

**Fast Flux PDP WG Teleconference
TRANSCRIPTION
Friday 5 December 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 5 December 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-20081205.mp3>

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#dec>

Present for the teleconference:

Greg Aaron - Afiliias Ry c.

James Bladel - Godaddy RRc

Observers - (no constituency affiliation)

Joe St. Sauver

Martin Hall

Rod Rasmussen

Dave Piscitello

Absent apologies

Avri Doria - NCA, GNSO Council chair, temporary chair

Paul Diaz - Networksolutions RRc

Randy Vaughn

Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC

Staff:

Liz Gasster

Marika Konings

Glen de Saint Ger

Dave Piscitello: ...issues and try to (trap) him to try to get him into a (case) to take him to the vet.

Woman: Yeah.

Dave Piscitello: A little longer than we imagined.

Man: So you were herding cats, Dave?

Dave Piscitello: Pretty much. Even herding one cat is difficult dealing with five dogs, I think.

Man: Recording.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you, (unintelligible). Well (unintelligible) I'll go through the roll call again. We have on the call Greg Aaron, James Bladel , Martin Hall, Rod Rasmussen and Dave Piscitello.

Then from staff we have Marika Konings and Liz Gasster. Avri sends her apologies. She is completely exhausted after her week of IGF which is still carrying on tomorrow. We have also apologies from Randy Vaughn and Paul Diaz.

Marika Konings: Thank you, Glen.

Glen DeSaintgery: Over to you, Marika.

Marika Konings: Thank you. As mentioned to some of you beforehand, (Avery), you know, feels strongly that the call should go ahead despite the fact that she wouldn't be able to join. And therefore asked whether I could take you through the outstanding sections and hopefully we will have a discussion on those and hopefully we can come to an agreement on the outstanding sections.

So if everyone agrees on that, I would propose that we have maybe start off with Section 5.4. This is one where a proposed text was posted on the mailing list following our call last week in which I basically tried to integrate on the one hand the original text that was proposed here and some suggestions that were made by Rod that was

circulated, I think, last - like, last Monday or something and already before Thanksgiving - sorry.

So there was plenty of opportunity to have a look at that and no comments were received. So is there - do people still want to discuss it, are there any issues, any feedback, any changes that people would like to share? I take silence as agreement?

So I guess we can remove them then to support Alternative U and move this to agreements and adopt this section as is. I think following this call, depending on how far we get, I think the idea would be to encourage working group members - and especially those that are not on the call - to have a thorough review of the report and, you know, so people are still able to review these parts and be able to provide comments and suggestions in cases where maybe, you know, they didn't have a chance to speak up on the call.

So another section that's still outstanding in 510. And that is one that I think was circulated by Rod some time ago. But we haven't had a discussion on the call yet on that. So I don't know if people already had an opportunity to review it - or rather they would like to take a few minutes now to read through it. Or maybe, Rod, you would like to quickly explain what's - you tried to say in this section? Rod, are you still there?

Glen DeSaintgery: His line shows open Marika.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Man: (Unintelligible) maybe.

Rod Rasmussen: Yeah, I'm still here. I'm having - I'm on the road and having problems with my phone here - getting it off of mute. The section on best practices, correct?

Marika Konings: Yes - correct.

Rod Rasmussen: Right - I'll just pull over here. Yeah - so the idea here was to mention the best practices that have been put out for related kind of activities, in particular the APWG's Best Practices paper for registrars and the (unintelligible) paper which I think Dave actually submitted that part of the text. But to give, you know, examples of where other works have been done that could be applicable.

Marika Konings: Okay, thank you. Are there any comments, suggestions? Do people agree with the statement as it is?

Man: I do.

Man: I do.

Man: I have one minor nitpick - the composite box list is actually the CBO. It's part of the expand house XPL but it's not the whole thing. So that just might want to be cleared up.

Marika Konings: Maybe specify which line you're talking about?

Man: It's like, Line 1155 and it's just sort of indicating XPL and I think you really want to have either CBO there or just say that it's part of the XPL.

Marika Konings: If I change it to CBO, are people okay with that?

Man: Yep.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Man: You know, the wonderful thing about that - also that it, you know, it may sometimes indicate fraud but I think it also can just simply be that the machine is compromised. So I don't know whether or not that'd be something (unintelligible) could live with as well.

Rod Rasmussen: Again, this is just mentioned as an example, too. So changing it actually changes somewhat the quote from the paper as I was actually quoting it - but that's okay.

Man: Maybe just something in the footnote or bracketed area or something.

Man: I don't like (stop, read or wave).

Marika Konings: You would like to include in brackets, (all compromised)?

Man: Brackets or footnote or whatever is easiest for you. I don't want to go ahead and disturb the quote. I'm sensitive to the idea of maintaining the integrity of that.

Marika Konings: I think if we do it in square brackets it would basically indicate that it's no longer a quote but it's a separate element. So they can just add their - the composite block list may indicate fraud or...

Rod Rasmussen: That the machine had been compromised.

Marika Konings: The machine has been compromised.

Rod Rasmussen: I hadn't mentioned that the introduction to the section had been paraphrased anyhow so I don't feel too horribly.

Man: Neither do I.

Marika Konings: Okay, I'll change that for the next version. Any other issues, concerns, edits? If not, I can sort of adopt it. I would make one footnote there because I think someone on the mailing list earlier indicated a concern but never really actually expressed it or provided alternative language. So this might be a section where some discussion might have to take place in the future, someone comes back with an alternative suggestion.

Then one other outstanding issue is related to Chapter 6. There was some discussion on one of the previous call whether this section should stay in or should go out as parts of it are summaries of constituency statements submitted as well as some other views.

There were some people that were concerned that a summary here without explicit approval of those people have been - have been viewed as being summarized might not be appropriate while others felt that it would be good to have a summary here. The full statements are annexed to the reports but in order to allow people to have a short overview of what is said in those statements - this would be helpful.

So we've left in now a bit half, where the text that is adopted or still not stricken out is related to the constituency statements received. And the ones that have been taken out are those other statements that were submitted as well.

So we'd like to open the floor and ask people what they think should happen with this section. We put back in the sections that have been stricken out, should they go out and we only have - the mention that we have received some statements and that they can be found in the annex? What do people feel?

Liz Gasster: Marika, it's (Liz) and I just want to, you know, share that I think that it is customary to summarize statements that have been submitted essentially to make it easier for the readers to get a sense of, you know, the different views on a sort of issue-specific basis where you can cluster the viewpoints around the issues and (unintelligible) often summarizes the viewpoints of others.

I think we can do that in a way that gives -as we have already - gives the person who's submitting the viewpoint the opportunity to amend or edit their view to be sure it's accurately summarized by staff. But I would encourage us to proceed to that do that and not be unnecessarily concerned about that as long as the individuals who submit the comments have opportunity to, you know, edit things they think they want to say more clearly or more accurately.

(James Liddell): Marika, this is (James).

Marika Konings: Yes - go ahead.

(James Liddell): I agree - we can keep these here if the goal is just to provide a convenience to the reader and reference the full statements. I think the concern at the time was that the summary might lead to interpretation or even possibly offering counter positions to the summaries - summarized positions. And I don't think that's appropriate here. But if it's just meant as a convenience here, then I can support that but I just wanted to be cautious about going down that other road.

Liz Gasster: Yeah, definitely. I would share that concern.

Marika Konings: Any other comments?

(James Liddell): And we want to see, for example, a summary that says, you know, constituency X feels this way but/or however, you know, we wouldn't want to see any of those conjunctions in this area.

Marika Konings: Yeah - and that is some language that is in there now. And if I remember correctly, I think, (Joe), you submitted some of those statements. And the question would be, do you feel that the point that you've made here has been made sufficiently throughout the report? So you know, the statement hasn't made - and we can just mention this to the summary of the constituency statement and other statements we've received or do you still feel that, you know, those points belong in here as well?

(Joe): I actually was sort of in favor of removing those summaries simply because they believe that, you know, a lot of water has sort of passed by. And for example, it talks about things like a lack of data - where there may have been a lack of data at the time things were kind of put together initially for those. But I think that's really changed over time.

And I also kind of, you know, just sort of feel that there's sort of going to be a disproportionate impact just in terms of placement of the summary and it really feels like this is the summary of the document rather than just the summary of the perspectives of those constituencies.

So part of the concern I always have of sort of the placement of these comments in terms of the summarization and whether or not the summaries accurately reflect those comments - I think that can be addressed by contacting the constituencies themselves. But it just seems like it's not really necessary to have it there. That's just my...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Would a compromise maybe be then to move this section to the annex in which those statements are found? So the summary is still - but it's actually linked to the actual statements? Would that be something people could live? And then...

(Joe): I certainly can be happier with that.

Man: So if I'm understanding you, Marika, it would be more of an introduction to the annex?

Marika Konings: Yes.

Man: I'd be fine with that.

Man: An introduction to the annex, not an introduction to each constituency statement, for example.

Marika Konings: No, no - it would be - the proposal would be to make that the first page of the annex that has all the statements - the constituency statements and I think some individual statements follow as well. But (unintelligible) I can made an annex that only relates to the statements that are summarized here and then take out the points that some are saying like, you know, at the same time some members of the working group suggests like, you know, those points are being restricted to the summary of the constituency statements received.

Man: Okay.

Marika Konings: Will that work for people?

Man: It seems to make sense to me, personally.

(Martin Hall): Marika, this is (Martin). Can I raise a related point?

Marika Konings: Yes, of course.

(Martin Hall): (Joe) was just talking about, you know, the reference to data that didn't exist and now - at least in theory - is going to exist in annex. One of the questions that occurred to me is, is that data just going to sit in the annex without any cross reference in the main body of the document or is it going to be a cross reference from the main body of the document?

It seems like there was two options that was going to be a cross reference. One is if this section stays, it would appear here. The other option is when I do a full document, do you recommend cross reference points that are - just seem obvious?

Marika Konings: I think that last point, in my mind, makes absolute sense. You know, when you do a thorough review, you see points that are, you know, sort of (unintelligible) by the base that provided them to link there I think would be very appropriate. I don't know how others feel about that.

Liz Gasster: Marika, would that get done kind of in the context you talked about earlier, about overall reviews that everyone should do?

Marika Konings: Yes.

Liz Gasster: Of the paper over the next couple of weeks to really focus on...

Marika Konings: Yes.

Liz Gasster: You know, internal integrity and consistency and language and...

Marika Konings: Yeah. I think the idea would be, I mean, we can discuss in a second whether there are any other sections or issues people want to discuss. But I think what we covered, like, all the big outstanding ones. I think the idea would be to now take this document back home and whatever and sit down and really read through it and, you know, look for inconsistencies, you know, mistakes.

Or as well, you know, referencing certain sections of the documents that might provide further clarifications on certain issues and really, you know, do that to make sure that the documents makes sense as a whole.

I mean, we've now focused on looking on different sections and different chapters. But haven't really done yet the complete overview of making sure that as a whole, the report is valid and, you know, consistent.

So I actually already made a start at, you know, going through it and trying to edit some, you know, minor things like spelling mistakes or rearranging sentences so it, you know, it would be more readable. But I think it would be good if everyone can take that task to heart.

So my proposal would therefore be - I don't know if people already had a chance to look at the edits I made. And I don't know if people prefer - the question actually is do people really prefer looking at the documents as it now and it still has all the changes or would people prefer the clean document, basically accepting, you know, all the things that we've discussed now and that we've previously discussed and provide a clean document to everyone for review.

But of course the possibility to go back to certain things or, you know, certain issues that haven't been thoroughly discussed, that they could still be raised by the group. But use that as a tool to go through the next stage and basically try to finalize the report.

So the question there is, do people prefer that I clean out the document now and, you know, take out all the changes and have a

clean document to start the review from or would they like to leave it as is and, you know, send me suggested and edits that I then incorporate in the document?

Man: I'd go for the clean one.

Man: I echo that.

Man: I think that's a good idea.

Marika Konings: Okay - I think we have a consensus starting to emerge. And again, I mean, those that prefer to work from the track changes documents, I, you know, it's no problem to send a copy of that around and you already have it on the Wiki as well.

So maybe then the question is, are there any other sections, chapters, items that people would like to discuss now?

(Martin Hall): The date for annex.

Marika Konings: Yes, (Martin), go ahead. I think some people already commented on it. So please share with the group, you know, what you still need from everyone or, you know, what you would like input on.

(Martin Hall): Yeah - so if anybody's got any observations on how that they (unintelligible) representative in the chart and are interested in that, I've already got some comments which were great. So that was one item.

The second really was the trade off between, you know, adding more views into large amounts of data that I think we and (Arbor) have got in

the amount of time it may take to, you know, extract that data chart and put it into what we're trying to achieve here in terms of getting this report out. (Unintelligible).

Dave Piscitello: Marika, this is Dave. One of the things I saw in the comments that were made after (Martin) posted his annex was trying to - essentially trying to anticipate the kinds of questions that would be asked about the data. And I think that that might be a really valuable focus because it's even so often that (unintelligible) wants to have data. And then if we present it in (unintelligible) it just doesn't satisfy the people who are actually, you know, trying to either become convinced or not - whether, you know, the issue is serious.

So maybe we could just focus on that and then see if there are other ways to represent data secondarily.

Greg Aaron: This is Greg. I think (Martin) has presented, kind of like the main matrix in his draft which is good. And I've done some kind of related statistics and reporting recently for APWG. And what I've - and Rod did too.

And I think the main - yeah, the main things is focus - let's focus first on the major metrics which is kind of raw numbers and where those are in each DLD and that kind of thing. And just be careful to define the metrics clearly.

So I think when people read the stats, they're going to want to know what is - how is the metric defined and therefore what is the kind of mean. And if you can do that, I think that'll help the reader. So I agree with Dave.

(Martin Hall): So Dave, you kindly offered to help me with this on the narrative so maybe I can cooperate with you offline on this from what I'm hearing people say.

Dave Piscitello: Absolutely - yeah - I'm sort of tied up in conferences most of today. But yeah, Monday would be a good time for me or, you know, I don't know how much you work on weekends, you know, getting close to Christmas here. So I'm going to spend a little time with my family but I can certainly arrange time if that's more convenient for you.

(Martin Hall): Dave, let's take it offline. Monday would be better for me but yeah, let's try and coordinate something early next week. And then we can just iterate on this together and present something to the group.

Dave Piscitello: Okay, then (unintelligible) for you and me.

Marika Konings: And I think that would be well, to provide you with some relief. And Avriwon't be able to do a call next week so I think the proposal to would be basically to skip next week's call and, you know, really give people time to review the document that, you know, we're talking about - more than 90 pages. Give people two weeks to really look at it thoroughly and hopefully have an opportunity to finalize it on the 19th of December. And hopefully that will give you as well plenty of opportunity to finalize a section on the data.

Man: That's fine.

Marika Konings: (Martin), was there anything else you wanted to raise on the call in relation to the data section or anything else? Anyone else that wants to

discuss any of the outstanding items in the report or any sections or any other issues?

If not, I then would like to thank you all for joining the call and I think everyone listening to the recording, I would like to strongly encourage you to read thoroughly the clean version I will circulate at the beginning of next week and provide any added, you know, normal added language things you can send directly to me. If there are any more substantial issues that you think might need group review, I would encourage you to send it to the mailing list.

And as mentioned, I think we will then therefore skip next week's call and reconvene on the 19th of December. And in the meantime, I hope we can keep the discussion going on the mailing list. And thank you again and have a good weekend.

Woman: Thank you, Marika.

Man: Thank you all.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Thank you.

Woman: Bye.

END