

**Fast Flux PDP WG Teleconference  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Friday 26 September 2008 15:00 UTC**

**Note:** The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Fast Flux PDP WG teleconference on Friday 26 September 2008, at 15:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ff-pdp-20080926.mp3>  
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#sep>

Present:

CBUC

Mike O'Connor - WG Chair CBUC

Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC - Council liaison George Kirikos - CBUC

NCUC

Christian Curtis - NCUC

Registry Constituency

Greg Aaron - Afilias

Rodney Joffe - NeuStar

Registrar constituency

Paul Diaz - Networksolutions

James Bladel - Godaddy

Eric Brunner-Williams - CORE

Observers - (no constituency affiliation) Joe St. Sauver

Rod Rasmussen - Internet Identity APWG

Randy Vaughn

Dave Piscitello

Marc Perkel

Joe St Sauver

Staff:

Liz Gasster

Marika Konings

Glen de Saint Gery

Absent - apologies:

Kal Feher - MelbourneIT

(Mike O'Connor): Fast-Flux page - if you go to the Fast-Flux home page.

Coordinator: The conference is now recording, so you can go ahead.

(Mike O'Connor): Thanks very much.

Man: Fast-Flux (unintelligible).

(Mike O'Connor): If that link that's in the chat doesn't work, just try going to the Fast-Flux home page where I've pasted the latest version as well. Glen why don't you all the roll?

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay. I'll do that with pleasure. We have on the call (Mike O'Connor), leader of the group, (Dave Piscitello , Joe St Sauver, (Marc Perkel, (Paul Diaz), (Mike Rodenbach), (George Kirikos (James Bladel, (Randall Vaughn), (Greg Aaron), Christian Curtis), and (Rod Rasmussen). And for staff we have (Liz Gasster), (Marika Konings and myself. Have I missed anybody?

(Mike O'Connor): Sounds like that's it. Thank you Glen.

Glen DeSaintgery: Pleasure.

(Mike O'Connor): I think today's agenda is very simple. I think we're going to keep working on changes just like we did last time. And I'd like to go a little bit out of order. I'd like to work today on next steps changes. And so in addition to the latest version of (Marika)'s proposed (unintelligible), it will be very helpful for folks to have a copy of the draft report with the line numbers in it, because you'll (need) that, what we're really going to be working off of, at least in this first part where we worked on

proposed next steps. It's going to be easier to work off the report than off of the changes document.

So I'll (unintelligible) for a minute to give people time to get the report in front of them. And then I think that's actually going to go fairly quickly, and then we can circle back to the content changes and do as much of that as we can today. But I'd really like to (see where we are on next steps and sort of get that nailed today, especially given that we've got so many folks on the call

(Greg) needs to drop off fairly early, so I'm going to push us along if we can, so that we can do this while (Greg)'s still on the call. And I guess what I would do is direct you to line 622 - (619) of the draft report. And what I'd like to do on this is the same thing we were doing last time, where we were using our checkmarks and our - essentially our agree and disagree buttons in Adobe Connect.

And for the first of these, I'd like to point us at line 619, and then the next, Line 628 where we've basically got two possible next step problem statements that we could recommend to the council. And so let me just restate them. And I think what we'll do is we'll treat it as binary, and we'll say, "Well if we agree with P1 we'll agree, and if we don't - if we want to do P2 we'll disagree." We'll just make it easier to capture the vote.

So P1 the problem statement is continue to focus on Fast-Flux, rapidly emerging technique that relies on internet names and numbers, which is used the hardened malicious networks. And option P2, which is explore a broader issue, which is how internet names and numbers are

used to enable internet fraud and abuse and the role of ICANN community in addressing this problem.

I did a little poll long ago that forms the basis of what I wrote, but I sort of want to ignore that poll, because we have basically everybody on the call now. And I'd rather just poll us on this issue maybe after a little discussion. But I think that the way to do this is if you want us to focus on Fast-Flux, agree, and if you want us to focus on broader issues, disagree.

And with that, I'm now going to look at (unintelligible) and watch tick marks unless people want to discuss (this).

Man: I've got a question for you. Are - what exactly are you envisioning this poll determining? I mean are we including both statements in the report and then just having (unintelligible) like this that (unintelligible)?

Man: What I'm thinking is that if we all agree on one or the other that we would just drop the other. We wouldn't even present the debate. If it turns out - what happened in my little poll is that we were very evenly divided. And so I put both in. But if it turns out that we all want to do one thing or the other, I think then what we would do is just recommend that thing.

And if we're divided - if we're evenly divided, then we'll put them both in and say we couldn't arrive at consensus. But I think the first thing to do is figure out the sense of the group.

(Eric): (Mike), this is (Eric). I just joined.

(Mike O'Connor): Oh hi, (Eric). We're working on next steps, which - and for now we're working off of the report document rather than the changes document. We'll come back to that in a bit. But I sort of wanted to take us to next steps at the beginning of this call, because we have (Greg) on the call and he has to drop off fairly early.

And so (Eric), are you able to use Adobe Connect, or are you strictly a telephone kind of guy today?

(Eric): I'm struggling to connect with Adobe Connect at this very moment.

(Mike O'Connor): Okay. Well if you can, that would be nifty. If you can't we'll just take your vote over the phone. And basically where we're at right now is the choice between - the choice on the next step, whether we should continue to focus on Fast-Flux or whether we should broaden the focus to the more general issue of fraud and abuse, of which Fast-Flux is but one technique.

And right now I'm not seeing much action in terms of voting, so I don't know...

(Eric): Okay. I'm not connected yet.

(Mike O'Connor): Okay.

Man: Okay, so again if you want to do the focus on Fast-Flux, you vote yes? Is that correct?

(Mike O'Connor): Yes. So if you want to focus on Fast-Flux -- approve I think is the term; let me look at the little option -- agree, yes. Agree if you want

Fast-Flux, disagree if you want broader. And go ahead and vote. I'm not seeing - and maybe - are people seeing votes show up? It may be that my connection's still (flawed)...

Man: Are we voting (unintelligible) the question or under the status - the (unintelligible)?

Man: Yes, what exactly is the question here? I'm sorry?

(Mike O'Connor): So the question is on...

Man: That's a fair question.

(Mike O'Connor): That is a fair question. If you go to six - Line 617 of the report...

Man: Six seventeen.

Man: ...draft.

Man: Of the - of (Marika)'s...

Man: (Unintelligible) (draft).

Man: ...Version 2?

(Mike O'Connor): No, this is the Fast-Flux initial report (EC80.PDF).

Man: (Unintelligible) I don't have that document handy, so...

(Mike O'Connor): Okay, well...

Man: (We're lost).

(Mike O'Connor): If you can find it you'll get less lost.

(George): That was the one September 2 I think.

Man: I'm looking.

(Mike O'Connor): It's on the Fast-Flux site.

Man: Okay.

(Mike O'Connor): It's the first draft under working group deliverables, Fast-Flux initial report number (ECE80.PDF).

Man: The line number? Sorry.

(Mike O'Connor): And the line number that we're working on is 619 through 628. It's basically the binary choice between - as to the focus of ongoing efforts -- whether we should (unintelligible) fairly narrowly focused on Fast-Flux or whether we should broaden the focus to include a wider range of issues.

Man: Okay. So...

Man: Hey (Mike) I've got a question. And that is, yes what if you'd like to go ahead and see this group focus on Fast-Flux, but you'd like to have some other group perhaps look at a broader range of issues. What would that go ahead and chalk out on on a vote?

(Rod Rasmussen): This is (Rod). Put me down for that one too.

(George): Doesn't (Mike Rodenbach) have an issues report before the council that somebody was going to be looking at the abuse policies of various registrar's registries?

Man: That's correct. That motion passed yesterday. The staff is working on initiated reports to be...

(Mike O'Connor): Well maybe that's where the other group comes in.

Man: Yes.

(Mike O'Connor): Did that work?

Man: This group should be focusing on its charter, not focusing on expanding its charter, although, you know, if you want to express that opinion that's fine, but council's still going to have to approve that.

(Eric): Thank you for your opinion, (Mike).

Man: (Unintelligible) next steps?

Man: Yes.

(Eric): (Unintelligible) might have (unintelligible) the question is that I don't know if we're talking about (unintelligible) mechanism.



(Mike O'Connor): Say that last little again. There was a big burst of static right when you were talking.

(Eric): Yes, the question about Fast-Flux only or other things, don't know if what we're actually making a choice between is expanding the scope of our inquiry into mechanisms or if we're expanding the scope of our inquiry following (unintelligible).

(Mike O'Connor): Oh that's a good question.

(Eric): I'm interested in the mechanism question. I'm not particularly interesting in the intent question.

(Mike O'Connor): Well one way to keep it simple would be to continue to limit the scope to Fast-Flux the mechanism.

(Eric): Yes, but see the problem there is that we've already determined the Fast-Flux the mechanism is just part of a larger set of mechanisms that share a common purpose.

(Mike O'Connor): Folks have a good idea on how to resolve all this?

Man: Maybe we need a round of people dropping more nuance statements.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes, that might be...

(Eric): (Unintelligible) fraud or any other sort of loosely defined more general notion of what the charter of the group is to investigate. It seems - that seems open ended, and we'll ultimately have more (teams), you know, for very small things.

But if we focus on mechanisms, then we can say, “Well,” you know, “Fast-Flux as presented as we’ve discussed at considerable length, is not one simple thing. It’s part of a larger set of mechanisms. And those are actually of interest in terms of policy development, with apologies to (Mike Rodenbach) for of course contradicting him.

(Mike Rodenbach): No apology necessary (Eric).

(Mike O'Connor): Well so it seems like we’re actually somewhat in agreement, but I’m not sure that we’ve got the right words on the page. Does somebody want to take a stab at saying in words what we’re leaning towards, and maybe somebody could capture them. (Marika), could you maybe be our scribe as we try to craft this?

(Marika): Yes, you would like me to do that on the notes board? Or actually I don’t...

(Mike O'Connor): Yes. Yes, can you do it on the notes board?

(Marika): I can’t write on the discretion notes board. I could write it on the chat.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes, why don’t you do it in the chat. Discussion note board seems to be something that only I can get at and I can’t today. I’ve got too many weird connecting going on. But do it in the chat. Somebody who’s good at blurting things out in words want to take a stab and what we’re really trying to get done instead of words in the report?

(Eric): (Unintelligible), (Mike). I’m still scrambling around trying to connect.

(Mike O'Connor): How about something like focus on Fast-Flux, which is a constellation of techniques that are used to harden malicious networks. (Does that) capture the thought that we were...

(Greg Aaron): This is (Greg). That might be overly broad, because some of those techniques used to harden malicious networks has nothing to do with Fast-Flux. Bullet proof hosting, for example is very different than what we're talking about.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes. True.

(Eric): Now it's the mechanism to achieve resiliency. It's the mechanism for optimizing a particular set of assets. It's true that's not everything is Fast-Flux. I think of bullet proof hosting as being more of legally (dependent) on an operation rather than a resiliency-basis detection resistance interference resistance (unintelligible) mechanism. And of course now (unintelligible) (intent back in there) rather than just sheer mechanism.

(Mike O'Connor): Oh I don't know. So where do we find ourselves? Maybe we're stuck. Maybe I'll...

(Dave): Hey (Mike)?

(Mike O'Connor): Yes.

(Dave): Can I suggest that maybe we were making such good progress going through the comments that were the main body of the document, that we go back to doing that and try to get to the point where we have a,

you know, a firmer idea of what it is that we're delivering in the interim report and then try to come back to these questions?

I think part of it is that it's very hard to visualize what questions we're asking at the moment and whether they're in the context of this working group right now, this working group after (Cairo) with additional (GNSO) guidance, a different working group or council - I mean I think that we all have a different perception of where - what the question is that we're trying to frame.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes, my worry is that we're going to run out of time. We might wind up in (Cairo) with no recommend on next steps, which (unintelligible).

(Dave): Well I guess I'd rather go to (Cairo) with, you know, a lot of useful information that, you know, the council could use perhaps to make recommendation, than to waffle on what the next steps are because we aren't decided and not have anything substantive to present.

(Mike O'Connor): That - I can buy that. It does seem like we're stuck on the next steps. So in terms of next steps, what -- should we kick off a discussion on email and see if we can come up with something for next week's call?

(Dave): I think that would work.

Man: Good idea.

(Mike O'Connor): Okay that's what we'll do. Because it is hard to craft these on the fly (I admit). All right, well in that case, then head back to the latest version that (Marika) could put together. Here we go. And that is also

out on the Fast-Flux website. And trying to figure out where we got. We got to - I think we got to Page 17.

(Dave): Yes. B3.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes, that's what I think. And - but we could just pick it up right there now if we do that - let me just look forward in the document. We have a lot of (these) to get through. Oh I don't know, what the heck. We'll just do our best. Let's start with B3.

Man: What page...

(Dave): Are we doing the voting that we did last week?

(Mike O'Connor): Yes we'll do the same deal on the voting that we did last week, and we'll carry on in our usual tradition. We'll let the submitter give us a very short introduction to what they were trying to accomplish, and then we'll go vote. So (Joe) I think you get the floor. Tell us what you're trying to do with B3.

Joe St. Sauver: Well in a nut shell I just wanted to make sure that we were explicit about some of the costs that were associated with this sort of identify theft - or phishing type crime that folks may be running into. So in addition to sort of direct losses that they may suffer, there may also be indirect costs and there may also be issues where people simply want an identify for the purpose of things like crossing national borders and so forth.

(Mike O'Connor): Okay. Discussion?

(Dave): I think it's a good point.

(Eric): I have no idea what the text is, because I still haven't managed to get in.

(George): Page 17 I think.

(Eric): That doesn't help me.

(Mike O'Connor): (Greg) do you have the latest version of the changes document from (Marika)? She emailed it to the list a couple of days ago?

(George): September 24.

Man: Oh...

Man: September 24.

(Eric): Okay, because I went (unintelligible) line by line a document that (Marika) sent.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes.

(Eric): They're all numbered from one - letter numbered. They were just roman numbers. There was no C3 or C4 or whatever it was that you were just going through.

Man: This is the green and red document.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes this is the one that's called Proposals list dash 18 September (unintelligible).PDF.

Man: Right.

(Mike O'Connor): And we're on Page 17 of that document.

Woman: It's also pasted on the wiki.

(Eric): Well that doesn't help me a bit.

(Mike O'Connor): He's another guy on vacation. My connectivity is better than his. Well hang in there, (Eric). I think we're going to churn ahead.

Man: By the way, we...

Man: People agree and disagree on this. So go ahead folks and use your little checkmark thing on Adobe Connect. (Greg) is needing to drop off. Thanks for joining us (Greg). See you next week.

(Greg Aaron): (Unintelligible). Thank you. See you all next week.

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Mike O'Connor): Okay, well I'm seeing votes come in. (Christian) are you pondering still?

(Christian Curtis): You know, I'm actually uncertain on how to represent my feelings on this - the material under this section in that I don't dispute that if

we're just categorizing a list of all the possible (arms) these things fall in, but I still have my objective to answering the questions at all.

(Mike O'Connor): I thought we were addressing that. Didn't we get language in somewhere to fix that up last time, (Christian)?

(Christian Curtis): You know, we haven't dealt with where that's going to go, but we - if - we had just slipped this into handling it in two separate parts.

(Mike O'Connor): Well I don't want to lose the points that you're raising for sure.

(Eric): Well he's not the only one who thinks that the questions are not proper - not useful to answer.

(Mike O'Connor): Right. And so - and my memory of - one of the things that you'll discover about me, if you haven't already, is that I have almost no short-term memory, and so as a result I can't remember how we resolved this last time.

(Mike Rodenbach): Well we really shouldn't be discussing this (unintelligible) questions. I mean obviously the council thought these questions were worth answering. That's our job -- to try to answer them.

(Eric): We're back on that, (Mike)?

(Mike Rodenbach): The few people don't want to answer the questions, then they should admit a statement to that effect and we'll get it in the report. Some of it let's not keep having that discussion with every question. It's just delaying.



(Eric): (Unintelligible).

(Dave): Well I make the observation that there are like eight people who say that, you know, that they agree with the statements, and we've got two expressions of, you know, that are contrary to that. And I think we just have to make note of that. We need...

(Mike O'Connor): Yes. Well and maybe what we do is we have a minority statement for this question that addresses that. Isn't that the way we did it? Didn't we say we were going to do a minority statement?

Man: Yes.

(Dave): Well I don't think we have to call it minority. We just have to say that there is, you know, an alternative expression, you know, and then you can - if it's necessary to include the account that's fine, but I don't think that we stop, because, you know, two out of ten people don't think we should answer the question. That's the only thing I'm concerned about. And, you know,...

(Christian Curtis): If I could chime in, I don't want to bog us down on this issue on each of these particular items. I just - I don't want to not vote no and fail to observe, you know, a minority position. I don't want to get the impression that I'm - that we're getting more of a consensus on the specifics than on the...

(Mike O'Connor): Right.

(Christian Curtis): ...answer on the whole.

(Mike Rodenbach): (This is Mike), I thought our goal here was to come (unintelligible) to consensus whether we agreed on these points or additions or whether there was support for them or whether there were alternative views?

(Mike O'Connor): Yes we had three layers. We had...

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Mike O'Connor): ...something in alternative.

(Mike Rodenbach): Yes, agreement, support, and alternative views. So here we clearly have agreement and...

(Mike O'Connor): Well no. It sounds like what we have here is support and an alternative view.

Man: Well we have...

(Dave): Yes (unintelligible) and alternative view. And I think that's the way we should record it.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes. I think that's where we're at.

(Eric): (Just) overlooked the fact that when there were more people active in these calls, we were more evenly divided on whether or not the questions were good questions.

(Dave): I don't think that that's - that you can make that statement, (Eric).

(Eric): Well I just did.

(Dave): I mean I don't think (unintelligible).

(Eric): The number of people who are active in this group has diminished in spite of the fact new people have joined.

(Mike O'Connor): Well and - (Eric), I think I'm going to push back a little bit. We actually - it's too bad you can't see the Adobe stuff, because we actually have...

(Eric): (Unintelligible).

(Mike O'Connor): ...a big, big active group. They're just quiet. But, you know, we, you know, we have folks in here participating through this other channel that you can't see, and that's part of the problem right now. So...

(Eric): (I'm happy) getting voted off the island.

(Mike O'Connor): (Unintelligible) off the island. It's just that you know, we do have...

(Mike Rodenbach): (Work to do).

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Mike O'Connor): ...in agreement here.

(Eric): I'm just concerned that we failed to represent the change in the group itself from a point where we were fairly clear that the (GNOC) had blown it in giving us the questions to a point where we are at present

where very few people who apparently held that view are still participating in the group.

(Dave): Well I don't think that that's the characterization that I would make from what we discussed earlier. I think what we said was that -- you know, and I think (Mike Rodenbach) said it repeatedly -- this is - these are the (type of) questions that we were asked to answer.

(Eric): Yes, I know (Mike)'s position. That doesn't make it correct (unintelligible) (Mike).

(Dave): Well I agree. Well I'm not certain - we're back to where we were before the last phone call.

Man: Right.

Man: Yes.

(Dave): It's frustrating that we cannot make progress because there is a perception because we're not obliged to make progress.

(Eric): Well I think it's frustrating. I'm not sure that's the only reason it's frustrating. But I appreciate that you're frustrated. I know I am.

(Mike O'Connor): That was a nice commentary.

(Eric): Yes, my associate just stepped in (unintelligible).

(Mike O'Connor): Oh okay. That was cool.

(Christian Curtis): Let me just chime in. For the purposes of these questions, I'm happy to address whether or not they fit or they're accurate (unintelligible) response. I don't want to be (waiving) the larger objection. I just - I don't want to be - I didn't want my checkmark to misrepresent my (unintelligible).

(Mike O'Connor): Yes. And I think that the way we come out of it is that we have an answer to the questions that has support, not agreement. Not 100%, not consistent, but support. And we have a minority view. And we need to craft a minority view that says essentially that some of us feel that these questions are inappropriate (unintelligible).

(Christian Curtis): Can we make sure though that the entire section is crafted as report so we don't have it simply being introduction and then it appears to be agreement on all these individual issues? I'm a little bit worried about the way this is broken up. I just want to make sure that the ultimate report makes it clear that the objective is to everything categorically, but...

(Mike O'Connor): Right.

(Mike Rodenbach): (Christian), you can make your objective however you want. Just submit it in writing. But let's stop delaying the rest of the group here. We're wasting a lot of people's time on this.

(Mike O'Connor): Taking a somewhat more positive view, I think (Christian) that, at least what I was envisioning was, that we would have an answer to this question that would essentially read as a single narrative that's comprised of all these little changes that we're making.

And then either before or after it, we would have a minority view that summarizes the objection. So it's not interspersed all the way through, but rather essentially reads as a single narrative and then has another statement.

(Mike Rodenbach): (Unintelligible) we just talked about that for ten minutes.

(Mike O'Connor): I'm trying to get, you know, we got to get this nailed down though, (Michael). That's part of what this is about. So I'm going to push back on you just a little bit here. This is about allowing everybody's opinion to be heard. So...

(Marika): This is (Marika). Maybe (Christian) if you can submit something to that end, I'm - will introduce it so it is in writing for the next call so we can discuss in more detail on, you know, what exactly you want to communicate to the group and then see indeed what the support is so it can be introduced and (unintelligible) alternative view - minority view of however the group deems to - deems appropriate to call it.

(Christian Curtis): Actually it's the last section of that document that I submitted earlier.

(Marika): Your - the statement, the chapter - the - would go to the annex -- you would like to see that...

(Christian Curtis): If you want, I can just pull out the relative parts and submit it...

(Marika): Yes. And if you can indicate then as well where you would like to see that in the document, I think that will help facilitate the discussion as well.

(Christian Curtis): Okay.

(Marika): Thanks.

(George): And (George) here. Can I ask a quick question?

(Mike O'Connor): Go ahead (George).

(George): Are there still 40 subscribers to the mailing list? Because I noticed in the list of working group members there are about 40 people. (There)'s about 10 or 11 on this call. I was just curious what happened to the other 28 that (Eric) was (unintelligible) mentioning.

(Mike O'Connor): Well we had...

(George): Are they still on the list or are they...

(Mike O'Connor): Well they - we have a lot of subscribers who actually have never participated...

(George): Right.

(Mike O'Connor): ...in calls. You know, their researchers or observers or..

(Liz Gaster): And this is (Liz). I mean I'd like to say that's unusual but it's really not. This is a topic of interest. And I'm sure many people sign on with the best of intentions or because they do want to just follow the activities. So I - in other working groups we find the same thing. I don't think that should discourage or delay anyone's progress.

(George): Are they still on the mailing list though?

(Liz Gaster): Yes, yes. They would still be on the mailing list.

(George): So we might hear from them later on then?

(Liz Gaster): Well yes, but I think - and that could always happen but, you know, recognizing that if, you know, they chime in on the last day, they may not have the opportunity to be heard at that point.

(George): Right.

(Liz Gaster): So they still...

(Mike O'Connor): Okay.

(Liz Gaster): ...(unintelligible).

(Mike O'Connor): I'm going to kind of push us along if I can here. I guess what I'm seeing is that this section as important but not total agreement, because presumably (Christian) and (Eric) would want to be on record as not agreeing. Correct?

Man: Correct.

(Mike O'Connor): Okay. Then I think we're going to call it that way. Call it support but not agreement and move on to the next. So everybody clear your little checkmarks, and we'll go on to B4.



Joe St. Sauver: How did the microphone thing get cleared? I've tried to clear that and is just stays there.

(Mike O'Connor): I've forgotten. Don't worry about it.

(George): Maybe go to meeting manage my settings and then...

(Eric): Since we're talking about it not working, I can't get a - the log-in request. You know, I'm (unintelligible) to work. That's not working.

(Mike O'Connor): Oh. You shouldn't need to a password to get into Adobe Connect. You should be logging in as a guess. And then (Glen) - okay, so onward. Onward, onward, onward. We're getting stuck here. (Joe), why don't you tell us about B4.

Joe St. Sauver: So, you know, B4 again is just trying to go ahead and just sort of capture the full scope of things that can happen if somebody has medically relevant information that's captured, you know, by the bad guys.

And essentially the point simply is, is in addition to blackmail or coercion, it can also be used for things like discrimination in employment. So if there's something like a latent condition that somebody has that no one knows that suddenly is discovered. But, you know, I'd hate to have this be a 20 minute discussion again, so it's a relatively minor point.

(Mike O'Connor): I guess the question I've got about a lot of these is, is this just, you know - again, is this Fast-Flux that's doing this or is this, you know, bad guys using all sorts of techniques -- phishing, fraud, whatever?

Joe St. Sauver: Well in a nut shell, remember this is sort of a reaction to, you know, some of the material that had been produced by other folks. And essentially it just sort of addresses the - what is the impact of the behavior on the individual I think for this one.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes, okay. (Eric) has raised his hand. (Eric) is in.

(Eric): About the...

Man: Yes.

(Eric): I don't disagree that this is bad. In fact, advertising firms actually do this, and there is a real likelihood that people do searches for things related to gallstones will eventually find that affects them in their work place, but that isn't about Fast-Flux. That's about some other bad behavior.

So - but I want to generalize and get to whether or not the laundry lists themselves are useful. And while I appreciate the intent, I don't think they are (to folks) out there.

(Mike O'Connor): So are we saying sure, go ahead?

(Eric): I would not add the material.

(Mike O'Connor): Okay.

(Dave): Can I - I'm struggling with this, because I'm thinking in terms of set theory. And saying that something is not appropriate for a subset of

activities when you agree that it's appropriate for a broader set of activities is sort of counter-intuitive to me.

(Eric): (Dave), are you going to teach me set theory?

(Dave): I'm not going to teach you set theory. I'm just asking you a question.

(Eric): What's the question?

(Dave): I mean if this - what we were trying to do here is enumerate harm and explain how the requirements are related to Fast-Flux and how Fast-Flux affects them. Doesn't mean that you can't do it elsewhere. You can do it in the brick and mortar world as well, can you not? So that doesn't mean it's wrong. It just means that this, you know, we're saying that one of the effects, one of the harms is, not the only way that this can happen is.

(George): Well I think (Eric) is trying to make the point that you could say that all the normal harms still exist, they're just perhaps made more resilient by Fast-Flux that it's - none of them are specific to Fast-Flux.

(Eric): Correct.

(George): So instead of writing ten paragraphs on harms on the internet, you know, you can refer to some external document.

(Eric): Correct.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes, and I am inclined that way as well. I mean that's where we got the phrase earlier.

(George): Maybe we can maybe lift a few of them, but (unintelligible) (fairly) have to enumerate them all.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes. These are, you know, that these could (unintelligible) represented...

(Eric): (Unintelligible) try to enumerate them all.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes.

(Eric): (Unintelligible) my dog license forgery.

(Rod Rasmussen): I think the argument is, is that Fast-Flux doesn't impact people, and that's why it's not an important issue and we shouldn't have to worry about it. Well it does impact folks in a lot of different ways, and I think that's what's important to go ahead and get out there.

(Eric): (Rod), it does not affect registries and their relationship and their contractual relationship with ICANN, their identity is registries. It doesn't affect registrars and their contractual identity as registrars, and it doesn't affect registrants and their contractual identity as registrants. It does harm to someone somewhere, but it doesn't harm specific categories of interest which we are...

(Dave): Well maybe that's one of the issues that have to be raised. Perhaps it should affect contractual relationships between registries and the ICANN registrars and ICANN registrants and (unintelligible). I don't know how...

(Eric): (Unintelligible).

(Dave): ...we could set up.

(Eric): ...but we're talking about the - you're making a claim that there's actual harm, and my point is that to some classes there is no harm.

(Rod Rasmussen): Remember this is a section talking about user impact, not registrar impact, not registry impact, but user impact.

(Eric): Yes, I'm aware of that.

(Mike Rodenbach): All right then.

(George): So are we maybe going back - deciding whether to take this all out or not or just say - or shorten it considerably? I mean that's a separate minority thing that we could vote on or something. I don't know.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes, I mean I like the idea of shortening this considerably so that we don't enumerate so many harms and make it seem as though Fast-Flux is the cause of all that. (This is)...

(Dave): Well, one of the things that Fast-Flux does is it makes these easier. It makes them persist longer. I mean yes, I mean I'm really struggling here with what I have to characterize as waffling, depending on, you know, on who's present. I mean we, you know, if we go back each time and revisit something, we're never going to make any progress.

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Dave): That serves one part of the, you know, the participants.

(Mike Rodenbach): Exactly. But having the same discussion over and over again.

(Mike O'Connor): We are not at consensus, that's all.

(Christian Curtis): Part of the issue is - here is that we have no outer limit as to how (unintelligible) something has to be connected to be included on the list. And so when we come to evaluating each of these items, we don't really have a basis by which to judge whether this particular item is relevant enough to be (unintelligible) or not. I mean obviously we're (unintelligible) in disagreement about where that limit should be.

Joe St. Sauver: Well look at the recent data we got from (RSA) They're indicating that 50% of all phish involves Fast-Flux. I mean that's about as mainstream a harm and as major an impact as you can go ahead and get.

(Mike O'Connor): I'm not sure that I'd go all the way to word harm (that).

Joe St. Sauver: You don't think phishing is harmful?

(Mike O'Connor): Well I had a little trouble with the (RSA) data, because I didn't know what the definition of Fast-Flux was used, you know, when they were identifying. This gets all the way back to the very early stages (unintelligible).

(Eric): (Who was it that asked the last question)? Who just asked you don't think phishing is harmful.

Joe St. Sauver: I was the one who asked is phishing not harmful that was Joe.

Man: Yes.

(Eric): That's who? I'm sorry, I didn't catch your name.

Man: (Joe).

Joe St. Sauver: Joe St. Sauver.

(Eric): (Joe), okay. Thank you.

Joe St. Sauver: And my assertion is, is that phishing would be considered a harmful thing by most folks (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

(Eric): This is about (unintelligible) not about what most folks consider harmful.

Joe St. Sauver: So it's in the sense that we've just seen data from(RSA) that says half of all phishing attacks are Fast-Flux enabled.

(Dave): (Eric) have you read the replacement text?

(Eric): (Dave), I'm struggling to get access to the net at this point. I'm using another method.

(Dave): Well I think one of the problems that (unintelligible)

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Dave): ...the replacement, you know, had attempted to make a clear distinction between your concern about Fast-Flux and being harmful or not. And there were two characterizations, one was a Fast-Flux attack, and another was a Fast-Flux that was used for beneficial purposes. And there was an enumeration or a characterization of the two in the replacement text.

So we're not - this is not a blanket condemnation of, you know, of Fast-Flux the technique. This is a - an attempt to identify when we have an attack that (you assess plus) characteristics, these are the harm.

(Eric): Thank you (Dave). I was aware that - of that.

(Dave): I'm not - I mean I - it just occurred to me that maybe you haven't - since you hadn't gotten through Adobe Connect you hadn't seen this. So...

(Dave): Thank you.

(Mike O'Connor): I'm (unintelligible) a loss of where to take us at this point, folks. Anybody got any good ideas?

(Eric): I don't thin we should enumerate the (endless list of harms). The catalog (of shifts) is not the best part of the odyssey. If we're going to deal with this, I hope we deal with the mechanism itself is a problem, not the things - all the things that it enables.



Joe St. Sauver: But keep in mind the question was how does this harm individual users. I mean that was one of the questions that was posed to us as part of our charter.

(Eric): And for the billions of individual users, that doesn't harm them at all, the ones who don't click on this stuff. It does harm those who do click on it.

(Dave): Well that's also true, you know, of people who are within, you know, within, you know, trajectory and bullet travel distance of someone who has a gun.

(Eric): (Unintelligible) doesn't wouldn't talk about first and second amendment stuff.

(Mike O'Connor): I'd like to...

((Crosstalk))

(Eric): Go ahead, (Mike).

(Mike O'Connor): I'd like to sort of regain control if I can. I'd like to hear from some people who have not spoken in the last 15 minutes as to where they think we're at and what we ought to do.

(Randy): It's (Randy). Can you hear me?

(Mike O'Connor): Yes.

(Randy): Okay. I didn't know whether I was on mute or not. We are looking at harm of the user, which Joe is saying there. But, you know, some of the things are very specific here. And I think we might be able to get by with this -- just saying this is just another way to enable harms to the user, and we can put a short list as for examples. But I'm not really sure. It seems a little bit - like we're having quite a bit of discussion about this, and kind of need to make a little bit more progress.

(Mike O'Connor): Anybody else who hasn't spoken want to chime in at this point?

(Rod Rasmussen): This is (Rod). The whole reason we're doing this is because this technique had been used extensively -- extensively -- to create harms against a lot of other people, including, I might add, registrants and registrars, because GoDaddy has been phished with that (twice), and those registrants have been affected by that.

So premise that this never affects registrars and registrants is incorrect. But beyond that, let's - I'm - what I want to get back to is why are we doing this.

(Eric): We differ.

(Rod Rasmussen): Why are we doing this? We're doing this -- at least in my opinion -- to try and get a handle on what's going on (unintelligible) and are there things that we can do to affect it from a policy perspective, maybe even from a technical perspective. I mean a laundry list of stuff, yes maybe that's not as effective as we might want to be, but the question was asked, what is the harm.

So people answered it, but there are some particular harms that are, you know, are almost exclusively being used in this (unintelligible) using this technique or being perpetrated in this manner right now. And that -those - these are focused right now on phishing and on malware distribution.

So I think that those things definitely need to be in this, and we need to be talking about those harms in particular, because those harms are costing lots of people lots of money and lots of time, et cetera. So that's - if we're going to concentrate on something, let's concentrate on that and then move on.

(Mike O'Connor): So let me rephrase what (Rod) said, and then I want to ask other quiet people to speak. Could we collapse the harm section to say Fast-Flux enables or answers the ability of people to do phishing and malware distribution and delete all the rest of the enumerated harms, which can be done all sorts of different ways? Is that what you're trying to get at, (Rod)?

(Rod Rasmussen): No, that's not really what I was trying to get at. What I was trying to get at was that, you know, Fast-Flux is being used to - as an enhancement, right? It's not the be all/end all. It's an enhancement for keeping these things up and running longer, and for making them more plausible and more resilient, okay?

(Mike O'Connor): Right.

(Rod Rasmussen): So all of the things that have been enumerated in some form or fashion have happened. I mean (unintelligible) schemes are doing all kinds of - there's lots of stuff used in this technique. The ones that are

catching everybody's attention and why people outside of the ICANN community are paying attention to it and want something to happen, and people within the community are paying attention to it, are in particular the phishing and the malware stuff, because it's so pervasive.

So when I'm looking at there is if you're going to talk about the harms, I would concentrate on the harms that people care about the most right now, because they're happening so much. And then you can reference the other stuff. I mean perhaps that's, you know, rather than saying - just getting rid of it.

And you don't have to enumerate it down to the nitty gritty detail, but I would certainly - these other things are happening too, but it's the - it's a matter of -- the word I'm looking for -- relative - not relevance -- relationship or prevalence. Not the word -- get the thesaurus out. You know what I mean.

(Mike O'Connor): Okay. Anybody else who...

Man: (Unintelligible) yet.

(Mike O'Connor): Anybody else who haven't spoken for the last 15 minutes want to chime in?

(Rod Rasmussen): Yes, this is (Rodney). This is (Rod). I guess my observation, you know, being one of the (unintelligible) sitting not he side of the (unintelligible) is almost feels like the difference between a dissertation and executive summary.

And I don't know how many people will go through the dissertation. Seems that we're spending hours talking about things that might happen, could it, you know, that happen in small numbers of cases. We're missing a larger point, which is that Fast-Flux is bad, it has an effect, and this is what we recommend to solve it.

(Mike O'Connor): Right. Okay. Anybody else who hasn't spoken? I'm kind of liking hearing the other voices. (Paul) you've been quiet.

(Paul Diaz): Hi (Mike). Yes I'm here, but I didn't actually back and forth on the call. I've missed big chunks. I'll have to take a pass.

(Mike O'Connor): Okay. Sorry I put you on the spot. People, I don't think that we're on the right track here. I don't know what the right track is, but I think we've got a problem with the process the way it's running with all these detailed changes. And...

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Mike O'Connor): ...could entertain proposals for a way to get to a draft other than this way.

Joe St. Sauver: Can I just jump in for a sec? You know, a lot of the detailed proposals with changes quote/unquote were originally just one item, and that's how I sort of originally set it up. And then folks said, "No, it's too big a single change." So then I took a bunch of time and broke them out in individual ones.

And, you know, one way or the other, I'd like to go ahead and just get through these and kind of up or down, vote them. And, you know, if we

need to do that offline via like SurveyMonkey, fine. But, you know, I kind of hate having spent all the time to just have them kind of get, you know, shoved aside again. Tried real hard to follow the process and now I'm hearing the process changing yet again. I just feel like that's kind of a fundamental unfairness.

(Mike O'Connor): I don't know that I'm trying to be unfair. I'm just sort of stumbling along following my nose here.

(Mike Rodenbach): I mean I really couldn't agree with (Joe) on this. I thought we had a process here going through (Marika)'s document, we're changing the text of the report. Why are we getting off track?

(Mike O'Connor): Well we haven't made a whole of progress today.

Man: That's true.

(Mike O'Connor): So I'm hunting for a way to make more progress. We're - the clock is sort of winding down (unintelligible) (Cairo).

Joe St. Sauver: We can go ahead and put them up on SurveyMonkey and just let folks vote them up or down? Hell, (unintelligible) whatever the result is at that point.

(Mike O'Connor): Ah, we have a young voice. (Eric), can you mute?

(Eric): I'll have to hang up.

(Mike O'Connor): Okay. I'm stuck, people. I don't know what to do.

(Marika): (Mike) this is (Marika). Would it make sense to actually have indeed this poll? And then might be some that have brought agreement and we don't need to have so much detailed discussion, and then discuss those issues where there's no agreement or where people really indicate I cannot agree with this or I want to introduce an alternative view? Would that maybe help the group forward on the next call?

(Mike O'Connor): We could certainly try that. The theme that's emerging a little bit is (Rod)'s point, and (Rodney)'s as well, that maybe what we need is a little less detail, and maybe to draw in (Eric)'s point as well. So let's focus a little bit more on Fast-Flux and a little bit less on sort of all of the harms that can be attributed to it, and make the point to the council yes there is something that we want to look at here without overwhelming them with this long list of things.

Is that a theme that summarizes where people are at? A sort of shorter version of this with perhaps a list of - that follows it of detailed examples? I don't know, something like that.

Joe St. Sauver: If you look at the initial questions, the tough thing is, is the initial questions ask who benefits and who's harmed. And I means that's really kind of the things that, you know - it's hard not to answer those by talking about harms.

(Mike O'Connor): Right. And the trouble is that it's very hard, you know, it's back to (unintelligible) issue we struggle with all the way along.

(Dave): Well actually it's not (Mike), because one of the things that's happened is that we've fallen back into using one term -- just flux -- and not qualifying it the way that we had carefully done last - the last call. And I

think that that's, you know, one of the big problems in trying to answer and satisfy the concerns that (Eric) and (Christian) and (Wendy) have expressed in the past that, you know, have constantly, you know, blown us, you know, blown us off course.

(Mike O'Connor): I'm not sure what to do about this. You know, I'm...

(Dave): Well I would like to see an effort to take the text that has been recommended and offer it up as a revision, because trying to find all these little bits and pieces without seeing the front matter to, you know, that proceeded this, appears to be a problem that's causing us, you know, causing us some difficulty.

I think that it's very hard for those who have not seen the entirety of the text as, you know, as I originally wrote it, as (Eric) - as (Joe) attempted to amplify it, may be one of the stumbling blocks.

(Mike O'Connor): So...

(Marika): I'm happy as well to introduce all the proposed changes in the original document as - with - using track changes so people can have a re-read for the next call and then maybe indeed be able put it better in compact. If that would help the group, I'm happy to do that.

Joe St. Sauver: What if we've got 30 things to get through and we only get through three a call, we're going to be doing this for an awfully long time. That's why I think we need something that's more systematic like the SurveyMonkey approach that (Mike) demoed.



(Mike O'Connor): Okay, so how about this -- (Marika), why don't you take a stab at incorporating all these changes. (Joe) and (Rod) and (Dave), why don't you take a stab at a summary that precedes this -- that sort of focuses people's attention on the real issues that we get this notion of an executive summary that we can insert...

(Dave): An executive summary for the report?

(Mike O'Connor): No, this is really just an executive summary of this answer, because this answer has gotten huge. It's got, you know, this long laundry list of harm, which it seems to me this laundry list ought to be headed by something that says these are example of the kinds of harms that enhanced by or made more robust by Fast-Flux.

(Dave): Okay. I'm happy to try that.

(Mike O'Connor): Why don't we take a stab at that and see if we can get something that we can do sort of an up or down vote on next time.

Joe St. Sauver: Does this imply we're going to continue to try and vote these one at a time as well, and assuming that we go ahead and participants the preparatory text?

(Mike O'Connor): No. I think what we would do is then just say that all of the details -- the big long list that we're grappling with right now -- would be listed as examples under the preparatory text. So the preparatory text would say in general -- and you know, I'm trying to reframe what (Rod) said, so (Rod) fix me if I get it wrong -- but in general, Fast-Flux enhances phishing and malware distribution.

(Dave): No that's not true. In general Fast-Flux attacks (unintelligible) and then we have a section subsequent that is down in the edits that say there are ways that - techniques that are, you know, that are described as Fast-Flux earlier are used in beneficial matters. And we have, you know, a list of (unintelligible) that that - ways that networks that try to be resilient, try to be adapted to failure, try to be highly, you know, available use Fast-Flux characteristics.

And so, again we have - I think that if - I'm hoping that if we have this all written out and someone gets a chance to read the entire section as we had agreed up to the front matter and, you know, and beyond last week, a lot of these concerns might be, you know, might be resolved, because I still think that there are people who are on the call who perceive that we're saying that all Fast-Flux is bad and all Fast-Flux results in, you know, in all these harmful, you know, you know, harmful consequences.

(Eric): (Unintelligible) you're missing the point. It's not about the distinction between good and bad. It's distinction between harm and not-harm.

(Dave): Right.

(Eric): (Unintelligible) unlikely example given by (Rod) or (Joe), whoever it was just a moment ago, that GoDaddy was harmed. GoDaddy was not harmed. Registrars are not harmed and their identity is (unintelligible). Registries are not harmed. I've (unintelligible) this over and over again.

(Dave): (Unintelligible).

(Eric): (Registrants) are not harmed by Fast-Flux. This isn't a mechanism that (unintelligible) domains by.

(Christian Curtis): How do you define harm in that case? I mean if you had to spend money and you lost domain registrations because of it, how would that not be harm?

(Mike Rodenbach): Or how are you not harmed having to answer additional (unintelligible) requests and...

(Eric): These (unintelligible) all exist. How much more is (unintelligible) by Fast-Flux (unintelligible) harm. Not that there is abuse (unintelligible) to deal with. But registrars don't lose their accreditation because of this.

(Dave): But that's not the only harm.

(Eric): I know it's not the only harm, but when we speak of harm to all, we should not overlook that some parties are not harmed in some particular relationships. And the relationship that registrars and registries and registrants to each other is not something to overlook.

Joe St. Sauver: But the registrars are covered in question number five. I think we're currently working on the one that's about the users, right, which is number six. Or number four and number six. Pardon me.

Man: (No).

(Dave): Well registrars and registries and registrants have a - certainly have a different risk model than users.

(Eric): It's not about our risk model. It's...

(Dave): (Unintelligible) risk model (unintelligible) harm. So there's different things that they're harmed by.

(Eric): Fundamentally it's (unintelligible) contractual relationship...

(Dave): Right.

(Eric): ...(unintelligible).

(Dave): Yes. But that really has nothing to do with the users. You know, registrars and registries have no contractual obligation to the user community.

(Eric): The point isn't just about this being registrars, registries, (unintelligible). It's almost all users are unaffected by this particular activity. Some few are affected, yes. And some of the (unintelligible) are quite (deal a) serious. It isn't all users. And certainly amongst the universe of users not affected, it's not registrants, registrars, registries, et cetera.

(Dave): Not everyone has cancer, yet cancer's a thing we spent a lot of time trying to combat.

(Eric): (Could we please) not analogize? Everyone's got an analogy.

(George): What I think he's trying to say is that for example a researcher activity trying to detect these things is affected directly because it's obviously an anti-detection method.

(Dave): What I'm trying to say is only - if only a few people are affected by something doesn't mean it's not important.

(Mike Rodenbach): Absolutely.

(Christian Curtis): And I would argue - also argue that everybody is affected by this, because the network operators are doing (unintelligible).

(Dave): And we also have no indication of some of the financial problems we're seeing right now are not related to phishing. You know, there's no evidence to support that it is, but, you know, we are having problems with the banking industry right now.

(Eric): If you want to make the case that WaMu was brought down by this, that's fine with me.

(Dave): I don't think I can, but it is kind of - crossed my mind a couple times.

(Mike O'Connor): Okay. So let's say we have a go at a new summary section - a new summary of this answer. Who did I name? I named (Rod, Dave, Joe). Did I throw you in there? I can't...

Joe St. Sauver: (Unintelligible) but quite frankly I'm not really willing to go ahead and devote yet more time to something that might just get blown off. I mean I've gone ahead and sent in stuff two or three times in a process that I thought we had agreement on, and I'm seeing basically not even the courtesy of a vote on it.

(Mike O'Connor): Well I think I'm open to suggestions.

(Mike Rodenbach): I agree with (Joe). I think there's no reason why this text should not get in the report if almost everybody in the group thinks it should.

Joe St. Sauver: And if there are folks who don't like it, I encourage them to go ahead and explain why as a - yes, a comment to it. And my one concern is we're just not making progress through the number of items we've got and yes, I think we need a different mechanism to do that.

(Mike O'Connor): All right. Well...

(Eric): It would have been nice if you'd thought of that before you submitted the laundry list of harms.

(Dave): But he was asked to submit the laundry list of harms.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes.

Joe St. Sauver: And for what it's worth, I think it's text that needs to be in there. He didn't submit it just for the heck of it.

(Eric): That's (unintelligible).

(Mike O'Connor): Well let's see, I can't do the SurveyMonkey thing for you, because I'm on the road. But I could show (Marika) how, and we could (transmogrify) just about this whole document that (Marika)'s got, into a huge SurveyMonkey poll, and let people crunch through it over the next week. Why don't we do that and see what kind of agreement we've got. Because I agree, there's no way we're going to get through this document at this pace in time for (Cairo).

And...

(Mike Rodenbach): It's striking how last week we got through so much, yet this week we get through nothing.

(Mike O'Connor): Well yes it is striking, but there you have it. It seems like that's the next thing to try. Does that suit people?

Man: I think that'd be great.

(Dave): Good work.

(Mike O'Connor): All right. That's what we'll do. I think maybe what we'll do is we'll end the call early except for me and (Marika). And (Marika) and I will sit and figure out how to get this thing put together, and we'll get it out to the list as soon as we can. Does - I think that's the next thing that does need to be done (with that) survey I guess. So with that, I'll give you 15 minutes free vacation except for (Marika).

(Eric): (Mike) what was the point of the document that was sent out a couple of days ago with the 40 or 50 or so questions on it?

(Mike O'Connor): Oh, that's the document that we're going to turn into a survey.

(Eric): Because I spent...

(Mike O'Connor): Yes, what we'll do is we'll put that to people to vote on, and we'll see what kind of support those various 40 or 50 changes to the report have, and we'll put the ones that have support in and we'll not put the ones that don't.

(Eric): Okay. You already have my response then for all of this -- all 50 or so of them.

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

(Eric): Okay.

(Mike O'Connor): But, you know, what we'll do is we'll probably ask you to pound them in again.

(Eric): That's not going to happen.

(Mike O'Connor): Why not? Any particular reason why you can't do that, (Eric)?

(Eric): (Time expression).

(Mike O'Connor): (Unintelligible).

(Eric): (Unintelligible) in email.

(Mike O'Connor): I know. But that just makes - well it makes a lot more work for (Eric) - for (Marika) to go through and (transmogrify) that. Oh well, whatever. Anyway, that's what we'll do next, and we'll convene again next week and see what we know. Anybody with parting comments before we wrap up the call? All right...

(Dave): Let's keep plugging on.

(Mike O'Connor): We'll keep plugging on. Okay people, see you in a week.



Man: (Unintelligible).

(Mike O'Connor): (Marika), please hang on to the phone.

(Marika): Okay.

(Eric): So can somebody send me a password?

(Mike O'Connor): What do you need a password for?

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Eric): I guess I don't need one then. That's fine.

(Mike O'Connor): No, there's no password protected stuff.

(Marika): (Eric) couldn't get into the Adobe Connect.

(Eric): Yes.

(Mike O'Connor): Fine, come in.

(Eric): Well I came in as a guest with...

(Mike O'Connor): Yes, well that's the way we're all in.

(Eric): Yes.

(Mike O'Connor): Everybody's in as a guest...

END