Fast Flux PDP WG Teleconference
TRANSCRIPTION
Friday 21 November 2008 16:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Fast Flux PDP WG teleconference on Friday 21 November 2008, at 16:00 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-ff-pdp-20081121.mp3
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#nov

Present for the teleconference:
Avri Doria - NCA, GNSO Council chair, temporary chair
Greg Aaron - Afilias Ry c.
Paul Diaz - Networksolutions RRc
James Bladel - GodaddyRRc

Observers - (no constituency affiliation)
Joe St. Sauver
Martin Hall
Dave Piscitello
Rod Rasmussen
Marc Perkel
Randy Vaughn

Absent apologies
Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC

Staff:
Marika Konings
Glen de Saint Gery

Glen DeSaintgery: …Mr. Rod Rasmussen is now joining the call. Sorry.

Avri Doria: Oh okay. Thank you.

Man: We're now recording (Avri).

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Good morning all. As I've mentioned a couple times

but I'll mention again, I'm going to need to leave fairly promptly after I guess an hour and 10 - at an hour and 15 because I have to catch a cab to the airport.

So we have many of the normal participants for the call.

Glen DeSaintgery: I'll run through the names (Avri.

Avri Doria: Please do, thank you.

Glen DeSaintgery: We've got Joe St. Sauver, Mark Perkel, Avri Doria, Greg Aaron, Paul Diaz, James Bladel, Martin Hall and Rod Rasmussen. And for staff we have (Marika) and myself and (Dave Piscitello) has just joined us.

Avri Doria: Just joined, fantastic. Okay, thanks. I was thinking that I would actually as opposed to going exactly as we've done before that I actually follow (Marika)'s recommendation, not that she made it as a recommendation, just as what we should pay attention to.

And she talked about Pages 34, 36, 44 and 48. Now she also talked about taking a look at Chapters 7, 8 and 9. Forty-four and 48 were all in chapters 7 and 8 - no, 7 and 9. So I was thinking we could start with 34 and 36. We could also take a look at 24 that you pointed out and then just work our way through 7, 8 and 9. And hopefully we can get through all of that in the next hour.

And if we do I think we're fairly close to trying to have one more meeting where we go through and make sure that we're fine and then do kind of like a last call. But let's see where we get to. Is that okay

with everyone?

Okay since no one's screen saying it was a terrible idea, let's go to Page 34.

(Marika): (Abry), this is (Marika). If I can just point out that the proposed suggestion on Page 34 is linked to that on Page 48.

Avri Doria: Right.

(Marika): There's two alternatives of the same thing.

Avri Doria: Right. I didn't quite understand whether those were alternatives of the same thing, whether they would appear in two different places or would it appear both in - I can say we basically we had a (section) has been proposed instead of the paragraph in 1393.

(Marika): That was how it was proposed.

Avri Doria: Okay.

(Marika): I mean it's up to the group to decide whether they want to have it in both places, only one.

Avri Doria: Okay. Well first let's look at the wording on Page 34. Okay, so that's the cooperative community initiative designed to facilitate data sharing and the identification of problematic domain names.

Examples include anti-phishing working groups, phish tank for phishing, (methods of) anti-abuse working group and various

(unintelligible) for SAN shuttle server foundation for Botnet and stop adware.org for malware.

Such a community effort may provide possible models of fast flux hosting.

Now the thing we have at 1393, Paragraph 1393 is...

(Marika): It's (Marika). If I can just add another thing for the change on Page 48. Basically I cut it there significantly to fit it with the rest of the text because it was a very long explanation and discussion which I thought was probably more appropriate for the group to discuss before putting it in here as ideas only.

Dave Piscitello: This is (Dave) with a quick question.

Avri Doria: Yes?

Dave Piscitello: I'm not sure on that block of text that I understand that last sentence. Community efforts may provide possible models for fast flux hosting. Do they mean models of possibly remedies against fast flux hosting?

Avri Doria: That's how I read it.

Dave Piscitello: Maybe we can make that a little clearer, just a thought.

Avri Doria: Okay. Now as I read the two, the paragraph on 34 and the 1393 paragraph, they actually - first of all, they're certainly not identical in content but they're similar in content.

And I'm not sure that I see why it's inappropriate for them both to be where they are. But others may have different views.

Because in one it's being listed among the possible next steps where in the other it's being listed as a (unintelligible). It's being listed as I believe as an example, correct?

Woman: No, a possible solution.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) proposal. So it's really the whole section of proposals. But okay, in one of them it's being listed as (unintelligible) discussed by the working group whereas in another they're - you're right.

So it's sort of a duplication but not just that paragraph, really the whole section.

Man: Can I jump in for a second?

Avri Doria: Please.

Man: One of them really is talking about a community based effort. And the other one is really talking about an ICANN based effort. So I actually think they're really two different ideas.

Avri Doria: Okay. So that would just take maybe changing the lead sentence in the first one to - well but that's that paragraph.

Do the rest of the bullets in the - okay. So yes, if 980 were perhaps changed a little to include the word community or something like that, the community information sharing proposals discussed by the working

included if that's true of all those bullets. And I'm not - (where) we would need to indent the 986 to show that it's subordinate to the list support 4. And that one would need to be indented one more.

(Marika): Correct. I'll do that.

(Greg): (Greg) (unintelligible) joins.

Avri Doria: Yes, oh hi. So what do people think of first of all leaving them both? Because even there's a slight duplication. And at the one in information sharing as was said, specific to information sharing and specific to community information sharing proposals as it were whereas the other one is suggestions of what things ICANN could do next. Is that - do people sort of agree with that differentiation of the two spots?

Man: Yes.

Man: Yes.

Avri Doria: Okay. Does anybody object to leaving both of those paragraphs? Okay, I don't hear anybody objecting to that.

Does anybody object to putting in the word the community information sharing proposal just to make sure it's clear?

No? Okay. Then we needed to fix a sentence. And first of all 998. Is that statement an agreement statement or a support statement? Does anyone disagree with it being an agreement statement?

Okay, then I guess I can go in at the agreement level. Now in terms of

clarifying the last sentence, that sentence is really not part of that bullet in a sense.

That sentence is almost an extra kind of like a framing sentence for the whole section. And I don't even know if it's necessary. What do people think, that such community efforts may provide possible models?

That sort of applies to all those bullets and it's redundant of 980 in a sense.

Man: If anything, it probably should say something like for sharing information about fast flux hosting. And I think once that's added it makes more sense.

Avri Doria: Within this bullet or for the whole paragraph?

Man: I would say within the bullet. Otherwise it's really a one sentence paragraph because that first line is...

Avri Doria: Right. You're right. Okay. Does anybody object to that change? Possible model for sharing. So that was such community efforts may provide possible models for sharing information. How did you put it?

Man: About fast flux hosting.

Avri Doria: About fast flux hosting. Okay. Is that okay with everyone?

Man: Much better, thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. So that could stay in. And it doesn't need to have a

support flag that you know and is an agreed upon statement.

Okay that was the Page 34. Page 36. Now the new proposal here is there was a support statement. And if understand correctly, the new statement would be a replacement for the old reports. And we need to see whether those agreements are support for it. Is that a correct interpretation in both of these cases? (Marika)?

(Marika): Well I think it is. This was circulated by (Mike Rodenbach) following the last call. And I think that's how he intended it to be done.

Avri Doria: Right. Okay. So in other words, if this paragraph - well I think that this paragraph will replace the other one. And what is - I guess, because it's really sort of redundant. And what is really a question is the wording in that paragraph and whether it's an agreement or a support statement.

So in terms of line 1052 through 1068, is there any discussion on the wording that's there? I mean it's been on the list and there's been discussion.

Any attempt by the working group to answer this question is deferred until the next constituency statements of public comment particularly (requested on) these points have been received and reviewed by the working group.

The (prior) solutions may include limitations, guidelines and restrictions on registrants, registrars and/or registry designed to mitigate the occurrence and longevity of fast flux (attack).

At that point, the working group might make an assessment (to lead) the (unintelligible) response against potential impacts.

Now the only quibble I would have had -- and I don't think it really matters -- is there's sort of the step of these things being reviewed by the council and coming back to the working group with revised charters. But I think that doesn't necessarily need to be there.

Do people agree with the statement? Is there any issue with it? Any rewording?

Paul Diaz: Yes, this is Paul. I don't really like the sentence, the middle sentence that begins on 1065 on proposed solutions may include. I think we're getting ahead of ourselves in suggesting that there's going to be restrictions on registrant - may be restrictions on these things design and mitigate.

I would like to drop that sentence. It's just s simple two sentence proposal.

Avri Doria: Right, okay. So what I hear you saying in a sense is that you have agreement on the two sentences and you would actually recommend that that statement would have - assuming - because it was proposed that that statement would drop to a support level as opposed to an agreement.

(James Liddell): And this is (James). I agree with that statement in there that, you know, it seems somewhat self-contradictory as well that there's a deferral to after constituency statement. But then they - then the second sentence right after that identifies some of the potential outcomes. So I just think

that that sentence needs to go.

(Greg):   This is (Greg). I would agree with that. It's a little too much ahead of ourselves.

(Randy):   Yes. This is (Randy). That looks logically inconsistent to have that second sentence in there with the first (one).

Avri Doria: Okay, does anybody beyond - I'm assuming that we not hear that (Mike) supports that statement. So at the very least it would be an alternative view and could we include it that way.

                 Is there any other support for that statement? Now...

Rod Rasmussen: This is...

Avri Doria: ...okay.

Rod Rasmussen: Actually this is Rod. I'm not sure that we shouldn't have something about what we've talked about pointed out here in that...

Man: Okay yes.

Rod Rasmussen: Because if nothing else, we don't want to have the next group or our continued work bring this up as a shocking thing or something like that. I mean we have talked about these things in the broader course of our work here.

Avri Doria: Okay. Anyone else?

Man: I'd agree with that sentence as well.

Man: Is there anywhere else in the report where those kinds of things are already mentioned? If so the statement would just be redundant.

Man: Instead of the word may could you say proposed solutions were advanced including?

Avri Doria: Well that's actually stronger sometimes than may. What I propose at the moment is -- and I want to see if that works with this group is to take that sentence out, drop it below and add a there was support colon and then an indented proposed solutions may include.

                 Because it sounds like there's some support for that but there isn't agreement on it. Is there any objection to taking that approach?

                 Okay fine. So (Marika), could you make that change to this?

(Marika):   Yes. No problem.

Avri Doria: Okay. So yes, so that sentence drops below. And so the first thing is agreement. And then there is a bullet there is support for. And then that second sentence, excuse me. I'm tripping over my tongue.

                 Okay, any other issue on this one before we move on to the next one?

                 In reading the next one, I assume that the same issue would pertain to the second sentence? Is that a correct assumption or is that a wrong assumption?

So in which case I would suggest doing the same thing here, just taking that second sentence and to leave the two outside sentences as agreed upon and take the second sentence and drop it to support level.

And in both cases, the previous support level stuff is lined out, it deleted. Any issue?

Okay, then let's - if that one's okay, let's jump back to 24 where there's a (registrars often) fast flux hosting activity. If so, how?

We have a bracketed statement that the working group has not hard evidence that any registrant intentionally facilitates fast flux hosting attacks. However, and then it goes on.

I guess there's discussion ongoing on the list on possible alternatives to this section sentence as (Marika) indicates. Where are we on that?

(James Liddell): This is (James). There were a couple of responses as well -- myself, (Mike Rodenbach), Rod Rasmussen and others.

I think that Rod had some excellent points. I think there was - but my only concern there was that it was starting to make this section kind of long. But I think we need to find some ways to capture this ideas because they were good ones in there.

But I think that the sentence should open with the idea and emphasize the idea that the vast majority of registrars, especially the larger ones are actively engaged at their own expense and a, you know, great investment of resources in combating fast flux and just general online

fraud and abuse. And I want to make sure that that point is highlighted in this section.

Avri Doria: In fact that almost seems like a good continuation, you know, (unintelligible) there's no hard evidence that any registrar intentionally (facilitates). In fact, you know, most registrars basically what you said. Most registrars, you know, make efforts at their own expenses to present, block -- I'm not sure which word you used but that could be a good extension to this first sentence. Do people object to such an exception to the (unintelligible)?

(Greg): This is (Greg). I think it makes sense. And actually it could say registrars and registries.

Avri Doria: Yes, okay.

Man: Well (Greg), there's a second above for registries. Maybe we could develop a parallel sentence to that and include it there so it's - we're hitting that point twice in each.

(Greg): That makes sense.

Avri Doria: It's actually good to put that in because a lot of time is spent on the sort of negative issues which of course are the focus of this. And one forgets that that's not the majority.

(Greg): Well it's certainly not representative of the folks who participant in ICANN right?

Avri Doria: Exactly. Okay, now what do we want to do about the rest of this? And

we have Rod on the phone call.

Rod Rasmussen: Yes, and unfortunately I have to leave. And there's been a guy with a leaf blower outside my window for the last 2 minutes. So I couldn't...

Avri Doria: Oh dear.

Rod Rasmussen: And I have to get going. But I circulated something last night because I know I could only be on the call here for a little while.

But I was looking at this and what I wrote last night. And I think that maybe we could put that into kind of the introduction area as talking about the overall kind of scope of involvement and then talking about specific ways below that which is what we've got laid out here.

And some of the things that have been done specifically that might, you know, help frame the argument and again, put the emphasis on the fact that there's a lot of work being done already by registrars to combat this and that the majority of what's gone on has not been any sort of, you know, intentional criminal activity and things like that, really, you know, frame it that way.

Avri Doria: Is this something that you sent out to the whole list or just among a few people?

Rod Rasmussen: I sent the whole list.

Avri Doria: Oh because for some reason I don't have it. Okay.

Okay so I can't...

Rod Rasmussen: I can resend that.

Avri Doria: Well if everybody else has it, I should probably look and see if it got misfiled or whatever. And I can get it from (Marika). But it seems like other people saw it so I'm the only one that doesn't seem to have seen it.

(Marika):   It was sent to the list I see, but maybe something happened in the...

Avri Doria: Well yes...

Rod Rasmussen: Okay unfortunately I have to go. So I'll let you guys - and since I'm not here to defend it, I'll let you tear it up.

Avri Doria: Well we'll probably come back through it again. But okay thanks.

Rod Rasmussen: All right thank you very much. Take care everybody.

(Marika):   Shall I send it to (unintelligible)?

Avri Doria: Yes, please do. And why don't we then come back to this and once I've gotten it and - as opposed to waiting for me to receive it and jump to Chapter 7 now. And then we can come back. Seven is on Page 42.

                  And there is changes, although there weren't great changes in 7 except for the paragraph they - I guess 1291 where the paragraph was put in about affiliate.

(Marika):   Yes, that's something I was asked to include after last call. But I did

make a note there whether...

Avri Doria: (If it was) appropriate.

(Marika):   Yes. Because it seemed to be out of sync a little bit with what that
                section is about. And I was just wondering whether it makes more
                sense to include it on the paragraph that talks about possible
                solutions...

Avri Doria: As opposed to challenges?

(Marika):   Yes.

Avri Doria: All right. First of all, what do people think about moving this to 5, 7 on
                possible solutions? Is there any issue with that?

Man: I'm sorry, what line are we at again?

Avri Doria: We're talking about the new section 1291 298. And it's basically - it's in
                a chapter on challenges. And this is a - it either would need to move or
                it would need to be - get a sub headline, you know, possible response
                to some of these challenges. But I think moving it is not unreasonable.
                What do people think?

Man: I think I might...

Man: Agree with moving it.

Man: ...who proposed putting it in there. And I'm fine with having it moved if
                that makes it flow better.

Avri Doria: Okay. Now if no one objects to moving it, what do people think about the wording? Is the wording fine?

Man: I'm sorry (Abry). I haven't finished finding it. What number are we on again?

Avri Doria: It's line 1291 through 1298 on Page 44.

Man: Okay, thank you.

(Marika):   And I probably should maybe ask (Greg) here if he agrees because he's basically one that's quoted in here as, you know, in the second part of this paragraph. Is that something that he commented on the initial suggestion of putting a point or two, the final request in, you know.

(Martin Hall): The only thing I would point out -- this is (Martin) -- is the kind of (alternate) sentences could probably be cleaned up a little.

Avri Doria: The short one, not all parties are similarly situated?

(Martin Hall): Well...

Avri Doria: Oh no, that's the one before it. It's...

(Martin Hall): Also, the one that starts also affiliate (factor).

Avri Doria: But this is a quote, correct?

(Marika):   Yes. Well it comes from a written submission to this comment.

Avri Doria: But a spokesperson quoted could change...

(Marika):   Yes. So (Greg), if you have any changes, you know, you can drop me
               a line.

(Greg):   Yes. I mean my observation about 1291 is that as pointed out in
               another staff report, the affiliated situation is not unique. And there
               seems to be a misapprehension that it is.

               A lot of registries already have policies and procedures to deal with this
               kind of thing. And I'm wondering why we're singling out a single
               company.

Man: I can tell you why I mentioned that particular one. And that is it came
               up on the list and I thought they did a really good job. So I'm often
               accused of being somewhat critical. This was meant to be a pat on the
               back for him, not anything as a challenge to anyone else.

               If there are registrars that have similar policies, I'd be delighted to see
               them also mentioned.

Avri Doria: Or one could append the sentence.

Man: I'm going to actually propose - I'm going to - I'll propose to the list an
               amendment to 1291 if nobody minds. And let me know what you think
               of it.

Avri Doria: Okay. So we'll move this to 5, 7 if agreed that that's okay to move it

there as part of a possible solution space.

And of course within that possible solution space it won't stick out quite as much as just one party because that - it has other, you know, people are doing this good thing, people are doing that good thing type perception. But okay.

And we'll come back to the wording but it'll move. And the person who's quoted can also check their wording. Okay. Let that for now (except moved).

Chapter 8, what we have is the reshuffling of a various interim conclusions were suggested. And (Marika) has now resorted it so that...

(Marika):   No this is...

Avri Doria: That's 9. I spoke out of order.

(Marika):   Yes. This chapter has been like this for a while already. And it was (a pointer) for people to carefully read it and make sure that they - you know, it fits with all the change we've made in other sections of the document.

Avri Doria: Yes.

(Marika):   So it's more something like, I wouldn't propose to maybe go through it now. But the people we do pay attention to this and, you know, make sure that it fits with...

Avri Doria: Well at this point I'd like to ask if - I mean we kept skipping over it but it's pretty much the time now to start, you know, getting these things done. So I'd like to go through if there are any issues and get them recorded and signed up.

If anything needs to be rewritten, who's going to do the wordsmithing on it? Because it's time to sort of get this section all squared away too I think.

First of all we've got the stuff in italics at the beginning. Is that still a true and acceptable statement about the world changing from the time the (FX) report was written?

Paul Diaz: Yes this is Paul. I think that's still fine, that's accurate, the italics. Just note 1302 because a little clean up that needs there.

There's change rapidly from the time not in the from time.

Avri Doria: Okay yes. So delete these.

Paul Diaz: In the.

Avri Doria: In the. Okay. Then Paragraph 1309 to 1316.

Man: There are some grammatical or wording issues on that. For example there's a line 1313, a number of many of the characteristics. I think that should either be many of or a number of but not both.

Avri Doria: Yes, makes sense. That's the kind of thing that I usually do. Okay. Anything other than the grammatical installing them? People - I think of

the grammatical installing, people should feel free to just slide those in email to (Marika) when they see them, you know.

(Marika): Yes please. And (more) definitely from our side, once we've finalized the content of the document we'll definitely have a careful read through to make sure as well we take out any inconsistencies and, you know, take up on these things.

Avri Doria: I think we're getting to be close to that point. I mean I think there may be a couple paragraphs that people are still, you know, wordsmithing and working on. But I think by and large that's - maybe, you know, we've got something that we should start and seeing as being in the evidence.

(Marika): Yes. So no I think we'll - once we are there I think we'll do a read through. And then everyone is asked as well to do a final read through to really make sure that we're happy with the document before it goes out for public comment.

Avri Doria: Right. Okay, anything in the Paragraph 1318 or 1322?

Man: I continue to have some concern about the subjective characterization on 1322. If something is illegal it's illegal. I understand that can vary by jurisdiction but it's not really subjective within that jurisdiction.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Man: In terms of a concrete suggestion for that, I would suggest striking as both labels are highly subjective in certain situations, basically the bulk of 1322 to go.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) other than (unintelligible). So you would end after the
                 date.

Man: Correct.

Avri Doria: Somebody in the wind? How do other people feel about dropping that
                 last (line)?

                 Okay does anyone object to dropping that quote in which case I would
                 put a line through it and we'll come back to it again when other people
                 who might want to defend it. And that might still hit (unintelligible).

                 Okay and Section 24 through 1334. Any issues?

(Martin Hall):   Avrithis is (Martin). I just - the 1327 sentence I don't understand. And
                 maybe I'm just...

Avri Doria: Okay, let me read it aloud...

(Martin Hall):   ...brain dead.

Avri Doria: See if it - the working group studies many of the methods of detecting
                 fast flux activity. And thwarting fast flux hosting requires (unintelligible)
                 and (intervention). It does look like some words were dropped
                 somewhere.

                 (Unintelligible) studies many of the methods for testing fast flux activity.
                 That looks like it should almost have a period.

(Martin Hall):   Well or you could put a period after and thwarting fast flux hosting. The required participation and intervention is the (bit) I don't get.

Avri Doria: Right. Okay, yes.

(Marika):   And I can check back whether something was dropped or this is part of a previous change that actually didn't get deleted or something like that so...

Avri Doria: But now - okay so now I would just line through required participation and intervention and leave that. And unless there's something else that comes back and then we can look at that next time. But for now it just makes - with the sentence that's there, right, just lining through requires participation and intervention.

                   You know, I could see that, you know, methods or thwarting were shown to require participation intervention. But, you know, look for that (for that) just line it through. Anything else in that paragraph?

                   Okay, 1336 through 1341. Any issues?

Man: (Unintelligible). I find the wording in 1332 and 1333 and 1334 to be a little cumbersome.

Avri Doria: Okay, so it's a wordsmithing issue, not an intent issue.

Man: Right. I'm old enough to get to (do) when I go past that sentence, through that.

Avri Doria: Study, (unintelligible) study? I always find that reading these things out

loud really makes a difference...

Man: Yes...

Avri Doria: ...in terms of knowing whether it's possible. These studies (met) further attention, particularly areas when acceptable level of false positives would provide - would prove that (unintelligible) of registrants effected by intervention and where measure are needed to ensure that parties reporting fast flux activity are provably trustworthy.

                It does almost approach with that long (unintelligible).

Man: Yes.

Avri Doria: Oh would prove (unintelligible).

(Martin Hall): Since we're discussing those sentences I sort of glossed over this. But I'm just not sure about provably trustworthy. That's a rats nest.

Man: Well I'm certainly tripping over that as well.

Avri Doria: Any recommendations for it on a...

                Well the prove trustworthiness is always an interesting problem.

                It almost seems like you could divide this into two sentences. These studies merit further attention particularly in areas where unacceptable levels of false (unintelligible) could prove detrimental to registrants effected by intervention.

And it's also important that now - and then period. Measures are also needed to ensure that parties reporting fast flux activity are to be trusted. Does that work? I always like making sure they're sentences.

So if we put a period after intervention, drop and, and where, capitalize measures and replace provably trustworthy with to be trusted. Does that work?

Man: One more time please on that last sentence.

Avri Doria: Okay measures are needed to ensure that parties reporting fast flux activities are to be trusted.

Man: Sounds good.

Avri Doria: Okay so if you could make those changes and then we'll be able to see them so they would still be, you know, highlighted.

Okay, going back now to - back to forward to 1336 to 1341. Any issue?

Okay.

Man: Are we - excuse me. Who is going to reveal the other techniques in line 337 - 1337, 1338?

Avri Doria: I would think - I mean that would strike me that revealed by whatever means they are revealed either because someone notice - write the paper or write the article or one of the researchers finds it.

I think it sounds to me like it's just a recognition of the fact that what's

been seen has been seen and what hasn't been seen or invented yet will yet need to be revealed.

Man: Okay, would determined be an appropriate substitute for revealed?

Avri Doria: Seems to me like it would work. Does it work for other people?

Man: Yes (Abry), maybe we could just drop the parenthetical. Because another way to read it is rather than the techniques described in this report, others to be revealed, the others could be other reports. It could be interpreted that way. And I don't think at this point...

Avri Doria: Well then it could be and techniques yet to be determined. Techniques yet to be determined means like we're almost waiting for somebody to invent new techniques.

Man: Yes. And reveal kind of implies that one of us are going to say something about it to me.

Man: And the constantly evolving in that same sentence goes ahead and really gets at the fact that there's more to come.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Man: Yes, yes.

Avri Doria: Anybody object to striking that parenthetical? (Unintelligible) to strike the (unintelligible).

So the techniques described in this report are only part of a vast and

constantly evolving toolkit for attackers. None of the techniques are necessary to the degree that mitigating any word would eliminate Internet fraud and abuse. That's also a little awkward.

Does it make sense to all of you? I understand what it means. Okay.

(Martin Hall): It doesn't make sense to me either (Arby).

Avri Doria: Okay.

(Martin Hall): I could...

Avri Doria: I mean I could parse it that basically says there's a lot of toolkits for attackers none of these tools that (have) been talking about are necessarily the tool that if you eliminated that tool you would eliminate Internet fraud abuse. However...

Man: We changed...

Avri Doria: However it is slightly awkward.

Man: We changed 1339 to say mitigating any one of them wouldn't eliminate Internet fraud and abuse?

(Martin Hall): That's better...

Avri Doria: Yes, and in fact you could even drop the necessary to the degree and say none of the techniques are such that mitigating any one would eliminate Internet fraud and abuse.

Man: I'm thinking we don't even need that whole introductory chunk of that at all. I think if you just start with mitigating I think that's really going to give you the same meaning.

Avri Doria: The techniques described in this report are only part of a vast and constantly evolving toolkit for attackers period.

                Mitigating any one or...

Man: Or toolkit.

Avri Doria: Evolving toolkit for a package.

Man: Mitigating any one technique wouldn't eliminate Internet fraud and abuse.

Avri Doria: Right. That sounds good. Anyone have issue with that? (Marika) did you catch it?

(Marika):   Yes I think so.

Avri Doria: Okay. Again, we turned a complicated sentence into two shorter sentences. Always a good thing to do.

                Okay, any other issues in that paragraph?

                Okay, then we have the last sentence 43 through 45. Any issues with that one? It is pretty vanilla to me.

                Okay, in which case I think that this section can now be taken out of

the highlight color. We obviously need to come back to it again to just double-check and to see the edits that we've made there. I think that can go out of highlight. Any issue?

Okay great. Moving on now to 9 where we talked about possible next steps. And as I started to say when we were jumping ahead that this has been restructured as we asked (Michael) to do where the possible next steps that we talked about in which are largely also extracted from the previous one have been (ported) to the front in various bullets.

And there's the bullet down at the end 1391 through 1400 which was the one that we discussed as a duplicate and then decided that it made sense having it in two places because we were talking about the different subsections. And that was one where what are the next steps for GNSO for working group for ICANN and what is a thing that a community is currently doing.

And then what we have is the old section below (lined out) just as a reference that if we're okay with it today I would like to (drop) it before the next pass.

So if we can go through this quickly bullet by bullet. First on the italics at the top, are there any issues?

Okay. First bullet. And I think we've gone through these before but I just want to double check on them. (Be the firm) issuance, so any issues on that at the moment?

(Martin Hall):   I'm sorry (Abry). Can I just take you back to the last sentence in the closing paragraph?

Avri Doria: Certainly.

(Martin Hall):   The objective of the working group will review the input?

Avri Doria: Will be to review.

(Martin Hall):   Okay, (typo).

Man: Don't we just want to say the working group will review?

Avri Doria: Well certainly we can. The thing about the working group will review is
                 of course we have to review the charter in the council. So actually in
                 proper sense it would probably be a subjunctive sentence to say the
                 objective of the working group would be to review.

                 However, I think leaving it at will, I mean that isn't a function that there
                 has to be some review by the council and some reworking of the
                 charter. And yet the working group can continue working in parallel to
                 all of that but that there'll be this negotiation on charter.

                 But I see no problem, you know, to list it under objective. I think that
                 leaves it as still somewhat open. Make a flat statement that the
                 working group will review is in some sense I think prejudge the
                 negotiation as it were of where do we go next and then call it a
                 negotiation because I'm sure in some sense it will be.

                 But is it okay to leave objective and so the objective of the working
                 group will be to review?

Man: I would just also - I think also the recommendation sections on 1352 again, it would be simpler if it's possible just to go ahead and say the working group will include. But I understand the need to go ahead and possibly qualify that.

Avri Doria: Yes, I think that the sentence - so say that if any - that's a switch. The input received by a public comment period and determine which if any recommendations receive the support of the working group for inclusion in the final report.

                I think that says it in a sufficiently ambiguous way to deal with the fact that we do need to get the rest of the charter updated or review them. I mean we may come down and say you have charters (line), keep going although I kind of doubt that. There'll be some (freedom) in there.

                Okay, going back to the first bullet, any issue? Okay, now that's the second bullet. (Unintelligible) possibility to improve other - to involve other stakeholders in the fast flux policy development (project)?

                Any issues?

                I have one. Now most of these have already been - yes, most of these have already been - these initials have all been explained somewhere else as I remember. So we'll probably (unintelligible) have to make sure that any of these acronyms have been explained somewhere earlier in the document.

                Any issues with bullet three at 1371 and explore other means to address the issue instead of a policy development process?

Any issue with that one?

Man:　　　　　It doesn't strike me as very definitive in terms of what those other alternatives might be. I mean I understand it's sort of saying the policy development process may not work. But it doesn't really weight what an alternative that would be viable might be.

Avri Doria:　　　Right. And I don't know that we can at the moment.

I mostly have a suggestion because that is pretty much a central argument that we are having now and we're having over the next PDP is there's a sort of - it's certainly a slip between (Chuck) and I and those other people on whether one has to do all kinds of things before a PDP or whether a PDP can include all kinds of work such as fact finding and speculation and can come back with a report that says we've done all this work, we've looked at everything and no, we're not recommending policy recommendation.

So I sort of stay away from trying to get too specific about that one because that really is a central discussion now and the whole evolution of how PDPs happen. And we have a steering committee and a working team that's actually going to look at all of that.

So unless somebody's got a really good suggestion that they would put in now I would leave that.

I mean it's a statement that I happen to disagree with. I think that the policy development process is a fine place to address issues even if they go beyond.

But I might be in the minority on that. So I just - I think leaving the question open and this is really one that goes to the council and the constituencies on how they want to deal with these kinds of issues.

I think one of the places is of course, and one of the issues that comes up is well if the problem is broader than GTLBs then do we need a policy development process or some equivalent that is (cross) supporting organization. And that's a really complicated issue.

I (unintelligible) other people can leave that one as is unless somebody has a suggestion for what's (planned).

1377 through 78 highlight which solutions, recommendations could be tackled by policy development, best practices or industry solution. Is tackle the right word?

Oh no, should prefer something like dealt with or...

Man: Addressed?

Avri Doria: Addressed is fine. Tackle just seems so sporty to me. And what do you do once it's tackled?

Man: You blow the whistle.

Avri Doria: Right, down on the ground and (unintelligible) what. So okay, yes. So change that word. Any other issues with that? Okay, while I have the bullet 1383 (unintelligible) registration these policy provisions could address fast flux by empowering registries, registrars to take

(unintelligible) involved in fast flux. Any issue with that one?

Okay.

Man: Just one, sorry (Abry).

Avri Doria: Okay no. No problem.

Man: A little slow on the mute button here. I'm wondering if we could tack on in addition to take down if we could put slash, suspend?

Avri Doria: Any objection, any issue?

Man: That take down has a feeling of permanence to it.

Avri Doria: Right, yes. I don't think it could be take down/descend. It would have to be something like result in the rapid take down of or suspension, take down or suspension of.

Man: Okay. I mean what I would yield to the registry representatives on the call.

Avri Doria: Any issues? I was just talking wordsmithing but...

Man: Yes.

Avri Doria: Any objections?

Man: I'm kind of slash happy. Sorry about that.

Man: Avriquestion for you. 1386, can you just update us? You know, we're saying in light of other policy initiatives related to. That sounds like to me like another PDP's under way. And I don't think it's gone that far.

              Where do we even stand with the registration abuse policy provisions review? I mean that's just like an issues report level right?

Avri Doria: Well we have an issues report. At our next meeting we have to be - by the bylaws we have to take a vote on whether to start a PDP or not.

              And this is basically where with the current bylaws we have as I said, we have to vote yea or nay on it.

Man: Okay.

Avri Doria: Now we can do several things. We can either have someone may put in a motion before that that suggests that we form a study group to study X, Y and Z. And then we vote no on the PDP.

              The problem we often have with voting no on the PDP is that is interpreted as they don't care. And so very often even if people are sort of saying gee, we're not quite ready for a PDP, there's a problem with taking a no vote.

              So if there's a motion beforehand that initiate the study, further study or some such thing, you know, whatever's been recommended by the...

Man: Issue report, right.

Avri Doria: The issues report, then we can safely perhaps...

Man: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...vote not to join. Or we may - and as I say I haven't - and no one's put motions on the table yet so I don't know what's going to go...

Man: That's sort of my point though (Abry). Since all of this is still to be determined, isn't...

Avri Doria: But it's a policy initiative. I mean there is an issues report. We have to vote on a PDP. The one thing I know is I'm putting in a motion to, you know, to declare the PDP because the bylaws require me to do so.

Man: Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay, so the policy initiative -- and this is one of those funny wording things -- an issues report begins a policy initiative.

Man: Part of the initiative, yes. I guess it just strikes - it may strike somebody who's not steeped in the...

Avri Doria: Right.

Man: ...details that the process is much further along then.

Avri Doria: So perhaps it might be a acceptable say in light of other possible GNSO policy initiatives indicating that...

Man: (soften it), sure.

Avri Doria: Right. Does that - is that a problem for any one? As I say, I understand that we're in a funny position. Though of course by this time, you know, four weeks from now we may be in this position...

Man: You'll have an answer.

Avri Doria: Right. Well we'll definitely have an answer. As I say I'm already breaking bylaws by not doing it within 50 days. But we've been breaking that one forever. But we do have to take a vote on it.

(Marika):   (Abry), this is (Marika). Could you just repeat what your proposal is?

Avri Doria: Yes, in light of other possible GNSO policy initiatives.

(Marika):   Okay.

Avri Doria: And that puts it in we haven't made any decision yet. Okay, any other issue on that one?

                 And the next one is the FFBRS which we talked about - I just - so this is just a different paragraph. So does anyone have any issue with that as written?

                 Okay in which case I can (erase) that. So what I recommend is that we'll obviously leave this marked up so that we come back to it. Well actually some of this stuff we've already come back to before, but I mean changes we've just made we may mark up.

                 Any objections to dropping the lined out areas from the next version of the report? Obviously they'll still be there in previous versions. But in

trying to finish this I would like to see those dropped at this point. Okay, so we can drop those before the next version.

Okay, so we've made it through 7, 8 and 9. What we have left on today is we jumped over 24. Now - and let me check and see if my math is (checked).

Okay. Okay yes, I have (unintelligible) all contributions. And we're (unintelligible) before. But what do we do about 24 now? Does anyone have any suggestions? Obviously I have not read this one (unintelligible) yet.

Man: So what line are we on again please?

Avri Doria: Well we're back at Page 24.

Man: Okay, thank you.

Avri Doria: And we had this - we have basically this very large new session - section. And first of all we're trying to find a statement of agreement. And on those parts where we don't have agreement we have to figure out the support.

As far as I can see, this is probably really the only question that we have to resolve of a major type before we're essentially done and then just have to go through and make sure and edit and such.

So we have a couple more minutes today. I'm trying to understand what we would like to do with this. We have 5.4. We have that first paragraph which is really I think there's probably no issue except

maybe wording issue comes to 6.1 on where we have some of the known attack (vectors) I mentioned below.

And I think that that is (unintelligible) that the people can let me know. Are there any issues below 661 through - actually we've got quite a bit to go through here. Well actually we've gone through all of this. We just need to make sure that there are no further issues and that the only real pending issue we've got is what we put into that lead paragraph 651 through 659.

So I guess what I'd like to do before we try and wordsmith -- and what I'd like to suggest is that we try and look at that paragraph 651 through 59 in light of Rod's issues on the list. But I must admit I probably can't do a meeting next week.

I might be able to because I'm going to be in India doing this meeting at the end - at night. (Unintelligible).

So are there any issues between 661 and 728? This is material that we've discussed before in terms of lists of things that can happen. The list ends at 686 and then it basically goes on the list being exhaustive, I mean representative but not exhaustive.

So I really think this section is very close. I just don't know what tweaking we need to do to make is acceptable for everyone.

Okay, any suggestions from any one on how they want to approach this?

Man: (Abry), I'm sorry. This may just be a lot to try and do on the fly like this.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Man: Looking at Rod's suggested text on the list, if we adopt even something close to it, then I think like beginning at Line 701 some of that text will need to either be removed or changed.

Honestly it might just be a lot easier if we could throw Rod's suggested text into a draft and then, you know, be working, seeing everything as it syncs up instead of right now I'm jumping back and forth from email to the PDF...

Avri Doria: I think you're right and especially since I only have 9 more minutes anyway.

Man: Yes.

Avri Doria: Okay. So is that okay with everyone to try that, sticking Rod's text in and then going through and basically discussing what if we've done - what next?

And perhaps (Marika) to take a first, having listened to the discussions and such and take a first crack at making a coherent section.

(Marika): Yes that's fine. I was just going to suggest that to try and do that. I think (Mike Rodenbach) at least indicated he was fine as well with Rod's suggestions there so...

Avri Doria: Okay, great.

(Marika): ...you know, he was the first who initially made a point about it. So I can try to integrate it and then we can see on the next call whether it works for everyone.

Or I'm happy as well to first circulate the text on...

Avri Doria: On the list.

(Marika): The mailing list to see, you know, if the changes that...

Avri Doria: That'd be great. Yes, that would be a good approach. Okay, thanks.

(Marika): Okay.

Avri Doria: So then last thing I'd like to do before we jump off is to go to Slide 5 here which is text we've reviewed before and see if there are any issues (where) the (whole) registrars (affected).

And we had 736 through 748 first paragraph. Are there any issues with that one? If not, we can leave that in. Accepted.

And then we had 750 through 756. Any issues?

Okay, if there are no issues at that point, then I think except for Section 5.4 which needs a retooling we're pretty much at the point where we need to just take another walk through the document after people have reread it and just make sure that people are fine with all the changes that have been made, et cetera.

(Marika): (Abry)?

Avri Doria: Yes?

(Martin Hall):   I'm sorry. (Marika), you had something to say. I had one thing I wanted
                   to raise that had come up on the list.

(Marika):   Yes, maybe we're wanting to raise the same thing. Is it about 5.10?

(Martin Hall):   I don't think it's about 5.10.

(Marika):   I just wanted to raise that (Mike Rodenbach) mentioned in his email
                   that he had some issues as well with 5.10. He says he thinks it needs
                   to be entirely rewritten or deleted. So that might be a paragraph that
                   might come up on the next call or maybe in the list on...

Avri Doria: Okay, it would be better if we could get it (filled) on the list. But okay.

(Martin Hall):   No, I was going to flag another thing.

Avri Doria: Okay.

(Martin Hall):   So in response to some of the data about, you know, how many
                   domains, the flux thing and the colo going down and all that, (Dave)
                   had said, you know, do we want to include some of the statement in
                   the report?

                   And (Jose) had responded and I was trying to look at, you know, some
                   coherent recommendations. But I didn't know whether the group felt
                   like including this data in the report. It is appropriate given this, you
                   know, we're on the verge of completing it or at least in this phase or

whether we should defer that.

Avri Doria: I had the impression -- and I'd be interested to hear other people -- that including simply not all the data but some extraction and some point is (unintelligible) in an appendix was something that people were not adverse to. But of course people should speak up on it.

So is anyone against including an appendix that has some data and (pointing) to other data as examples or as sort of signs of work in progress?

I get the impression that if there's the will to do the work and the collection and the cleanup that there's acceptance.

(Martin Hall):   Okay Avril'm sort of doing some background work on how we might coherently do something that's not overwhelming that, you know, would be a defensible summary that would enhance this. So let me continue to do that and maybe hook up with (Jose) and continue this discussion on the list.

Avri Doria: Okay great. Thanks. So okay, I don't know how to schedule a meeting in the next two weeks. And as I say, I'm going to be fairly well booked up from - I travel Wednesday morning and then I'll be in India.

But I will be on a 12 hour off schedule. So perhaps we could do something Friday that (ended a) relatively early morning for me Saturday.

And if we could find a time that works like that, then I could probably do a meeting. Otherwise I think I'll probably have trouble scheduling it.

So I guess I'll work with (Marika) and (Glen) to see if we can find a time. And I don't mind doing it at strange hours. In fact, strange hours is the only time I'd be able to do it because regular hours are owned by someone else for the next two weeks. (Unintelligible) owns me mind, body and soul for the next two weeks.

So is that okay with people trying to find a time next Friday/Saturday that we can come back to this?

Man: No Avrinext Friday, Saturday, that's the Friday after Thanksgiving?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Man: Okay. I guess...

Avri Doria: I'm having Thanksgiving in a plane. I forgot about that.

Man: Yes, I'm traveling. That'd be impossible.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Man: I thought you were talking about the week of the 5th which is Friday the 5th, 6th -- something like that...

Avri Doria: Okay let me see. Friday the - possibly Saturday, Friday, Saturday the 6th is another time when we could because my meeting ends on Friday the 5th. Friday the 6th I'm going to be involved in packing up and writing analysis and synopsis.

So something that fell on Saturday morning the 6th would be possible for me. On the 7th I'm flying all day. And then Monday the 8th I'm back in Rhode Island for four days.

(Marika): Avri , this is (Marika), there won't be a call next week?

Avri Doria: I guess not because of Thanksgiving. I forgot about Thanksgiving. I know I'm US and should remember Thanksgiving. But I will be on a plane so I forgot all about it.

So yes, there'll be no call next week because of Thanksgiving. We can try and do as much as possible wordsmithing on a mailing list then. But I think a fair number of US folks will probably be unavailable from sometime Tuesday until the following Monday.

And so let's try and plan for a meeting on 5, 6, on the 5th for most of the world but on the 6th for me.

Is that okay? And then we - hopefully we can finish up - I really want to drive finishing and getting this initial report at least and into review now as soon as is reasonable.

And I also want to remind you all about how we pick another chair. Okay, anything else before I close the meeting and (unintelligible)?

In which case I thank you all. And for those that are celebrating Thanksgiving, have a good one.

Man: Thank you.

(Martin Hall): Thank you.

Woman: Bye.

Man: Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay, bye-bye.

Man: Bye now.

END