avri Doria: Okay, so it's only those who are doing that and if people are having Skype or other side conversations you know they could be doing that even without the tool.

George Kirikos: Right but it would at least be visible to everybody.

Avri Doria: Okay. Anyone else think that we need this? Okay so for the moment we'll see how this one goes, and if at the end of the meeting people say you know we really missed it and we should get it back then I'll look into getting it back for the next time.

Okay the other thing I wanted to talk about was how to go about doing this. First of all we have the new document, we have the surveys. I'm not recommending that we actually spend time going through the survey, but that we have the survey as a tool to go back to.

But that we really work off the document that Marika has put out with all the changes. Now I've already mentioned to Marika one change in the next version that I'm going to ask for.

And that's in each section that contains things that are you know supported or other views or agreement that basically we have block subtitles so that we have you know the top of the subject agreement.

And then it has an agreement discussion and then support and it has a support discussion and that alternative views, it has an alternative view. So that it's easy for people to see and delineate kind of what she's doing in colors now.

But in black and white and visible so that there is you know three subsections to any section so people can quickly see which is which.

But other than that what I wanted to do was basically start walking through this document and make a pass through it now. What Marika has done is marked everything that she has decided was an alternative view or a supported view or an accepted view and - with tentative. And as much as possible I'd like to be able to remove those tentatives in this first pass.

So then we have a next document that only shows us the stuff where we have some disagreement about what its status is in the discussion.

So does that - does anyone object to taking it through that way and I'll take a queue of names of anyone that - anyone that wants to speak on that particular process. No one? Okay, so that's okay, great.

Then starting - I guess we'll go to the document. And if I look through it the first place that I see any marked changes from the last document - and what I'd like to ask is I'll go to the first change which in this case is lines 192, 194.

And if anybody had something that was an issue before 192, 194 please say something, but otherwise I'll assume that the first place we have changes at the moment was 192 and 194 and this just looks like wording changes if I could be sure.

But...

Marika Konings: Avri, this is Marika. If I could just maybe point out to everyone that the track - the changes in blue are those that were already discussed and principle decided upon on previous calls, so before the survey.

So that's why these are not color coded, and the others are color coded as - you know according to the survey. So just for everyone's explanation.

Avri Doria: Okay, that's a good thing because that actually fits in well with the way I'd like to go through these documents. Normally what I'd like to do is for example this time we'll go through and mark a bunch of things that are tentative as not tentative.

And yet they'd still be in changes because what I'd like to do is next time around go back to everything and sort of say okay, last time we said that that was okay.

But is it? It's kind of like you know we have several different statuses going through that at the moment you have things that are tentative.

The things in blue have kind of been resolved but they are still in preview so people can look at it this time and say yep, that's what we meant.

And then if we go past it this time with nobody having any changes then we can basically next time it shows up color free. So basically so on this one, these are changes that you guys made last time, are they okay?

Anyone want to say anything about 192 to 194? Nope, cool, then mark those as accepted. Next was just a quick I guess deletion in 205, 206, any issues?

Okay. Next one is one that's marked tentative which is one that came out of the survey and that's the illicit uses of Fast Flux which was basically a deletion of why is it a problem to illicit uses.

And that was something that was agreed to, green was your color meaning that your impression was that it was a - something that it was agreed to, correct?

Marika Konings: Correct.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. And please jump in any time I don't know what I'm taking about because I'm running my way on this document. So can the tentative be removed from there? Okay great.

So Marika in terms of next time, this would show up without the tentative, without the green, but still in blue.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Avri Doria: So that next time we can go through it again and just make sure that everyone that was on the phone call, everyone had a chance to see it, people had a chance to think through it and say but wait a second.

In other words, so it's kind of like a two pass on doing that. I find that helps.

Marika Konings: Just for my information, the ones that we just went through, they can just be accepted, because they are....

Avri Doria: Accepted, right, they're accepted.

Marika Konings: They've been already reviewed so in the next document they just come up as the normal text.

Avri Doria: Exactly. But anything that's only being sort of accepted for the first time today, you know everything that's tentative gets a slightly stronger than tentative but isn't quite.

I just found and hopefully that will work here and if it doesn't work here we'll come up with a - it's sort of you know I call the status, it's been reviewed, it's believed closed but needs confirmation. And then at the next meeting it gets confirmed, people look at it and say yep, close that one.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay, so then moving on the next place I see blue which is again stuff that's been reviewed is lines 232 through 242. Any issues on that or can those be closed?

That's definitions of agreement support an alternative view.

Man: On line 230 the number 490 can probably be changed to 700, there's 694 current mail.

Avri Doria: Oh okay. Thank you. And that one probably will be changed again.

Man: Yep, you might want to put a memo after that.

Avri Doria: At the end when - okay. So now just to cover those, so the way I'm doing agreement and the way it seems to be working with what Marika does is you know you (pause it) in green that you think there's agreement tentatively.

And then you go through it at least twice to make sure that indeed the agreement is there, the same thing with support and such. So okay. Then the next thing was the members of the working group.

This was tentative, it's a statement that people have I guess agreed to in the survey. I wanted to ask people one question about it and normally I'm not going to ask too much about contents.

But it's on an individual title and not necessarily representative for their respective constituencies or I would assume your companies. Or is that not the case?

Man: Correct.

Avri Doria: So would it be unreasonable to add respective constituencies or employers? I guess thinking of the safety of you that have employers that might not want to agree with what you've agreed to.

Man: I'd certainly appreciate that.

Man: I'd support that change.

Avri Doria: Does anybody object to that change? Okay so could you add that Marika to representative for the respective constituencies or employers?

Marika Konings: Yep, will do so.

Avri Doria: Okay so the text is going to be in blue next time under the review status. Okay. I don't think we need to go through the names, so everyone should check their name and their employer and send any corrections.

For example I sent one on (Leo), but...

Man: Are we going to alphabetize those or anything?

Avri Doria: I suppose we could. And if we alphabetize them is it okay to alphabetize them by first name? Well then that puts me first. I don't like that. But yeah, I see no reason why they can't be alphabetized.

It looks like they're at the moment in addition - in order of joining the list, or maybe not, I don't know.

Man: I think they were initially probably alphabetical by first initial then a few more people joined and it - were inserted randomly.

Avri Doria: I think alphabetizing them before the end is fine then if no one objects. I can't imagine anybody objecting. Alphabetized and I believe Marika's choice on how to alphabetize.

Marika Konings: All your imaginations about these groups then are too limited.

Avri Doria: Well let's leave them limited, let's not disabuse me of my notions. But anyhow if anybody has a caring for how it's alphabetized, please. And then again I just (winched) about having my name first so I understand.

Okay, the next addition we have in addition ICANN security senior technologist Dave Piscitello after we participate in open group discussions.

I assume there was a reason for having his name separate from staff. I would think that it should also list the other staff members who have participated you know in the calls.

But anyhow, any objection to that as it stands? Okay. Moving on, we'll get some harder stuff. Okay, in 266 the word definition was deleted, I don't know, characteristics was added.

Also in 273, 276, 277 had the same change with also a Fast Flux attack network was added. Any issues on any of those? Are they all okay? Okay, moving on, 279, some but not necessarily all of the network nodes are - any issues?

And one of these, what was the change on 281, I'm not quite sure I see what the change was.

Man: Both of those words are 279 I think.

Avri Doria: Oh okay. Okay, so are those all okay, accepted? Thanks. Okay, 294 through 303, previous change, additional characteristics and then a list. Then as I understand it 305 through 308 were two extra bullets that would get added to that.

Oh no, those are support not - I notice the first set of characteristics are characteristics that have agreement, correct? And then these next two are characteristics that only have support?

Is that a correct interpretation?

Man: Correct.

Woman: I don't think there was - I don't know that the first set were subject to an agreement question, were they?

Marika Konings: This is Marika, if I recall correctly I think the first part was discussed in a previous group and I think there was - or in a previous meeting and we did through the Adobe system.

I think we did a vote and then there was agreement, but the second set was I think submitted at a later stage so that's why it appeared in the survey.

And that didn't receive agreement but was just support.

Woman: And see I must have missed the call.

Avri Doria: Okay. So in other words then the tentative would go and this would be and there was support in the working group for the following additional characteristics. I see, okay.

So any issue with that removing the tentative and leaving those two points as points that have support but not agreement. Okay.

Dave Piscitello: Avri?

Avri Doria: On many of these things we will go by them again.

Dave Piscitello: This is Dave. I was wondering if we could clarify the second bullet where it says WHOIS records are fraudulently created, the other situation is when an account is stolen you know as in a hijacking of an account.

And so perhaps it should say WHOIS records are fraudulently created and then following the parenthesis or stolen or the domain name is stolen.

Avri Doria: Okay well it already has for example using stolen identities or payment method and basically you want to add a third condition which is the domain name itself is stolen.

It sounds like you're actually offering another bullet. You've got WHOIS records are fraudulently created which is one thing and WHOIS records are - WHOIS entries or something are themselves hijacked.

So it sounds like yet another bullet.

Dave Piscitello: Yeah, I just want to make certain that the other case you know is enumerated because a small domain account accomplishes the same, you know the same as the fraudulently created account.

And you know is that reported on registrar impersonations you know in phishing attacks and so I think it would be appropriate to mention that additional charge.

Avri Doria: What I would suggest doing is leaving this alone at the moment, in other words these were already discussed and voted on and are tentative. Remove the tentative, leave those three and then what I see you're doing is suggesting yet another bullet.

That perhaps you can try crafting that bullet, send it out on the list, we can determine whether that bullet is one that falls into this support category or into the upper agreed category and go on it from that way.

As opposed to trying to change something that we've already gotten a degree of support indicated on.

Dave Piscitello: Sounds perfect, I'll do that.

Woman: I have a procedural question.

Avri Doria: Sure.

Woman: Since I missed the earlier call for agreement, am I too late to disagree with several of the points up above.

Avri Doria: I don't think so, that was the reason for asking - in other words doing the double check.

Woman: Right, that and....

Avri Doria: And so okay, so basically which of these are you saying - and of course just one person is not necessarily enough to knock it from agreement to support. But which ones are you questioning?

Woman: The consumer broad band and poor quality to Liz I would not support. The IPs lying within consumer broad band allocation rocks and poor quality list.

Avri Doria: Okay, so you would say that those should be moved down to support.

Woman: Yes. I would not express my agreement with them.

Man: I think I'm almost on Wendy's side on most issues, but I think on this one it's intended only to be part of a fingerprint, it's not necessarily the main part. But it's just that if you've got hijacked consumer PCs that could be a partial signal.

And it doesn't necessarily stand alone that that's a factor for Fast Flux attacks.

Woman: Okay, I would then expect that compromised computers would garner more support than the mere location of the computer, yeah, on the network, but.

Man: Because we could probably add in other things you know running Windows operating system (unintelligible) as consumer network as opposed to...

Avri Doria: So what you're arguing is that by used to distinguish a fingerprint, that these things are just a cluster of things that may or may not contribute to that definition or to that fingerprint.

So I - what I would suggest doing is take the in address or IP line within consumer and support quality WHOIS and leave them in blue for next time.

And so - and then we have these others that will be in blue and actually talk about moving them down to that other category. Is anyone else in agreement from moving them from agreement to support?

James Bladel: Avri, this is James.

Avri Doria: Yes.

James Bladel: I agree with the statement about poor quality WHOIS as well as the support bullet WHOIS records are fraudulently created. I think that I understand what the sentiment is and I think that we can express it I think probably combine both of those points into a single supported bullet that says something to the effect of WHOIS records contain fraudulent submissions.

Or contain invalid data, but I'm not sure I like way that the - especially the way the tentative bullet is worded.

Avri Doria: Okay. So sounds like three of you have had comments on the wording and placement. Anyone else want to speak on this particular issue?
Okay.

Man: I'd be in favor of going ahead and working to combine the items if possible but I do think that for example the WHOIS item and the location in the consumer blocks, I think those are both things that should go ahead and receive as much emphasis as possible.

So those are very helpful in terms of distinguishing the Fast Flux from non-Fast Flux domains.

Avri Doria: Okay. So you're basically arguing that they are within that cluster even though that cluster is not all things must exist or any time you see these things it means.

What I'd like to ask is before the next meeting if those of you that would like to see the recombination or wording could actually try to work out some wording either on the list or between yourselves.

And suggest that we leave this one all in blue and get rid of the tentative, but leave it all in blue so that we come back next time and can look about shifting things around in order.

And if you guys have been able to agree to some other wording that you're all happy with, then we could substitute that in. Is that an okay approach?

Man: I'm for having a possible helpful clarifications on launch 95 it says additional characteristics that in combination or collectively have been used, perhaps the word empirically used or statistically determined.

Like that kind of maybe shows that it's not something like a causality base that necessarily is implied into the future but is determined through observation.

Avri Doria: It sounds to me though that you're almost saying what people are saying is additional characteristics in combination or collectively have sometimes been used to distinguish or fingerprint.

Is that you know sometimes one has been used, sometimes another, it really depends on the study and the technique and the message that people are using is kind of what it sounds like I'm hearing.

And that all of those are not necessarily there and that's why it's more of a sometimes. And it's in combination or collectively. But I would ask

the people that are sort of having issues on this one to basically go off and see if they can come up with some recommendations in common that we can look at the next time and come back to them.

Man: Will do.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. Okay so Marika I would say this particular section remains blue thought it can use the - lose the yellow in tentative. Okay, then the next on is 310 to 314. Is that fine? Okay great. Moving on.

Jose Nazario: Actually hold on a second, this is Jose. This - my experience has been that this applies to Fast Flux nodes but the way that it's worded it could also include the back end servers, the mother ships.

And that - those mother ships are everything that I've seen, those things expressly run and operated by the owners. So those are totally by their own consent, not a hijacked PC.

So I guess I would argue that we should look at constraining that paragraph only to those - the advertise nodes and not the mother ship.

Avri Doria: Okay, I have a question from reading this though, any of these networks through the mother ship may be with consent, but that there are many nodes in that system that are running software without notice or consent.

And it's a characteristic of that network that there are system - it's not that all systems are - and when I read this it's not saying to me that every system in that network has software running without consent.

Because there's always something there that is intentional and consented to. It's just that there are many elements that are being run without consent. So I - whether it's one thing or another, I don't know that this statement actually goes against what you were saying.

Man: If I can jump in for a second, I think what Jose might actually be saying is that we've really been focused just on the visible components of the Fast Flux networks, and there's sort of a second layer behind there that visible components talk to.

And I don't think we've really paid a lot of attention to that layer of it.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I understand that but this statement doesn't necessarily exclude that. And that's because here you're talking about the network. And the network has stuff installed on the host without notice or consent.

It doesn't say all software installed on all hosts is without notice or consent. So I'm not really arguing the point but I'm sort of saying the statement that's there seems to not be disagreement with what you're saying.

I mean obviously if you think that there is a change to this that's necessary but here it's saying that in any network, and I don't think that you're saying that there's a secondary part that has consent.

That in any network that is being used this way, this is one of the critical features, that there will be software installed on the host without notice or consent.

Correct?

Man: Yeah. I see where you're coming from and I guess if other folks don't find ambiguity there or confusion or you know then I'm happy to withdraw my point there.

Avri Doria: And I mean there is stuff later in this document that does seem to talk about you know mother ships and other systems.

Man: Okay.

Avri Doria: We can always leave it in blue and come back to it again basically, we don't necessarily have to change it now. We can leave it in blue and say yeah, we want to think about it again.

So I'm not trying to close the door on it. If there's more thinking and perhaps word changing that people want to suggest at another pass you know we can come back to it.

It's really the madness of its method is if you don't accept it now then sleep on it for a week and we come back to it in the next pass.

Man: Yeah.

Avri Doria: We can have another crack at it, so I'm not trying to force you to accept it in any way, I'm just sort of arguing as to what I read it in.

Man: Yes. That's sounds good, I'm going to withdraw my objection at this point, thanks.

Avri Doria: Thanks. Okay, moving on, charter questions, I don't want to talk about charter questions. All of these are questions from the charter. Okay, we have a blue 333 here which is defined as being replaced by characterized.

Sounds like that was a global change people made. Okay, then the next blue section was who benefits from Fast Flux, I really hate those words.

Any issues with that blue? Okay. Next is at 356, this is one that came out of the polling fairly long section where we have a agreement statement and we have a - then we have an alternative use statement.

Is there initial agreement to the fact that this is an agreement statement? This was one that Marika decided there was agreement based upon a - and I'm not looking at the sheet with the votes in front of me but based on the number of votes.

Man: One mechanical issue, on 360 can we go ahead and remove the URL broken due to length assuming we can figure a way to not break the URL?

Avri Doria: Yes, I'm sure. Can always put in a short URL.

Man: No, don't put in a short URL.

Woman: Which we can then break due to volatility of networks.

Man: You just need a footnote where you've got a smaller font and that's it.

Avri Doria: I mean even if the URL is broken, so be it. I mean if anybody cannot tell that that's not a hyphenated word, that that's a URL that's broken, anyway.

Okay so I am assuming that we can remove the tentative and the green color but we'll leave it in blue. Moving down to the next one at 368, tentative and alterative view of the following, that's so hard to read.

Was offered their legitimate users a short (TGL) values and that - so any disagreement that that was an alterative view? Okay then, so let's say remove the tentative and the shading.

Okay next, 383 through 386. This is previously agreed to, any issues with it? Okay, 391 through 394, previously agreed to, any issues with it?

Man: Again just a mechanical thing, I think discover should be discovery on 394.

Avri Doria: Yes, okay.

Woman: And tour isn't capitalized, that's T O U R, not...

Avri Doria: I'm assuming Marika that you're capturing all these...

Marika Konings: Yes I am.

Avri Doria: ...edits and such and typos and such. Okay great, okay so that one moving on, on those things where Marika is changing something

because of a typo, I mean she can leave it blue - that word blue for us to confirm it next time, but I don't know that that's critical.

Although it's probably good for anything just to be marked that way so we can tell for sure. Okay, next is 411. This is one from the voting, it's marked as tentative.

It's an agreement statement. Is there any issue with whether this agreement statement is agreement? Say we'll come back to next time or in the next pass. But now - okay. So that one can remove the tentative, remove the shading but remain in blue.

And the next one is tentative one alternative view. It's expressed in 431, 433 is there any issue with that being listed as an alternative view.

Woman: I would support the alternative.

Man: Me too.

Avri Doria: Right. And at some point we may on some of these come back if people have an argument that that tentative has bigger support than just - you know if that alternate has bigger support than just one or two people and that it should be upgraded to support then you know those people should make a case for it.

But there should be you know a significant number of people and - to upgrade it just like there should be a significant number of people to downgrade one.

But we could certainly look through you know all of that as we go on and at any point where you know somebody has managed to convince six other people of their alternative view, those people - those six people should show up and we can upgrade the view.

Okay, 443 is data listed. I don't assume there's any issue with that. Okay, 448, 449, maintaining an acceptable rate of false positives, I just deleted avoiding. Any issue with that change?

Okay, that can remain, 455 through a whole bunch, 455 through it looks like 513 is that previous edits that were believe agreed upon, are there any issues on those?

Man: Could I suggest that we expand the acronyms? I think you know when we tucked those in we were using email, (unintelligible) and HIPAA?

Avri Doria: Okay, now one of the customary practices and I want to see if this is okay with the group is that the first use of any acronym is fully spelled out and that after that one can - if it's used again one can still use it.

Is that an acceptable practice?

Man: That's right on, but GLBA and HIPAA are both introduced without having been explained.

Avri Doria: Oh yeah, yeah, no, I wasn't disagreeing, I was just making sure that as a policy as long as basically and then Marika can just look for this in the document in general as a general comment.

And that on any acronym at the point of its first use it should be spelled out and then after that it can just be used.

So I was just thinking while we were making that note, we can just make that a sort of general note for the document that you know she on her own time can basically go through and just make sure that that's the case on all acronyms if that's okay with people.

And then so hopefully then if somebody notices that that hasn't happened then they can make an issue, you know bring it up, but - okay.

Okay so anything else in that 455 through 513 section? Okay so that can be marked as accepted. Okay in 515 through 523, there is a tentative in there that was one of the things that was voted on.

This is all being listed in the - in basically, excuse me, in agreement, so is that acceptable? Is that a correct evaluation there, of that being a thing that's disagreed on.

Okay so I would say that number three there stays in blue for next time, but loses the tentative in the shading. And okay then the next one, sorry, then the next one is - I have my pages turned around on me, 525 through 546 is statements that were voted on.

And that those were support, now I'm kind of curious on this one and I want to understand. The previous statements, they may and willingly disclose medical personal information that could be used for blackmail or coercion.

That was something that was agreed upon whereas the rest of the content here in yellow until we come down to individuals who purchase bogus products, especially pharmaceuticals may be physically harmed.

I wonder about these, the word bogus, but okay. And then we go back to support to add. So in this case if those two statements that are currently unshaded are agreement statements and the rest of the stuff is only supported statements then I would suggest that this is one of those places where I talked about where we would have sort of a clear definition that we wouldn't try to intersperse stuff that's agreed on with stuff that's only at a support level.

So there would be basically you know agreement and then there's the two statements, you know people may unwillingly disclose and bogus products and then support and all the stuff that's in yellow so that it's visually clear.

Unless there's more support for this than just what it looks like. Does anybody want to speak to that?

Man: I think the intent was originally to go ahead and just sort of expand on what was meant by the two sort of briefer statements and you know the person who went ahead and actually submitted that text it's just like going and routinely talk to folks who don't really get exactly what the issues are with that kind of disclosure or leakage.

Marika Konings: This is Marika, if I can just provide you with some of the comments that were actually made and I think reason why people maybe agreed on the first part and only supported the other one, is that I think a lot of people thought that the text was getting too long.

And I think it was a question that you know people didn't agree with the actual content of it but I think it was more a statement that they had a feeling that this part of the text was getting too long.

George Kirikos: Is it possible - George here, is it possible to put all this in an appendix? Because it's really just a laundry list of harms on the internet which aren't particularly directly related to Fast Flux but were put in there, things like medical records, health records.

You know that could be non-Fast Flux too. Because I think particularly related to Fast Flux for many of these things.

Man: But remember the actual section title is WHOIS harms by Fast Flux activities and the intent is to go ahead and sort of explicate what those harms are.

George Kirikos: But that's basically all the harms on the internet, like it could be done with you know one sentence and say you know refer to appendix 12 or something.

Wendy Selzer: Yeah, this is Wendy, I'd agree that attributing all of these to Fast Flux seems a bit too much - too close a connection, rather than saying I think there's one more step that Fast Flux can be used as one means of perpetrating harm and separately there are dozens of harms internet users may...

George Kirikos: For example you could toss in something about online gambling given the key ruling yesterday and then open up whole new can worms but

you know at least you want to get support from a certain constituency, you would just you know toss in there pet peeve or whatever.

So I don't want it to be seen as a political thing that you know if you're special you know concern of health or whatever or gambling is mentioned that you know you'll get support for the document because of that mention.

Man: I have some concern that we're kind of cycling back and sort of revisiting things that we've already discussed and discussed and then even voted on and I'd sort of like to avoid that if possible.

I don't know how you feel about that Avri, but...

Avri Doria: Oh I very much feel that things that you have discussed and discussed and voted on shouldn't be redone. Otherwise we won't complete. What I'm really trying to figure out is how to deal with the separation between what's agreed on and what's supported.

I tend to agree that since it's in this part of the section it should probably say they are trying to move it into an appendix at this point would be a major rework I think.

I would recommend and see how that goes next time, is basically in this section you know to basically take the two lines in blue and say you know put those together under this disagreed part and then basically go supported and then add the rest of this and see how it looks next time.

And then see if we can - if people can read it and sort of decide well you know we don't have to keep it separate as supported. But if the reason people are objective is the length of it, I would say don't worry about it.

This thing is already 76 pages, what are two paragraphs?

Wendy Selzer: Just a brief comment from Wendy but I'm objecting to the emphasis on harms. We know which generic harms aren't stacking them all into the document makes Fast Flux into a worse seeming problem than it needs to be.

Avri Doria: And that's why you would consider only supported as opposed to disagreement.

Wendy Selzer: That's why I would dissent from supporting it.

Avri Doria: From just having it included in there.

Wendy Selzer: Right.

Avri Doria: Okay.

James Bladel: And this is James, I support Wendy's statement there. I think it leads to the implication that securing Fast Flux secures these other ills.

Man: Well that's a good point.

Avri Doria: Okay. So let's just try to see what happens if we separate those two out and just leave them as saying supported comments and then leave them there, and then next time we can go back through it.

Man: I have one mechanical suggestion in terms of how to represent the varying levels of support. For the stuff that essentially has you know strong support I think it seems like it would be easy to show that sort of in a large font.

And then essentially as the support becomes smaller and smaller perhaps decrease the size of the fonts?

Avri Doria: That's - that aesthetically just bugs me. But also it becomes very hard to read. I believe that what we can - it's actually visually clearer to people if you say these are the statements on which there was agreement, these are the statements on which there was only support.

You know and in fact in your case Wendy you may want to add an extra statement that only has support that gets added into the support section that basically cautions against you know in other words what you're saying, maybe that's just an alternate view that gets added in if only two of you are saying it.

We can determine that later, but sort of expresses what you're saying that listing all these things is problematic. And so we've got the things that are agreed on, we've got the things that are supported and then we have the alternate view that says you know yes these things are dangerous.

But you know securing Fast Flux does not cure the common cold. And move on from that, and basically so it's all been sent. So that might be worth...

Wendy Selzer: I'll send that...

Avri Doria: That might be worth trying and perhaps you want to phrase those two, three sentences and then send them to Marika and she can put them in this section, you know start out certainly as alternate view and then if we find out that there's you know stronger support for them we can upgrade them.

Okay, we can take a couple more before we hit the hour mark, 548 there was agreement on all this green goop, 548 to 561, any issues? Other than fix that thing right there?

Okay, I'll lose the tentative and lose the color but remain in blue, 563 through 574 again it was agreed upon and is there any issue with that being left there as agreed upon?

Okay, we'll leave it in blue, lose the tentative and the color. Then we have basically 576 through 79 agreed upon last time, any issue? Okay, then there's 581 through 588 where we have the first part that was agreed upon.

And then there's oh I can tell this is the same issue, there's support for adding some examples such as child pornography which of course will go away when we get rid of Fast Flux and such.

So it strikes me that the same comment here would be support for adding these examples of things that hopefully will be ameliorated in our - at least we'll be able to catch the bad guys better or whatever if people are saying here.

And then perhaps there's also a you know an additional comment you know on - essentially the same comment you were making before. I'm assuming that that's the same reason that this didn't get support. Is that a correct assumption?

Man: That is correct.

Avri Doria: Okay. So yeah, so you may want to add that same sentence under alternative view. So now that's seven, we'll basically have a first part. I'm not sure and I'll talk to Marika about this later, whether anything that's divided into the three we have seven agreement.

You know seven support, seven alternative view or some way of saying it so that we've clearly delineated where those things are so people can see it and people will understand what the issue is.

And I think by laying it out that way, people can see that you know there was agreement on a certain part, there was something else that people thought important to say and then enough people thought important so it had support.

And then there was something that a few people said you know raised the flag and said but caution you know etcetera.

And that would be good to be able to be seen. Okay, is that okay, then moving on to 590 through 595, basically seem to have agreement. And then any issue with that having agreement?

Okay, and then we go into who benefits, and I think we're at the end of the hour. So what I propose to do is how often, are you guys meeting weekly or bi-weekly? Hello?

Man: Weekly.

Avri Doria: Weekly, okay. So that's good because it seems like - so what I would suggest we do is that the people that we're going to sort of head some issue to work together on some of that previous language get together and if you can come to agreement.

You know and I have absolutely if Marika has the time perhaps you want to set up a ad hoc phone call at some point to talk about it.

But if you can do it on email lists or in some other way that's fine too, perhaps working on the wiki is a way to craft some language.

However you know it's easiest for you guys to work together to craft some alternative language there that you all agree to and then bring it back next time so that we can see if everyone else agrees to it.

But basically next time I will start from 597 and try to run through you know a bunch more of these things. And what I'd look for is if in some of the areas coming up they are similar to this one that you know you voted against supporting something because of a particular view.

And there's a couple of you that have that view, then you might as well create that alternative view statement, hold on, my headphone, so then basically the statement that explains you know the alternative view to why there isn't support.

Because almost whenever there is going to be only support for something, then there's obviously somebody who had an alternate view. If there's agreement, there may not be an alternate view.

But if there's only support then it almost stands to reason that there's an alternate view that goes with it that explains why if there wasn't full support.

And it's useful I think to get those things in as part of the full snapshot that people have. And does anyone else have something to add?

George Kirikos: George here, are we still trying to get this done by Cairo? Like how many more...

Avri Doria: No. We took the break. I'm trying to get it done as quickly as possible. It would be good if we had a fairly clean and so if we made a couple passes through it and were at a fairly clean point by Cairo.

But I'm not trying to rush it, I'm just trying to get a clean snapshot without you know going through stuff. So read through the things, think through it. I think we might be able to move a little quicker next time.

Basically the content that we have to deal with basically goes until about page 41, so we essentially made it about half way through the voted on stuff this time.

And next time I'd like to make it through if we can through to line at least 1157 which is you know the possible next steps. I don't care as much about the possible next steps yet.

You know I'd like to basically once I get to 1157 then at the - and if we can get to there by the end of the next meeting, then at the following meeting we make a complete pass through and hopefully there will be very few issues left at the end of that pass.

Okay? I thank you all and if people feel that we should do a longer meeting next time, let's discuss it on the mailing list if people feel that hey, you know an hour's not too painful, we can do two hours and finish quicker, I'm fine with that.

People let me know. Okay?

Man: Thanks very much.

Man: Bye everyone.

Woman: Thank you very much.

Avri Doria: You have good weekends all and I'll talk to you next week.

Man: Thanks Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you, bye bye.

Glen Desaintgery: Thanks Avri, bye.

END