Registration Abuse Policies Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 14 September at 14:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the   Registration Abuse Policies Working Group meeting on Monday 14 September 2009, at 14:00 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-rap-20090914.mp3
On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/index.html#sep

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

Present for the teleconference:
Greg Aaron - Registry C. - Working Group Chair
James Bladel - Godaddy Registrar C.
George Kirikos - CBUC
Mike O'Connor - CBUC
Berry Cobb - CBUC
Faisal Shah - IPC
Rod Rasmussen – individual
Jeff Neuman - Registry constituency
Philip Corwin – CBUC
Richard Tindal - Registrar
Robert Hutchinson
Martin Sutton - CBUC

ICANN Staff
Margie Milam
Marika Konings
Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat
Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:
Roland Perry

Coordinator: The call is - this call is now being recorded.

Gisella Gruber-White: Greg , Mikey would you like a quick roll call?

Man: Yes please.

Man: Please.

Gisella Gruber-White: Good morning, good afternoon to everyone. On today's call we have Greg Aaron, Mike O'Connor, George Kirikos James Bladel, Barry Cobb, Rod Hutchinson Martin Sutton, Richard Tindal, Jeff Newman, Faisal Shah, Rod Rasmussen.

From staff we have Marika Konings, Margie Milam, Glen De Saint Gery and myself Gisella Gruber-White.

I have not recorded any apologies for today's call. And if I can just remind you all please do say your names when you speak. This is for transcript purposes. Thank you very much. Over to you.

Greg Aaron: Thank you Gisella. This is Greg. I just wanted to say I'm in Germany today at the Anti-spam Summit here. My connectivity is bad. You may lose me at some point.

I've asked Mikey O'Connor to do the honors today. And he will lead us through the agenda and recognize speakers and such. And I'll be here on the line as long as I can. So thank you Mikey for stepping in today. Over to you.

Mike O'Connor: Okay thanks Greg. I'm going to start us right off. We've got a series of subgroups that are going to report in, the first being the cyber squatting group. And Marika has got a document on the screen which I think we can all

read and control. So does somebody from that group want to sort of take us through where things are at?

James Bladel: Mikey, this is James. I think typically I'm the only person from that group on the general calls. Is that correct?

Mike O'Connor: Yes, that does seem to be a trend.

James Bladel: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Phil Corman might be here today.

James Bladel: I'm sorry?

Man: Isn't Phil Corman in that group? Oh no, I guess not. Actually no he is.

Phil Corman: Yes I'm on the line.

James Bladel: Oh hi Phil.

Phil Corman: Hi.

James Bladel: Okay. All right, so we have two members from the cyber squatting group on the call. And there has been, let me just be upfront. There've been no meetings of this group since our last general conference. And there has been no traffic on the mailing list towards the definition.

And what I have done is taken the summary thread that (Mike (Rodenbach) and myself, and I'm trying to remember. I think it was (Fred) and (Michael Young) had commented on and I had submitted that over to Marika.

And think that's where she was helping us to put together a synopsis of that thread and the goal being pushing us towards a definition.

Mike O'Connor: Yes that's right. And if you all will, for those of you who are on Adobe Connect we've got a document in front of us in the middle there that has if you scroll down a bit, a draft definition that maybe I'll just read what's on the screen so those of you - is Greg the only one who's not on Adobe Connect or do we have others that are also off that today?

(Rod): This is (Rod). I am not on Adobe Connect yet.

Mike O'Connor: Okay.

(Rod): No activity issues here.

Mike O'Connor: Let me do a quick read then. The draft definition says we suggest that the work group consider the UDRP's definition of cyber squatting as the consensus working definition is well established throughout the ICANN community as a consensus policy appended to all contracts between ICANN, it's contracting parties, and GTLD domain registrants.

We also suggest incorporating two additional categories. A "bad faith" to supplement those specifically stated in the UDRP taken from the USA CPA consistent also with the nominate ADR rules in the UK.

They are included in the brackets at the end of this definition from the UDRP. And then what's followed is the cyber squatting definition from the UDRP which I won't read.

And then at the - now where are those brackets? So is it 5 and 6? Yes.

Man: Yes, that's correct.

Mike O'Connor: The additional ones to the standard UDRP are five. You have provided material and misleading false contact information when applying for the registration of the domain name or you have intentionally failed to maintain accurate contact information.

And then six, your registration or acquisition of multiple domain names which you know are identical or confusingly similar to mark of others that are distinctive at the time of registration of such domain.

So if you imagined in your head the normal UDRP definitions, plus those two, that's essentially the proposal that is on the table, right James?

James Bladel: Yes I think that's where we left the group, left the discussion. And I certainly would welcome any thoughts (Philip) had as well.

You know, the UDRP plus those last two and there was some discussion over those last two items. And I think that Mike Rodenbach is pretty much, I think fairly convincingly established that those are used during by UDRP panelists who determine whether or not registration is in bad taste.

So I can clearly see where those would be conjunctions of the other items of the definition here. But whether they constitute cyber squatting standing on their own is I think a different issue.

Mike O'Connor: Okay Phil, do you want to chime in at all and then I've got two people in the queue? And I'll take others in the queue too.

Phil Corwin: Yes, you know, I think these points, I have a little concern about, particularly about 6 and the fact that, you know, we have a set of rules. I mean if the UDRP is the official definition of the balance of abusive domain names and where you can lose one under an ICANN approved administrative proceeding.

So I get a little uneasy about going beyond it. I think because who is data as part of the contract, I have less concern about 5. I have more concern about 6 because it kind of gets away from a particular registration and looks at the context of multiple registrations.

And I'm not familiar enough with the trend in (UTRP) decisions and how often that's looked at. But, you know, generally UDRP, there's no binding precedent. And what one panel or panelists does in one case there are many cases where almost identical facts go the opposite way in another case.

I'm also concerned with 5 that you can provide accurate who is information at the beginning when you do register and then over time you just forget, you know, particularly if you have a lot of names you just, you know, something changes and you haven't updated it.

And it doesn't mean you're a bad actor. It just means you haven't updated your information. It may not be for any nefarious purpose. So those are generally my thoughts on that.

Mike O'Connor: Okay. I've got Marika, (George), and Richard in the queue. Marika do you want to go?

Phil Corwin: You know, the other thought was that I think we have to keep in all of this, keep going back to the original charter grant which is that registration abuse is abuse other than abuse which arises from the subsequent use of the names and but actually is a separate incident in and of itself at the time of registration.

Mike O'Connor: Thanks for that Phil. Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes I just wanted to point out to the group that I have included in the wiki and what you can see as well on the Adobe Connect just above the drive definition section the main point of discussion that has taken place between

the (SOP) team group members particularly relating to that question whether points 5 and 6 should be included or shouldn't.

So they're, you know, two camps and the related argument as to why it should be included and why it shouldn't. So that might help us all as well for the group to review those and maybe decide on which one they would like to support.

Mike O'Connor: Thanks Marika. (George)?

George Kirikos: (George) here. I share Phil's concern on Point Number 5. And for Point Number 6 I definitely oppose it. And I've mentioned this on every call. You can own two dictionary domain names - dictionary word domain names. And almost every dictionary word has a trademark.

If you use them in the generic sense you're safe in the real world. However according to Number 6 simply your registration or acquisition of multiple dictionary word domains because they're identical to Mark's would make you guilty. So obviously Number 6 is unacceptable.

Mike O'Connor: Thanks (George). Richard?

Richard Tindall: So I share (George)'s concern there. And I had a specific question in that regard. The word distinctive in Number 6, does that have a precise legal meaning in that context?

Phil Corwin: Well almost every trademark needs to be distinctive in order to be registered. So it doesn't really save - buy you anything having that word there.

Richard Tindall: So what you're saying the word distinctive is really kind of meaningless there?

Phil Corwin: Yes, I believe so.

Mike O'Connor: Okay, others want to comment? One of the things that Marika has prepared is sort of a sense of the group pool that she has got available on one course that we could take is to take a little poll as to the sense of the group and see where we are at.

Jeff Newman: Hey Mikey, this is Jeff Newman. Can I make a comment?

Mike O'Connor: Sure, go ahead.

Jeff Newman: Yes, if you look at the above where we're just talking about this being evidence of not indicative of, in other words these are six factors, but I don't get the feeling that what we're saying is that having any one of these factors alone is going to make you or make us think that it's an abusive domain name registration.

So I think Number 6 is, I think 5 and 6 are actually could be used as evidence of but not dispositive of bad faith. So I mean I think you got to read how it's being used.

We're not saying that each individual one is by itself dispositive of abuse but is rather a factor. And I certainly think 5 and 6 are factors when considering whether you have bad faith registration.

Mike O'Connor: Okay (George) are you up again or...

George Kirikos: Yes, still continue on that point. Let's say you have a registered domain name of beads.com, a domain I own which there's a registered trademark in some obscure category and I own another domain name say math.com which actually did have a live trademark in some obscure category at some point.

I acquired those domain names after the marks were registered and I did so in good faith. And I would be captured by Number 6 even if I didn't use them. Notice that this - your registration alone is evidence.

And so people who own generic domain names that are using them in their proper sense or even not using them in any infringement sense would be caught by that language.

And so it's, you know, not fair to expand the, you know, UDRP using this, you know, one country definition.

Mike O'Connor: A bunch of people in the queue. I'm just going to run down. Richard is your hand up left over from before or is this a new time?

Richard Tindall: No it's my other hand.

Mike O'Connor: Go then.

Richard Tindall: So Jeff....

Mike O'Connor: We've got a lot of folks in the queue today. So could everybody take care to take your hand down when you're done so that poor old chairman Mikey doesn't get confused? Go ahead Richard.

Richard Tindall: So Jeff I think you're saying that it may be evidence. It's something to look at and it may or may not in fact prove to be bad faith. Is that your point Jeff?

Jeff Newman: That's absolutely correct that if you, you know, not showing any one of these factors alone may not be abuse but showing a number of the factors. And (George) you can argue A, you have legitimate rights to the name and, you know, you're not using it in such a manner as to be confusing with the complainant's mark.

I mean there's plenty of things that you can argue. And I don't think that we should be taking away factors because you're worried that any one factor alone might be used to go after your own domain names.

I mean the reality is when you look at Number 6, 5 and 6, take it out of the dictionary context and put it into, you know, someone who registers all these different multiples of telecom companies or all these different multiples or typos of an individual company and you see that 6 should be considered as evidence but not necessarily dispositive of abuse.

Richard Tindall: Okay so if that's the case...

Mike O'Connor: Hang on, hang on. I'm going to exercise a little discipline here because we've got a big queue the time around. So Phil is next.

Richard Tindall: Well actually this is Richard. I was still going.

Mike O'Connor: Oh I'm sorry, my apologies.

Richard Tindall: Just...clarify so now that he's done that. Jeff would you agree that the bit that precedes 1 through 6 should read instead, the following circumstances in particular but without limitation may be evidence of the registration and use of a domain in bad faith?

Because at the moment it says that is evidence. So - and to me I'm not an attorney, but to me that says it's actually, you know, it is bad faith. So it would - should the word shall rather be the word may?

Mike O'Connor: Should, could we just quickly check on that? (George) would that work for you if we softened that introductory sentence?

George Kirikos: No because it works in practice is that people tend to, you know, count evidence as proof. And even more so it's counting registration separate from

use. It's saying registration alone constitutes proof of registration and use. So I still oppose it on that basis.

Mike O'Connor: Okay Phil you're next.

Phil Corwin: Yes I want to kind of follow-up on what's been said here. When you really parse this from a legal point of view we've got a draft definition of cyber squatting which starts with the URDP factors, the three factors all of which must be proven in a case.

And then we've got this list of six which go to the last two words of that test which is bad faith. And it says that each of these factors independently shall be evidence.

And that troubles me because, you know, in the real world it they may be evidence or they may not. In many cases you have to look into this and you get into questions.

If it's just an absolute shell and not just a possibility, it doesn't leave any room for any further exploration of the facts and circumstances of a particular domain registration.

You also get into who's going to make this decision. And what we've got ICANN approved arbitrators for UDRP, this definition, attempted definition of bad faith goes beyond some of those factors. And again, the ICANN panels are all over the place. Similar cases can result in different decisions.

And then you get to what is going to be the impact of this whoever decides whether a particular name represents a registration abuse as opposed to an independently a UDRP violation.

And when you look at the potential recommendations for cyber squatting one review of UDRP, while that's a whole separate PDP.

And the organization I work for has been suggesting that for months in a different context but we should recognize it's way beyond the purview of this working group.

Work with search engines like Google and Microsoft, well I think we ought to talk to Google and Yahoo! and the people who offer PPC because I believe they're already looking at quality of Web sites in terms of where they offer their services and what they pay for them.

And then I'm really troubled by the third point which is to require (LIPO) and (NAS) and other arbitration centers to provide a list other than actual UDRP cases have been decided.

Where is this list coming from? Who's going to create this list? How is that - that really troubles me. Because I don't know who's going to be creating this list. At least in a UDRP you've got a formal record and a process for rendering a decision. But where does this other list come from and what's the consequences of providing it to (sir changes)?

I think we're on dangerous ground here because I don't know where this - how this list would be created.

Mike O'Connor: Okay Faisal?

Faisal Shah: Yes I just wanted to point out, you know, I think we're talking about 5 and 6, I think you have to - I agree with Jeff. You have to read these for what it is here.

I think that it's pretty tough standards within the definitions themselves. For example, if you have intentionally failed to maintain accurate contact information, this is not a situation where I think Phil was talking about, you

know, you accidentally or forget to maintain the contact information. You're doing this purposely and intentionally.

I. think on 6 I think, you know, distinctive is a big deal. And I think it is a term of art in the legal world. And I think it's not necessarily something like music which is generic but it's something that is like Yahoo! or Google or something.

So I think when I read these, I read these as having pretty tough standards. And it's not something that, you know, we should dismiss lightly.

Mike O'Connor: Thanks Faisal.. (George)?

George Kirikos: Yes, I think we have to take into account also that the UDRP already has the words, the following circumstances in particular but without limitation.

That means that at the time of a cyber squatting dispute people can try to bring in 5 and 6 as additional factors. But I don't see why we should attempt to enumerate them officially as being factors when people can do so later on especially since we don't have any counterbalancing items added.

Like these are only going to be used to tilt the UDRP in one way, and that's in favor of respondents. We don't have any factors being added to counterbalance that. And so I reiterate my concern.

Mike O'Connor: Thanks (George). Jeff, I think you get last word.

Jeff Newman: Well I mean I think that was a perfect intro. I was going to ask (George) and Phil to kind of come up with counterbalancing ideas and not just dismiss it because you haven't yet or there's been no mitigating factors put in there.

I would like to see those mitigating factors. I think that's a good point. But to just reject these as being evidence or - of abuse when clearly it's considered

by most reports and by the UDRP panelists as evidence of abuse, I think it's just kind of basically saying you don't want to see any amendments at all.

George Kirikos: No I'd be happy - (George) here. I'd be happy to go over an official UDRP reform and talk about all of the ways that the definition can be improved upon. But I don't think this is the place to do it.

Jeff Newman: No and I'm not asking for UDRP. I'm asking you to take these factors, the definition of abuse and if you can come up with mitigating factors then that wouldn't constitute abuse, I mean I'd like to see that. I think that would be good.

George Kirikos: Yes, I'd be happy to. For example the mark is registered after the domain name is registered like the domain name in other words has the priority date. That should be an exculpatory factor. But a lot of the panels ignore that.

Man: While in fact doesn't - I'm sorry to interrupt, but doesn't - maybe I'm confusing this with a couple other things. But doesn't it say that the following shall not be evidence of bad faith in the UDRP and lists a couple elements too, or is that...

George Kirikos: No it's always evidence of bad faith, and nothing to counterbalance that.

Man: Well maybe that's...

Mike O'Connor: Okay, this is chairman Mikey.

Man: Sorry.

Mike O'Connor: I think we've got kind of conversational branch points. We're at half an hour in. It seems to me we can go one of several directions. Marika's got a poll up there. We could poll ourselves or and then see where that takes us.

Or we could agree that amending these would be a useful exercise. And maybe add Phil and (George) to the sub team with the objective of coming back with an amended version for the next call.

So before we get to the poll I guess I'd just like a use the little Xes and checkmarks gizmo in Adobe Connect to give us a sense as to whether you'd rather come to a vote now. That would be the thing you approve or go back for amendments, that would be if you disapprove of the vote that way.

James Bladel: Mikey this is James, if I could add just one thing quickly?

Mike O'Connor: Sure go ahead.

James Bladel: Just wanted to point out that there's already been more productive conversation and definitional work in this call than I think of the entire lifespan of the cyber squatting work team.

So, you know, if we wanted to reconstitute that group with it with some of the interested membership here, that would be fine. I just wouldn't be in favor of throwing any of this work back to that group.

Mike O'Connor: Fair enough.

James Bladel: Thank you. Okay, thank you.

Greg Aaron: This is Greg .

Mike O'Connor: Go ahead Greg .

Greg Aaron: It strikes me that one of the things we're talking about here is not so much to finding what cyber squatting is, but we're really talking about the UDRP in some cases which is the mechanism used to deal with cyber squatting.

Because we're talking about does the UDRP have the right criteria and case history and so forth which points us to the fact that the UDRP has been around for a while. I guess they've developed (unintelligible) it's own.

Is one of the things we're talking about making recommendations to look at the UDRP?

Mike O'Connor: That certainly seems to be a theme that's emerging for me. Others? Anybody opposed to that idea? Let's put it that way so that if we have silence we can carry that forward as something to move on.

Greg Aaron: I have - this is Greg. I have no feeling one way or the other. But this is, I will remind everybody that this is a pre-PDP working group just to look at issues. And one of the things we can do is make recommendations for what should happen next. So that's one of the things we're supposed to do.

It doesn't mean we have to solve that problem, we just have to say that something is worthy of some significant additional work if we (recommend) it.

Mike O'Connor: Got so many things on the table I'm going to parse it out. Let's take that last one first. And, use agree, disagree in Adobe to say, yes I support the idea of recommending that future PDP work be done on the UDRP. Let's do that one first.

Go ahead and say yea or nay and we'll get a sense of where we're at on that. Don't all check your checkboxes at once. I'm not seeing a whole lot of checkbox action here.

Greg Aaron: How do you actually submit it, I...

Mike O'Connor: Oh you go down where, you know, that little thing where you raise your hand? If you click to the left of that you get a list of things that you can do.

Man: (There)'s options.

Greg Aaron: Oh sorry I actually was at that poll was up there.

Mike O'Connor: Yes, forget the poll. That's disappearing. No this is just...

Man: Can you restate the question please?

Mike O'Connor: So the question would be does, do you agree that we should recommend
                        future review of the UDRP as one of the recommendations that we bring
                        forward as a working group?

                        This is back to Greg's comment that one of the things who we get to do is
                        describe future work since we're a pre-PDP group.

                        I'm seeing mostly agreement, pretty much all agreement. Okay I think it we'll
                        take that as agree.

                        Now back to our conversational work. I sort of got the sense with James's
                        comment that maybe what we ought to do is reconstitute this team.

                        Would Phil, and (George), and James, and Jeff be willing to be part of that
                        reconstituted group to go off and try and hammer out an amended version of
                        this?

James Bladel: This is James. I would.

Phil Corwin: Yes Phil here, absolutely.

Mike O'Connor: (George) are you okay with that?

George Kirikos: Sure, I'd be glad to help.

Jeff Newman: This is Jeff. I'd be glad to help. I'm just not the best for all these phone
                meetings so the more we can do on email I strongly encourage.

Faisal Shah: Hey Mike , this is Faisal. Are we talking about amending 5 and 6 or are we
                talking about - I mean what we talking what...

Mike O'Connor: I would actually tend to throw the scope wide open and amend them all. Just
                as long as, you know, as we're tinkering lets flush out as many issues as we
                can.

                So I would encourage a broader scope of amending, rather than narrower.
                Because right now what we've got is language that's directly listed from the
                UDRP plus language is directly lifted from the ACPA.

                So we're tinkering with established language in both cases. So let's go ahead
                and tinker with it all would be my inclination.

                Because I think that at this stage given that we're a pre-PDP group, what
                we're really interested in is raising issues and having discussion about those
                rather than...

Greg Aaron: But I guess I was thinking, I mean I guess my thought is there wasn't any
                issues with anything else except 5 and 6. And so why are we going back to
                the whole thing again?

Mike O'Connor: I don't hold that view strongly. Maybe the way to do it is leave it up to the
                subgroup to decide for themselves. Is that acceptable?

                Okay, let's do it that way. I see Jeff's hand up. Are you jumping in at this point
                Jeff or is that a left over from times past?

Jeff Newman: I think, I don't know how that got up. No, that's left over.

Mike O'Connor: Okay, how about Barry , you - Berry just dropped off. (George) you got any?

George Kirikos: (George) here. I sent a link that talks about distinctiveness. And all the registered marks have to be distinctive. You know, there's a continuum. People - marks can be inherently distinctive, you know, made-up words like Kodak because it had no meaning before it was adopted.

But you can have words acquire distinctiveness. So I reiterate that, you know, the definition as it currently works could be improved by putting words like fanciful marks. That would limit it to something that would be more acceptable.

((Crosstalk)).

Mike O'Connor: I'm going to draw a line under this conversation at this point if it's okay with the group and send the four of you off to work hard via email and bring us something for next time because we do have a couple other pretty big issues to get through.

Is that okay with the gang or are there urgent last comments that need to be made? Barry, you've got your hand up.

Barry Cobb: Yes my - I just have one question that, you know, we've circled back around this definition several times in the working group which - and, you know, the discussion and dialogue is great, you know, whatever works best.

I - my question that I have though is why is it important at this juncture since we're in a pre-PDP that we nail down this definition to the exact word from a legalese perspective?

It seems to me we're a long ways out about make - putting forth any recommendations around cyber squatting and a lot of other things.

So I just - can somebody help remind me why it's important that we nail down these definitions specifically?

Mike O'Connor: This is Mikey. I think that I'll take an editorial comment. This is sort of the nose of the camel in the tent problem. And I think that it's probably worth taking at least one more round of care to make sure that we've got I think the issues out.

I like this as a vehicle to bring issues forward because there's precision here. And precision's a good thing. So I think that's partly what's going on.

Barry Cobb: Yes, but so is the intent that by us walking away with a more formalized revised definition of cyber squatting that would it in turn lead to a PDP that would change the UDRP definition at some point in time? Is that our goal here or...

Mike O'Connor: No, no I don't think so. I think that the goal here is to get a deeper and more current understanding of the definition simply to guide our work. And then what we will do, given our poll recently, is we will also recommend essentially without prejudice I think that the UDRP be - it would be a good idea to look at the UDRP but that we won't make recommendations about it except that we will have created a record that presumably that future working group might want to take a look at. But we're not...

Barry Cobb: Okay thank you.

Mike O'Connor: ...rewriting the UDRP here. That's way outside our briefing.

Barry Cobb: Okay got this. Just to kind of re-emphasize Greg 's point is we seem to be talking more about UDRP than we are about cyber squatting. So thank you very much.

Mike O'Connor: Okay I think we're done with this. And I commend all of you for a great discussion.

Marika Konings: Mikey can I ask you a question. This is Marika?

Mike O'Connor: Sure, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes I just wanted to for the record, who were the four volunteers for that group?

Mike O'Connor: Goerge Kirikos, Phil Corwin, Jeff Newman, and James Bladel

Marika Konings: Okay, thank you.

Man: Well I think Faisal was on that list, too?

Mike O'Connor: Faisal you want to be on it too?

Faisal Shah   Yes go ahead and put me on it.

Mike O'Connor: Okay, Faisal

Barry Cobb: And please add Barry Cobb too.

Mike O'Connor: Barry, oh cool. Yes, and anybody else who wants to join, I didn't mean to be exclusionary. I just wanted to get a core group going.

Marika Konings: Yes if you just can keep me in the loop so in case I have to summary. So it's always nice to be already included in the discussion.

Mike O'Connor: Yes. And maybe the way to leave it, if anybody else wants to be on that group just let Marika know and carry on.

Okay, it's 40 minutes in. Our next item is the (uniform) A contracts group ably led by Barry Cobb. I'm going to throw the ball to him.

Barry Cobb: Thanks Mikey. This will be a quick and easy. Some good news and a hint of some not so good news.

The good news is that we met as a sub team last week. We all seem to come together and have agreement about how the research and our findings should be shared. We've created kind of a distilled version of the research and findings.

And I - the original intent that - let me back up. We're also creating a corresponding PowerPoint deck that will explain how to read the research and some of the sub team findings. Basically it will list out what some of our options are and a couple of our recommendations. So we're just about ready to post this to the working group.

The heads of bad news is I hoped to have this ready for this session but I didn't get it finished. I have two more slides to complete on the deck. And I'd like to share that with the sub team before I release it out and into the wild.

So I'll have those completed today. I'll send out the revised research, the deck for review by the sub team. And I'd like to have it posted out to the list by Wednesday morning.

In general the team worked together really well. We had a great session last week. We got consensus on how all of this should be shared. And we do have a general recommendation of kind of a preview if you will.

We've confirmed that there is dispersion or variance among contracts relating to relative to abuse or registration abuse.

And our general recommendation is that we feel that, you know, we'd be better served by seeing a little bit more uniformity as it relates to abuse be it some sort of minimum standard or minimum guideline none of which has been formalized and no decisions have been made.

We want to share all of our findings with the overall working group, bring that to everybody to discuss hopefully at the next meeting. And then we'll take our actions from there and move forward.

Mike O'Connor: Thanks Barry. This is Mikey. Just to reiterate, Barry uses the personal pronoun we a lot more than he really should. He did a fabulous job on this research. And as a member of this group I have my hat off to him.

Any comments from the group accept (Hasa). Way to go Barry and thanks for all the work.

James Bladel: James (unintelligible). Look forward to it Barry .

Mike O'Connor: Yes it's a great job. Okay thanks Barry . We'll look forward to that and maybe I'll just exhort the sub team members.

Let's turn around our comments on Barry 's deck when it comes as quick as we can so that he can get it out to the broader group.

All right, next and last on the agenda is a continuation of the spam phishing malware - oh I'm sorry.

Marika Konings: No, we're missing some subgroups.

Mike O'Connor: I'm way behind. I'm sorry. I'm way off (base). Hold on.

So next is malware Botnet control, (Rod) and Greg Aaron are on that one. Either of you guys want to report either or both?

(Rod):   This is (Rod). I don't know that there's been a lot of work done directly on this. I had some - I was at a conference last week and learned of yet another massive .net that is using the same technique that hasn't gotten much coverage at all called the Patcher Botnet.

It's using the standard technique I guess now of an algorithm. This one has got 150,000 or so of domain variants in it at any one time so yet more folks going on.

I've got to get the information from the researchers who were looking at this one. This one's been targeting Scandinavian banks in particular that haven't gotten quite the - maybe the popular press that others have given what it's doing.

So anyways we'll - I'm getting the information from the researchers on that and we'll add that to the list of various folks that are doing this Botnet command and control so we've got more of it out there.

Mike O'Connor: Greg where - refresh my memory. Where are we at on that sub group task? The goal for you guys was to come up with a definition for the report. Is that right?

Greg Aaron: Just as will fill up the whole input actually to include a definition of the issues. We're work on that on the wiki actually.

And then what would come next are some draft recommendations.

Mike O'Connor: Oh, okay.

Greg Aaron: We've been working on the definition background sections so far.

Mike O'Connor: Okay.

Greg Aaron: Haven't gotten to the recommendations yet.

Mike O'Connor: So the wiki is progressing and we should take a look at that and offer any thoughts perhaps. It's homework for the rest of us. Is it to the point where we should work at it or you want to give it another go before you have us take a look?

Greg Aaron: Well we have some background material but we don't have any recommendations. So you want - I don't know (Rod), do you want to get it to that point before we bring it out or (what do you think)?

(Rod):   We probably should so we could have actually something to debate about I would guess. At this point we've got a fair amount of background there. Yes, I would think that that's really the next step and get - we argue about the background too much.

Mike O'Connor: Yes, I think that's right.

                  You know, it's almost like maybe it's time for an arbitrary deadline. What if we just said we'll go with whatever you've got in two weeks or something like that?

Jeff Newman: This is Jeff. Can I ask a question?

Mike O'Connor: Sure, go ahead.

Jeff Newman: So maybe I can ask (Rod) and Greg or actually ICANN staff if they have the answer to this. But I noticed that there was a call set up for September 29 I want to say from ICANN staff on their proposed recommendations for what to do in the new TLDs.

I was wondering if anyone had any insight into that and B, how that is going to be used, if that's going to be used in the work that we're doing? Because presumably ICANN is now creating a policy or creating response or what it's recommending as how registries should react.

So I guess I'd throw that all open. And maybe there's someone from ICANN staff that could address.

Mike O'Connor: Just to clarify Jeff, do you mean just in terms of malware and Botnet control or is this of broader?

Jeff Newman: Well I think it's broader but it's entitled malicious activity. And I don't know any more than just a brief announcement that came out that I saw sent to a bunch of different groups.

I don't know if it was sent to this group. But know it was sent to the council. I know it was sent to a bunch of other lists. But hold on. I'll pull up the announcement that I saw.

Greg Aaron: Jeff, this is great. Greg . I think that...

Marika Konings: (George), I can comment on that too. I don't know the details of what they're discussing but it's - I do know it's a conference call or Webinar that's expected to give the community an overview of the approach that they're considering taking in the (DAG) with respect to malicious abuse.

So Jeff is right. It's directed to that. New TLD is not all new TLDs. So it doesn't have broad implication across all TLDs but it does crossover on some of the work that this group is covering.

Mike O'Connor: Greg did you or...

Greg Aaron: Yes, I think my understanding is that there's these various overarching issues that are trying to be addressed before the next draft applicant guidebook is published.

My understanding is that there's some sort of a call tomorrow about the IRT and the issues surrounding commercial property issues in (TLD). It sounds like there is some now being scheduled a series of calls to deal with those overarching issues (unintelligible).

So I haven't seen the announcement yet but it - was it sent to the various groups Jeff?

Marika Konings: I think it was an invitation that was sent to the council, the GNSO Council.

Glen Desaintgery: Marika, this is Glen. It was sent to the liaison list which is the constituencies. And if you like I will send the invitation to this group right now as well.

Mike O'Connor: Thanks Glen. I think that would be great.

Man: Yes that would be most welcome because I'm a member of the business constituency and this is the first I've heard of about either of those calls and the IRT. I mean there both of great concern particularly IRT one coming up tomorrow.

Greg Aaron: I don't think there is a - I don't know of coming up tomorrow. I'm on the IRT so I don't know of one tomorrow.

Man: Okay. Oh someone said there was a call tomorrow that discussed trademark protection.

Man: Well I said that because a member of the IRT was presenting today and said there was a call with ICANN. So I don't know what it was about but it's about IRT.

Man: Okay.

Greg Aaron: But at this point there's no call tomorrow on the IRT, take that from an
                authoritative source.

Mike O'Connor: Okay. Cool.

Man: Today or tomorrow.

Mike O'Connor: Any of you authoritative sources if you hear about such a call, could you post
                it to our list? Because it's - I know it's not relevant to our charter but there are
                a bunch of us who'd be interested.

                Anyway okay, so back to malware Botnet control. Greg , (Rod), how do you
                feel about an arbitrary two week deadline go with what you've got?

(Rod):   Well we have - I've been thinking about this. We had another volunteer that
                had just recently gotten married if I remember right. And I forgot his name, my
                apologies, the gentleman from surveillance who we're going to convene with
                right around this time period so...

Mike O'Connor: Oh, okay.

(Rod):   So I would like to get his input on some of these issues because he's going to
                get up to speed, get a different perspective on this as well.

                I think having a deadline is good. I'm just not sure what the deadline should
                be yet.

Mike O'Connor: What about a tentative deadline just to put a little fire under you guys of a
                couple of weeks right now? And then, you know, you could always ignore me
                if you want. At least...

(Rod): Well that's fair. We usually do anyway.

Mike O'Connor: Yes, you know, so what's new? But, you know, I know that sometimes it's nice just to have a date that says okay, okay we've got to have something. And between now and two weeks from now a quick call to at least sketch out a few preliminary recommendations would be...

(Rod): Yes, that's reasonable.

Mike O'Connor: ...move the ball forward.

(Rod): I think that's reasonable.

Mike O'Connor: Greg , are you okay with that?

Greg Aaron: Okay.

Mike O'Connor: He's fading away. All right, anything else on malware Botnet control or we'll move onto front running? Jeff, your hand is just lingering. It's stuck in the upper right position right? You're not wanting to comment?

Jeff Newman: Right.

Mike O'Connor: Okay. (George), front running?

George Kirikos: Yes, (George) here. I sent an email to the list and I'll post a link in the little chat box with the updates since the last call. I basically added what we talked about in the conference call last time to the wiki and what we talked about on the mailing list.

And as in the comparison document you can see that it's updates we're talking about what constitutes insider information. Jeff had concerns about

that and also how much time we should be spending on this issue whether it's, you know, a theoretical versus an actual abuse at this time.

And I updated it to reflect the (benial man) additional data and additional color to prior topics.

I don't know how folks want to proceed. Do we just want to just leave things where they are now in thesis or...

Mike O'Connor: Well this is a lovely piece of work (George). Greg , when you started us down this path of building out these responses to the templates on the wiki, what was your thought that we - when it got sort of to a certain place we would take a look at it and approve it? When it got to a certain place we would just say this looks good we're done?

(George) certainly has done an awful lot of work on this. And it's - at a minimum it looks worthy of some sort of review, probably not on this call but maybe soon. But I can defer to the real chair is supposed to the picture.

Greg Aaron: Hi it's Greg . Yes its general approach is that this is the place where we essentially end up writing some materials.

We found that at a certain point probably after it's discussed by the group it gets - it's (based) well enough because Marika becomes the owner of the material. She handles updates to it so she could kind of be the authoritative source of the draft.

So we have to decide if what (George) has written, set a point where it's worth everybody reading and we walk through it and then discuss any changes that some people would like to see.

Mike O'Connor: I am quickly scanning this. And it looks to me like at the very bottom Pages 6
                  and 7 of (George)'s wiki page we don't really have recommendations. And I'm
                  just not seeing - oh, here's possible recommendations.

George Kirikos: Now (George) here. Yes, I left it because we need to do it as a consensus
                  within the group.

Mike O'Connor: Yes.

George Kirikos: I can't (on my) own recommendations.

Mike O'Connor: Got it. Got it, got it, got it. I - you know, I guess just looking at it myself this
                  certainly looks close enough for the rest of the group to really take a hard
                  look at.

                  And maybe depending on what Greg wants to do with agendas maybe at the
                  next call finalize it and move some of those recommendations down into the
                  recommendations column.

                  So I guess that's where I'd like to leave that unless there's somebody in the
                  group that has an issue which with what (George) has written or feels that we
                  need to go another way.

                  Marika and then Jeff and then (George). Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I just wanted to emphasize that it'll be important for this
                  group to discuss and review the recommendations as some of them are, you
                  know, new and haven't been discussed before, but also for the group to think
                  about a mechanism or a way to involve those that, you know, are not able to
                  participate in the call or make sure that they have a chance as well when this
                  group has gone through it to review it and make comments because, you
                  know, if no one's been putting the links to wiki's on the agendas for each call.
                  But I'm not sure how much reviewing has been done by the group.

So I think, you know, we need to make sure that people are aware that, you know, it's last call. Now it's time to have a close look and share our edits or views on the mailing list so the group can indeed come to a closure at a certain point in time and that we don't have a situation where we need to go - going back to the same set of text or recommendation just because someone didn't know it was already, you know, at that stage or they didn't have a chance to look at it yet. So I think that's something to take into account.

Mike O'Connor: Yes. And I would think that if we decide to go forward with a pretty hard review for next call that that would be something we'd want to alert the list to as an action item for the next two weeks for everybody to really give a hard look at (George)'s page.

But okay, (Jeffrey)?

Jeff Newman: Yes, thanks. So a couple of questions I guess. And, you know, I appreciate all the work (George) has done. But I think the recommendations, especially, 4, 5 and 6 seem like they're more towards the development of a consensus policy as opposed to kind of issues for a PDP.

I mean these are conclusions, prohibiting a registry like Number 6, prohibiting registrars and registry operators from using disclosing availability checks. That's a conclusion. I mean it seems like we're going beyond what this group is supposed to do.

I. mean I personally disagree with all of that and I'm delinquent for not have having put that on the wiki. But I just think we're going a little too for far.

The recommendations should be if there is a recommendation it's a PDP on this to look at all the issues around it, not prohibiting registrars and registries from using the data.

Mike O'Connor: (George), would you take that as a friendly amendment and reword those
                   or...

George Kirikos: (George) here. Sure. I just put this out as possible topics. We obviously need
                   more discussion. And even the sections above that need more discussion
                   because I kind of present both sides but I don't present what the group has
                   formed a consensus around so.

Mike O'Connor: Why don't you reframe those the way (Jim) described which is consistent with
                   our charter as a pre-PDP group and reframe them as recommendations to
                   engage in a PDP process around a given issue. And, you know, it seems like
                   that's a fairly minor...

George Kirikos: Yes. That would be consistent with Number 3 which is basically more study
                   put it to a PDP if...

Mike O'Connor: Yes.

George Kirikos: ...I just feel...

Mike O'Connor: Just frame them all in that context that Jeff just raised. That seems like a
                   more consistent with our charter approach.

George Kirikos: Yes.

((Crosstalk)).

Man: And then this...

((Crosstalk)).

George Kirikos: Number 6, (George) here again. If you look at Number 6 it says alternatively
                   creating roles as to how those availability checks can be used. That's kind of

going in the line of prohibiting isn't the only option. So I'm sure Jeff would disagree with the first section but maybe it wouldn't disagree with the second one which is to create roles around how those could be used.

Mike O'Connor: Because well I think the fundamental point that Jeff is raising is that it's our charter to make recommendations on future PDPs not recommendations on actions, correct Jeff?

Jeff Newman: Correct.

Mike O'Connor: So, you know, just - I think that the language can stay the same it just can't be stated as a recommendations for actions. It's got to be stated as a recommendation for a PDP to take a look at that action.

Greg Aaron: This is Greg . I agree with Jeff that the recommendation would be if there is one that that one recommendation would be a PDP.

This is why in the issues sections of these wiki's you have to state very clearly what you think the issues are. In other words, the reasons why a PDP or some other action might be in order.

So again, I encourage you to focus on explaining the issues and then, you know, the group will eventually arrive at a recommendation.

Mike O'Connor: Yes.

Greg Aaron: Anyone's free to draft a recommendation of course. But getting at the issues and saying what's really at stake or what the problem is really important.

Man: Right. And I'd like to see a poll within the group as a whole to see whether the use of traffic data is really an quote abuse. I mean I - again, I think that's probably going to be a mixed view from the group as to whether it's actually

abuse. And if it's not abuse that I'm not sure we can recommend anything on it.

Mike O'Connor: Yes. And I think what I'd like to do is leave that whole discussion for next time. You know, we'll disappear into a pretty long conversation if we start that one now.

But I think it's good to sort of tee it up because, you know, it gives people a couple of weeks to sort of think about it, read (George)'s page come up with arguments for and against, et cetera, et cetera. if that's all right.

Marika Konings: Mikey, can I add something?

Mike O'Connor: Sure. Go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, just a more general point on all these issues. I think it's really important indeed that, you know, the recommendations are clear. But if there is specific questions or specific issues that, you know, that group reaches consensus around that should be included in the PDP, I think that will be really helpful. Because of course if we go down the path of a PDP the next stage would be an issues report. And issues report would have to review, you know, specific questions.

So in order to really have a focused PDP it would be really helpful to have those specific issues outlined that a PDP should address. So that's more it in general for all the issues that the group is looking at and linked to the recommendations they will be making.

Mike O'Connor: So let's see, to summarize this one, A, great work (George) -- very nice. I haven't read it for quite a while. It's a long way.

B, we'll put this one on the agenda for next time for a concentrated look. C, (George) will revise the recommendations to be consistent with the recommending PDP charter rather than actually making recommendations.

And D, any and all are encouraged to vigorously debate this stuff on the list between now and then so that we can perhaps move some of this forward. Anything else?

Okay, sorry about getting ahead of ourselves. Now we are at the spam, phishing malware discussion.

Greg Aaron: Hi Mike , this is Greg .

Mike O'Connor: Go ahead.

Greg Aaron: May I? As we launch into this I'd like to mention a very related issue which is been commended to us by the GNSO Council. That's the issue of fast flux.

Some of you are familiar with that working group. And it basically came to an end after a final report was issued recently.

And the council decided to commend the issue of malicious use of the fast flux to us. The fast flux working group looked at fast flux. And what it discovered is fast flux is a technique. And depending on how you define fast flux, it's up thing that can be used for good or mutual or bad purposes.

So the real issue was basically criminals, people who were using Botnet to do malicious kinds of things. Those are very often things like spam or malware distribution actually.

So I'm wondering if fast flux somehow also gets tied into the spam phish malware thing because it's basically a tool used to spam and phish -- very

related issue. I just want to kind of throw that out there and figure out if this is the right place to also discuss that issue.

And I would invite James and (Rod) and Mikey to also comment because they were on the working group.

Mike O'Connor: This is Mikey. I'll start.

James and (Rod), start preparing your thoughts. My - I have two reactions. One reaction is it certainly seems like we should take a look at it.

And I - and my second reaction is that I'm sort of ambivalent as to whether it goes into the current one, spam, phishing, malware or if it goes into the Botnet one that we just discussed. I'm not sure I have a strong feeling about that. So anybody who wants to comment after me can make a case either way. James?

James Bladel: Hi Mikey. I think before we dive into that -- and I apologize. I was multitasking for just a moment there so I probably missed the one conversation where I can actually do some damage.

But you know, I think first we should probably take a look at the fast flux as a registration versus post-registration concepts.

I think, you know, now that the working group is closed we can maybe take a look at that a little more closely and then if so probably I agree with you would be categorized as part of the phishing.net category. But I think that that question needs to be examined by this group.

Mike O'Connor: (Rod), you got anything that you want to add?

(Rod): I would say that the - if we're going to combine that with one of the other two, you know, clearly, malicious stuff with the topic we're about to talk about and

versus the Botnet command and control it would go into the phishing/spam/malware drop site one because fast flux is a command and control technique is pretty rare at this point and not very reliable for the Botnet guys.

I think the much larger portion of where you're going to see this is in supporting spam campaigns and things like that. So of the two that's where I think it belongs.

And I, you know, I think that yes, we should definitely be taking a look at what is possible, you know, at the registration time period versus post-registration. It seems kind of - parsing that out clearly so that we can get a good definition, not get mired in a lot of semantic arguments down the road like we did previously in the fast flux working group.

Mike O'Connor: Okay. So to draw this one to a close I'm going to restate what I think we - four of us have just said and encourage anybody else on the call to chime in at this point.

But point number one, yes, we accept the remit from the council to take a look at this.

Two, it belongs in the spam phishing malware category.

Three, the nub of the issue is the distinction between those things that can be dealt with at registration time as opposed to post-registration. Anybody want to add to that?

I'm not seeing a huge onrush of hands so let's call it done at that.

Anything else Greg that you want to kick us off in spam, phishing, malware before we go into the summary that Marika goes got up in front of us?

Greg Aaron: Oh, no thank you.

Mike O'Connor: Okay. In front of us on Adobe Connect (Rod), sorry that you can't see it. But Marika has started the...

(Rod):   I can see it Mikey.

Mike O'Connor: Oh you can. Okay, terrific.

Marika has started the Web page on that. And we had a pretty lively discussion. If we were take to take a look at that discussion which Marika summarized so well on the Web page and looked at it with the lens of our pre-PDP charter which is are there some PDP topics in here that we would want to recommend or push for work, what with those topics be? Maybe we'll just spend about ten or 15 minutes brainstorming around that and see where that leads us.

Or maybe that's not a good topic kicker offer. I mean we had a lively discussion. Did we come to conclusions? I'm sort of reading this dense page here as I talk. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes no, I just wanted to point out that of course the focus of this group is registration abuse. And I think we did this concept, you know, we would look and categorize and, you know, possibly come up with the recommendations for issues that are post-registration or abuse related.

So I don't know if indeed this sign is related to that that focus of the group is on those other issues. And, you know, maybe at this point in time it's might make sense to spend too much energy on trying to do that part. I don't know it's...

Mike O'Connor: I actually want to clarify what I heard you say. Did you say that we are including post-registration abuse in our charter as well?

Marika Konings: No, no. I understood that the group felt that as we have a long list or - and
                    have -, you know, made subcategories that it might be useful to show the
                    community that we, you know, discuss all these different abuses and
                    basically manage to categorize those and then focus on registration abuse
                    but just for the record to at least include the definition and some of the points
                    discussed around the issues to have a complete report. That was my
                    understanding of the previous discussions.

Mike O'Connor: Yes, right. Now I'm not putting this particular category in exclusively in post-
                    registration. On the last call we did have a pretty extensive discussion around
                    that.

                    The sense I got was that there were instances where at registration time it
                    could be determined that the registration was being used to conduct those
                    abuses. Am I as often I am confused about that?

                    Because I'm taking this to mean that these three abuses are within our remit
                    but only to the extent that they can be determined at registration time. Correct
                    summary (Rod)? Go ahead.

(Rod):   Okay, yes. That's - I was going to talk about that precisely. I think that's a lot
                    of the discussion last time was about was that post versus during and the
                    like. And I made the argument that there are many instances where you can
                    actually tell what's going on at registration time. And there was a lively debate
                    about all that.

                    So I think that, you know, I - as far as this group's concerned I would like to
                    concentrate on those things that are determinable and actionable at
                    registration because it's, you know, obviously what the group's started for.
                    But also I think that's where we can have the most impact.

The post-registration abuse I think is being handled pretty straightforwardly by most registrars already.

It's what you can do or what we can do as a community to work better together at and help registrars and registries identify abusers as they're coming in on a more consistent basis.

We talked about, quite a bit about policy versus best practices and that kind of dividing line. So I think that we wanted to continue that discussion was the point for this week.

Mike O'Connor: I guess I - Greg , I'm going to defer to you on this. Is this another one that needs a subgroup to go off and do a little writing? Do we want to discuss this in a general on the call? How do you want to proceed?

I'm happy to lead it any way you want but I'm not exactly sure what you want to do.

Greg Aaron: (You mean) a subgroup to tackle spam, phishing, malware and...

Mike O'Connor: Yes and sort of does the same sort of thing that (George) has done with - well that the other subgroups have done where they've got the template and they crashed through the template and build a wiki page for us.

((Crosstalk)).

Greg Aaron: I think we - and I think that group has to kind of wrestle with what are the contours of the policy issues especially. So I think we need volunteers.

Marika Konings: There are some volunteers already listed at the top of the page because I think we did already discuss before creating a sub team. So for now I think it's Greg and Martin Sutton and Mikey that are listed.

Mike O'Connor: Yes.

James Bladel: This is James. You can put me on that list.

Mike O'Connor: Okay, anybody else like to join this gang?

(Rod):   I should be on that list. This is (Rod).

Mike O'Connor: Yes, you should.

Man: You should be leading that list (Rod).

(Rod):   Yes. The other thing was that we - the reason we left this on the agenda for this week was because we had such a lively discussion last time - I don't remember who suggested it but said hey, we should just keep talking and then form a subgroup based on what other points got brought up.

                   You know, the points are getting brought up. Maybe we can we can just move on with the subgroup and get onto the next thing.

Mike O'Connor: Well I think that would be a great course of action. I think that we started this subgroup and then it sort of stalled out because we didn't exactly know what our charter was. And now I think we do.

                   You know, we need to do as the other subgroups have and start flushing out the template. And so maybe that's the way to handle it.

                   Unless people have really urgent things that they've like to say to the full group, why don't we leave it that the newly enhanced and expanded subgroup will try and get together between now and the next call and begin working on this?

Who's going to lead this subgroup? Who's going to call this meeting (you said) rhetorically?

Nobody's leaping forward. I would normally volunteer but I am in the last six weeks of a yearlong project here in Minnesota to do the broadband strategy so to speak. And so I just can't until that's over. Come November I can volunteer for stuff like that.

James, do you want to be our convener? After all you're not leaving the fast flux working group anymore.

James Bladel: Oh.

Mike O'Connor: Said as one former chair to another.

James Bladel: Yes, all right, okay. Sure well.

Mike O'Connor: Cool. You know, just convene. Don't do a whole lot of work just do the doodle and get us together.

James Bladel: Yes. Maybe...

Mike O'Connor: Marika, do you want to be included in this group as well?

Marika Konings: Yes please.

Mike O'Connor: Okay.

I'm sorry James, I cut you off.

James Bladel: Oh just I was going to ask the same thing if we could just ping Marika afterwards and get rolling.

Mike O'Connor: Yes, cool.

                   All right, anything else on this topic for today?

                   I'm not hearing anything. I see nothing else on the agenda. We've got ten big
                   minutes to spare in the call. I think I'll throw it back to our chair for concluding
                   remarks and then we're done. Greg ?

Greg Aaron: No, no. It was a good meeting, thank you.

Mike O'Connor: All right. Well gang thanks a lot. We'll see you on the net and in a couple of
                   weeks.

Marika Konings: Bye.

Man: Thanks for hosting Mikey.

Mike O'Connor: All righty. Bye-bye.

                                            END