

**Fast Flux PDP WG Teleconference
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 29 April 2009 14:30 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Fast Flux PDP WG teleconference on Wednesday 29 April 2009, at 14:30 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-20090429.mp3>

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

Present for the teleconference:

James Bladel - GodaddyRRc - Working Group chair

Paul Diaz - Networksolutions RRc

Greg Aaron - Afilias Ryc

Observers - (no constituency affiliation)

Jose Nazario

Rod Rasmussen

Randall Vaughn

Martin Hall

Staff:

Marika Konings

Dave Piscitello

Glen de Saint Gery

Absent apologies:

Kal Feher - Registrar

Joe St. Sauver

Coordinator: This meeting is now being recorded. You may go ahead.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you, Operator. We have on the call James Bladel who is the Chair of this group, Rod Rasmussen, (Randall Vaughn), Paul Diaz, (Martin Hall), Jose Nazario, and Dave Piscitello and Marika Konings and myself from staff. Thank you.

James Bladel And we have...

Glen DeSaintgery: And we have apologies from Joe St. Sauver and Kal Feher And Kal has added that if there are any tasks to be distributed, he will be very

willing to take a task on because from next week he will be freer to do this.

James Bladel That is a dangerous statement to make, isn't it?

Glen DeSaintgery: It's very.

James Bladel No, we appreciate (Cal's) willingness to volunteer. Well, good morning, everyone. And I apologize that I am a little behind the eight ball today, as well as from a communication standpoint. I'm doing this over Skype so if there's audio problems at all, let me know and I will try to find an alternate means of connecting to the call.

There's been some good traffic on the list, but to get us started I wanted to go back to Marika's message from Wednesday the 22nd on our last call where she outlined several bullet points, action items that were take-aways from last week's call.

And we can use this somewhat as a jumping off point, as a pseudo agenda for this session. And keep us moving forward and keep us knocking items off of our list for next week. Does that sound appropriate or a solid approach for everyone?

Man: Yes.

James Bladel Okay, so starting off there with the first bullet point, (unintelligible) hosted a draft of a letter to relevant (IETS) directors on the list. And I saw that there were a couple of exchanges on the list relative to that.

So can we start there and then the group come to a consensus on what we want to include in that letter or if it's good to go as it currently stands? Any thoughts or comments on the letter or (Dave) is there anything that you'd like to add on that?

Dave Piscitello I think Greg has corrected my typed - my misinterpretation of the acronyms. So I can certainly correct that. If there's anything else, I'm happy to, you know, make adjustments.

James Bladel The only comment I had is just questioning whether it was appropriate for this letter to be coming from me directly or from the group as a whole or, you know, I'm happy to do that as well. I certainly don't want to seem like I am taking the credit for putting together this nice bit of work here, (Dave).

Dave Piscitello I think that you speak for, you know, you think on behalf of the working group. And that's the way that I usually write things for (C Proctor). And I, you know, I view your role pretty much the same. So unless there is some formality that Glen and Marika know, I have no problem with, you know, identifying you.

James Bladel Okay and I am willing to be the point of contact for those folks as well. I just wanted to make sure that - if I am speaking for the group I want to make sure that I have consensus on what we're asking them to provide.

Paul Diaz: (James), this is Paul. Can I have a question?

James Bladel Absolutely, Paul.

Paul Diaz: It's really for both you and (Dave). The question is just you asked for the comments to be returned by the 15th of May. Do you think that's realistic? I know there's been a lot of talk about banking holidays, holidays for folks outside the U.S., North America. I guess it's tomorrow.

And, you know, you're basically going to be giving them two weeks to respond. And when you consider how long we've gone through all this, is two weeks realistic for them to kind of chew on the questions we're putting in front of them and return a response or are we more likely to get a better response if you give them perhaps another week?

Dave Piscitello That's a good point, Paul. I think that Friday, we're into May already, correct? So perhaps even another week or perhaps even towards the last week of May would be more appropriate.

James Bladel Yes. I really just credit (Dave) because he may know that these folks are so expert that they may be very well aware and can dash out a response quickly. I just wouldn't want to almost paint them into a corner saying hey, can you do this in two weeks?

And they feel that maybe they want to contribute but at the same time that's just such a tight deadline for them if it's truly a question.

Paul Diaz: I guess I see one of two outcomes. It will be largely ignored, which is one outcome or we're going to get, you know, a flurry of comments, hopefully some of which will be productive.

You know the (IETS) is not much different than the ICANN community. You know, there are people who will jump at the opportunity to dance

on something and there are other people who will say, "I don't have time for it," no matter how much time we give them.

My concern is that something that Marika has to really, you know, feed into because should we get a lot of comments and we get them June 1, what's the likelihood of getting a final report by the 17th when we're - when many of us are heading to Sydney is very, very slim.

And I know that my writing assignments are just piling up and I'm certain that everyone else is as, you know, as overworked as I am. So, you know, it's kind of a practical thing. And it's not my decision.

James Bladel That's a good point. Paul, I think that you're absolutely correct. I think that perhaps we could stick with the 15th. And I think those folks who are interested but yet can't get something submitted by the 15th maybe we can reach out to them individually.

And see if we can somehow provide a little more time for them to respond without pushing the entire schedule back. But I don't know. Marika, I'm open to the 15th or maybe the 25th.

Marika Konings: Could we otherwise to say by the 15th or an indication by when you would be able to submit comments? So we do indicate to them that, you know, we are working under a tight deadline but we do leave the door open for them to suggest an alternative date in case they need more time to provide comments. Could it be an in-between approach?

James Bladel Yes, kind of like what we're doing for issues reports - that one issue report I think for (ROTPB).

Marika Konings: Yes, whether it is basically a deadline or an indication by when you're able to provide the report or in this case the comments. I think there might be a way to - because as they said, they might just, you know, ignore it. And then we don't get any response. But I don't think we need to deter them either by giving them such a strict deadline.

At least leave the door open like if they really want to comment to provide that opportunity to say okay, we need another two weeks or another week, something like that.

James Bladel Okay, so the way to modify that is one possible suggestion would be to change the last line to we request that you comment and then perhaps in parenthesis or indicate your intentions to respond and then by May 15, 2009. Is that appropriate? Maybe we can wordsmith that a little bit.

Paul Diaz: Sure, that will work, (James). I didn't want to open a can of worms here. I just - and I totally understand what (Dave) is saying. I'm kind of - am hoping you'll either get folks who are up on this issue quickly responding and silence will be taken as the silence, you know. And then the 15th deadline applies so that we can try to wrap this stuff up before Sydney.

James Bladel Absolutely. And I think you're right on the money, Paul, especially recognizing the public comments on other issues that are coming down the pipe, like (Dave), our writing assignments are piling up.

But I certainly don't want to build in an extra week automatically for folks who may have no intention of responding at all. So I think that Marika's suggestion is probably a good one.

So if we're satisfied with that as a group, we can move on to the next bullet point. I guess just to close on that. Marika how soon would you want me to then send that out? We can work offline then to actually implement that, sending that letter to the director.

Marika Konings: Okay.

James Bladel The next item was also assigned to (Dave). Dave's got the first three, which was to - relevant to the comment 1A made by (unintelligible). It was (R. Atkinson). And you had circulated something to the list. Is that correct, (Dave)?

Dave Piscitello Yes.

James Bladel Okay. Let me pull that back up. Okay so, you're going to have to bear with me here while I dig through some notes. This was a gentleman that was pointing to the use of short (TCLs) to facilitate mobile (DNS) services.

Dave Piscitello Correct.

James Bladel Okay, and this is for shipboard or aircraft Internet services and how they are - I'm assuming they're roaming from different non-terrestrial connection points. And what would you like to say to kick this off because this is new material that was not considered during the original working group.

Dave Piscitello Well what I did was I went through the interim report and I said if we're going to include something like this, you know, how many different places will be affected? And so my email identifies places in the

executive summary and sections of text that should be incorporated or authored.

And I've offered some of the, you know, some of the suggested replacement text but some of the other required enough words, you know, wordsmithing and, you know, creative writing that I decided I would pause and see if the working group was, you know, was satisfied with my approach before I dove in and worked with, you know, Marika to coordinate an update to, you know, the draft's final report.

So there's a - kind of a laundry list of items in an email I posted yesterday that I'm not certain we want to walk through but primarily what, you know, what we want to do is, I believe, is to expand on the positive applications of the Fast Flux techniques, which was one comment that (Ron) made.

And then one of the things that he and several others had mentioned was that we really didn't do a very good job of making the distinction between positive and malicious use of (fast books) clearer.

So some of the comments in this email address the sort of improving or tightening up of the wording that kind of evolved over time in the interim report, so that we actually used the term (volatile) networking, we use it consistently, we use the term Fast Flux attack consistently.

And then I think importantly we make clear that one reason why there is - we appear to abandon that terminology when we specifically address the comments from the GNSO Council or questions from the

GNSO Council is that we felt it was inappropriate for us to alter the questions that (it's) formulated, so we present them as formulated.

So there's a lot of little editing all throughout the document that kind of required to pull all that together. And begins on, you know, begins in the executive summary, Section 13. It carries through to bullet items under each instance where we talk about the charter questions.

It carries through in sections where we talk about who benefits from Fast Flux, so under each of the subordinate questions in the charter questions that are relevant. And then it sort of culminates in writing a more detailed explanation of, you know, what the mobile application is that, you know, that (Ron) introduces.

I think it's valuable for us to actually provide some of the citations that he provides in his comment. And I think if we do that, we probably, you know, address his comment, you know, to the extent it's appropriate. And we've also I think given a little bit more balance to the argument.

James Bladel Okay, so I am looking for that message. I did have this three-paragraph message that you provided on the 22nd but...

Dave Piscitello This one was dated April 28 at 8:52 am U.S. Eastern.

James Bladel Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Dave Piscitello ...helps. And it says the subject is accommodating (Ron Atkinson's) comments.

James Bladel Okay. The last one I have is processing (Ron Atkinson's) comments, so my apologies there. I guess the one - it seems that we have a couple of different ways we can handle this comment because there's a lot of good and substantive information (unintelligible) at least in my opinion, the scenario that wasn't fully explored during our deliberation.

And if we did explore it, we didn't flush it out possibly as well as it deserved. I think one approach, the simplest approach would be to simply acknowledge that, you know, in the document, to acknowledge that there are - there's this beneficial use that was not identified or explored during the original discussion and possibly do some intelligent deferments where we outline what it is and what it isn't.

And then possibly recommend in the future in the Next Steps section recommend future studies on that because I'm concerned that (unintelligible) a new path, that that's going to open up not only potential benefits but then potential ways that could also contribute to different problems and different parties that might be involved and compromising, you know, now we're talking about when we go back to compromised hosts, that there's such a thing as a compromised mobile host.

Dave Piscitello Absolutely.

James Bladel You know, so I'm afraid it might be just the tip of an iceberg or the tip of a spear that would open up a whole new section of the report. The second section would be - or the second attempt, sort of a middle ground, would be to find those areas about things like who benefits and legitimate uses.

And make sure that we mention mobile (DNS) applications in that section. And again, I'm just trying to strike the balance here between, you know, we certainly don't want to add another 60 pages to this thing but we also don't want to shortchange the subject. This is an excellent comment and its new information and it's something that we hadn't considered.

We want to do it justice but on the other hand, we also want to make sure it doesn't kind of overwhelm this report this late in the game. So what - just wanted to throw those benchmarks out to the group and see what we can arrive at. I think we have a couple of different options.

Dave Piscitello Just as a note (James), I actually don't see that this would result in, you know, dozens of pages.

James Bladel Okay.

Dave Piscitello My - I'm literally thinking that what we would do is, you know, is essentially plagiarize (Ron's), you know, (Ron's) comment and incorporate it. And it's, you know, I don't believe that it's more than, you know, a half a page. And it could be probably condensed into something that is sort of consistently detailed with the other examples of applications.

So my thinking was that we would simply incorporate this in the same, you know, the same degree of attention that we had with the other applications. Not that we would...

James Bladel Okay.

Dave Piscitello ...off into it, you know. So I think that's your alternative to, is what I had originally intended.

James Bladel Okay, that's fine. I was concerned that this would merit inclusion in essentially every aspect of our charter question. But you don't see that as necessarily being the case?

Dave Piscitello No, no, maybe I confused everyone. They're directly two questions that (Ron) asked. And one question that I was - that we just are, you know, I think coming to some agreement on is that when we incorporate the mobile application, we would do so consistent with the way we treated other applications.

The second issue that I said was sort of permeating this - the report was that we kind of, you know, the report evolved over a month as everyone knows. And there are places where having read it again trying to think about how to introduce (Ron's) first comment.

His second comment was we don't do a good job of distinguishing between malicious and beneficial uses. And part of that was because we didn't use the terminology consistently throughout.

So that comment is like, you know, a couple of words here and a couple of words there and maybe, you know, an introductory note before the charter questions are presented.

But I don't think again that that's going to make the report substantially longer. It's going to hopefully tighten up some presentation that isn't

quite as clear to people who didn't weather the entire six months of the working group.

James Bladel Okay. And I'm still looking for your message from the 28th. But did you just identify those insertion points? Or did you also have some...

Dave Piscitello Yes, I identified them...

James Bladel (On) proposed text?

Dave Piscitello Yes. And it's actually - Marika had sent out a draft final report and so there are page numbers and line numbers to help.

James Bladel Okay. And I see why I didn't have it there, (Dave), is that I filed it under the RAP working group thread, so the dangers of us participating in so many different groups.

Dave Piscitello Yes.

James Bladel Okay.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. What I can maybe do in between now and the next call because it might make it easier for people to review this text, actually insert (Dave's) suggestions in the draft final report so people can see as well, you know, which context is placed and the text around it is.

And I might be easier in that way to suggest further changes or, you know, make additional comments to do so. So I don't that - people will find that helpful to review these in that context or...

James Bladel I think so. Would they be just indicated as a comment or highlighted as an insertion?

Marika Konings: Yes, what I've done now is basically anything that's added is all in track changes. Anything that has changed from the initial report to now in this draft final report is all in track changes.

So that will give us an opportunity at a certain point in time to go through the different sections and, you know, like we did as well I think with the draft initial report to see, you know, section by section what has changed, whether people are happy with the change, whether, you know, they want to make further comments or provide additional draft and work on that basis might be the easiest.

James Bladel Okay. I would - I think that would be an excellent approach, Marika.

Dave Piscitello And I'll help, you know, Marika, just send me any questions and I'll prepare the sections now that I said I'd wait until we actually had, you know, had some closure. It's just a couple of paragraphs that I didn't write frankly because I'm writing a million other things.

Marika Konings: Okay, that would be great. And I think as well in the meantime, if anyone already had a chance to review it and wants to make comments, I mean, I think we can take that in the meantime as well on the mailing list and work in that way. Or I don't know if there's time on this call to discuss any of these items now.

Greg Aaron: Greg Aaron has joined.

James Bladel Hi, Greg.

Greg Aaron: Hi, did I miss anything?

James Bladel We're now down to the third item on our action list, which we're using as an agenda from April 22. Greg, you did comment on the - on (Dave's) response to (Ron Atkinson's) comments?

Greg Aaron: (Dave Discatello's) comments?

James Bladel Yes. I see your message here where you provided I think some information from the registry constituency input statements?

Greg Aaron: Yes with some technical information about (PTLs). And I think (Dave) was thinking about working that into text. He was working on it for that section, so I'll guess we'll hear back from him.

James Bladel Okay, did you have anything else to add to that comment, Greg?

Greg Aaron: No, thank you.

James Bladel Okay. Okay (unintelligible) somewhat dovetail into the next bullet point, which is the - to formulate a note on distinction between legitimate and illegitimate use. And circulating that to the mailing list, is that a separate message, (Dave) or was that part in parcel of the text for Mr. (Atkinson's) comments?

Dave Piscitello I think its part of what we're going to try to do, you know, with (Ron)'s comments. You know, as I said, it wasn't just (Ron) that made that observation. There were several people who felt, you know, we could do a better job.

So if everyone's comfortable, you know, Marika and I can try to, you know, include - incorporate that as we make the track changes and then, you know, we can discuss. But I think that's at least one of the, you know, one of the sections that I mentioned in the long message talks about this and about, you know, what wording we might be trying to use.

But it's not really, in my mind a change in substance or - it's a clarification that is probably, you know, overdue and we probably should have done a, you know, in hindsight, a little bit better job of tightening the language before we published it as an interim report. But that's why you have an interim report, so you can make these kinds of corrections.

James Bladel Absolutely. The next item was (unintelligible) communication between Marika and myself to reach out to (Casey Clappy). And get some of her thoughts on how to - or what might constitute a mechanism to separate legitimate and illegitimate use based on, I believe, purely technical means.

And Marika had sent me a letter and because I'm operating under the same schedule as most everyone else, I was just getting to it this morning. And I think its fine and we'll work with you (off list) Marika to get that sent out to Ms. (Clappy).

Marika Konings: Okay.

James Bladel The next item was - I think that was the Mr. (Woodcock's) comment, wasn't it - 2A?

Marika Konings: Correct. I incorporated a proposal in the draft text and circulated it as well on the mailing list. And I think Greg made a very good comment there. And I think Mike Rodenbaugh responded as well to maybe go back to him to get some further information on whether he has additional data to back up the (data searches) to decide whether the working group should incorporate it or incorporate it but without any official support.

Did I understand that correctly, Greg? There was a (single) point you were making that we need to see if there's more supporting data available to what his statements basically, no? Greg, are you still there?

James Bladel (Unintelligible) Greg and it looks like Mike responded that he agrees with (Greg's) option to - asking for additional information.

Greg Aaron: This is Greg. I'm back.

James Bladel Hi, Greg. So it looks you've laid out two options for us relative to comment to A. The first one is to essentially indicate that we're not taking a position on his comments or two ask him if - ask Mr. Woodcock if he can substantiate a little bit further with data and just demonstrate how this is - this issue affects the digital divide.

I think that as long as we're reaching out to (IETF) folks and (unintelligible) manager I think it's perfectly acceptable to reach out to Bill Woodcock as well and I had a couple of different communications with him in the past so I can take that as an action item, Marika, to reach out to Mr. Woodcock and ask him for additional information.

Marika Konings: Okay great.

Paul Diaz: (James) can I ask a question? It's Paul again.

James Bladel Yes of course.

Paul Diaz: I'm sorry, you know, I wound up missing up missing last week's call and so and I haven't listened to the MP3 so I'm not sure if you guys addressed it on the call but on the list there have been some discussion a ways back about some of the end results of this working group specifically in terms of will anything be posted or positions best practices versus requirements a mandate.

I'm just left wondering if you can bring me up to date or up to speed in terms of, you know, we're reaching out to folks and, you know, we are setting tight deadlines, you know, no more than two weeks to respond, et cetera. But it just seems like God, this thing is going on and on and on and I really am not sure.

I mean you look at how few of us are on the call now. You know the interest, there's clearly a perception at least it seems very clear to me that and this group is supposed to be wrapping up and, you know, for actions items or whatnot a lot of the, these things problems related to Fast Flux because Fast Flux in of itself was not the immediate problem.

A lot of time it was the uses it was going to be picked up in the RAP, the registration abuse policies and procedures working group.

I'm just wondering where are we now because, you know, if we're reaching it out to more people even if they're responsive and whatnot that means maybe two weeks from now we have additional calls, additional talks and we've invested a tremendous amount of time in this.

I'm sorry I'm just not feeling confident that, you know, that we're seeing the end of this, this thing wrapped up. And again, you know, I'm sorry if we did have a discussion but, you know, recommendations to reach out to ask more people to get more details.

Good Lord, you know, this has gone on so very long. Where does it end, where do we draw the line, say here it is and be done with this particular issue.

Greg Aaron: This is Greg. I mean, yes we could ask people like Mr. Woodcock for more information but frankly I don't know if it's going to contribute to the endpoint we're trying to get to.

In his case he's really talking about traffic created by (Botnet) and we can't do anything about mitigating (Botnet) and their spread and where those nodes that all around the world in the developing countries. I mean asking for more information in this particular case just kind of drags things out.

James Bladel Okay. Well I was operating under the premise that this one comment in particular was introducing something new and clearly we pretty much tore through category one, let me just say Paul I agree with you 100%. One of the reasons why I kind of jumped on the hand grenade here to some degree was to try and get this to an orderly conclusion.

And that's certainly what we should all be, you know, there should be a light at the end of that tunnel. I think I was concerned that there was some comments last week on the list that seemed to be very circular and they were reopening very old, very worn threads.

And, you know, some of those folks aren't on this call so I didn't necessarily want to dive into those or attempt to say that we resolved them but certainly we don't want to go down those paths again.

Paths about scope and paths about, you know, policy versus mandates and best practices (unintelligible). I think that a lot of us are in a like mind of that but I think that it's also important that we salvage the work that's been done to some degree so that it at least can be informative if not as a counterexample for future groups like the RAP.

Marika Konings: And (James) if I could maybe add to that, I think part of the work that we're doing now as well is to do justice to those people that have, you know, taken the time to provide comments.

We did get quite some comments so I think part of the process we're going through now is to really make sure that, you know, reviewed them, taken them into account, incorporated them where we feel appropriate and necessary.

And I think, you know, as pointed out in the email we still have that final step of looking at Chapter 7 and 8 like conclusions and, you know, any potential next steps because I do believe the council will or is expecting, you know a response from the working group on, you know, whatever the group can agree on what should be next steps.

Or, you know, if no next steps should be taken but should be a recommendation then as well. You know I think we do still have a bit of work ahead although, you know, I feel all your pain and, you know, I think everyone would like to wrap this up as soon as possible but I think we do need it due justice I guess.

James Bladel Yes and the last call that I think we had several folks say that, you know, that the group was kind of in it's spaces and not necessarily charging down the tracks for a couple of weeks there and the goal is to get this off of everyone's calendars just as quickly as possible so that we can move on.

But I don't want to shortchange the work that we've already done and shortchange the folks that have really provided some insightful comments. If nothing else, you know, (unintelligible) was that we capture those comments, categorize them put them in an appendix to the report and then start working on the last section.

And it was pretty clear that a lot of folks thought that was kind of a hasty approach on my part. And so, you know, Paul I think I'm with it, I'm with you there you know.

Paul Diaz: And (James) to be clear I certainly appreciate, you know, the role you have as a chair and I certainly appreciate the desire to, you know, fully address everybody's inputs. You know, it kind of makes me wonder for future efforts as part of the PDP working group, you know, are there ways that we can better reach out to folks so that we get these sustenance comments earlier in the process not at the eleventh hour.

And I'm not sure what the answer is but, you know, I appreciate I just, it seems like we keep setting out even more and more work for ourselves and I mean I'm looking at the calendar and God if, you know, some of these comments aren't going to come back until the 15th.

You know, the clock's ticking and a very, very short timeframe if the goal was to try and have this wrapped up by Sydney and if it's not and now we're into the summer and, you know, just where does it end. That's just a general question, where does it end.

James Bladel Can I - go ahead (Dave).

Dave Piscitello I think that what we're seeing here is very, very good illustration of why one might conclude that, that this is an area where policy, you know, would struggle to be agile enough to accommodate the shifting sands and the various concerns.

If you look at how we started and thinking about that Fast Flux was in effect back in, you know, now - you know, the end of 2007 and you look at how its evolved to the (unintelligible) model now and, you know, continues to evolve. We are playing a game of catch up.

And we always will be playing a game of catch up and I think that's something that we could acknowledge in the report without having to say, you know, we're going to do more study and we're going to look into how we could, you know, how TTOs are used here and how TTOs were used in this attack and how TTOs are used in this application.

I think that we can do justice to the comments by acknowledging that, those that can be contained, you know, within a reasonable timeframe.

And we have to let go in some respect that the notion that we're going to be able to answer all the questions of things like the digital divide and how about the (unintelligible) as Greg said.

But I really would, you know, I have to agree with Paul that it would be very problematic for us to try to, you know, draw this out beyond Sydney.

James Bladel The last council meeting prior to Sydney is May 28. So is that one month give or take from today. I think that either that meeting or the council workshop in Sydney, we should preparing our final report.

Does that sound like - I mean is there a consensus on the group that that's a hard stop for this issue. And I say that knowing that some of the folks who like it or not fully addressing these issues are not on the call today.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think it will definitely be doable as long as people are willing to take on the tasks and provide input or some comments to be integrated and especially provide suggestions or recommendations for those sections that, you know, still need further work like Chapter 7 and 8.

And there are as well there are two questions in the report that we have left to, you know, we'll address this question once we have further feedback. I mean it might be as simple as saying well, you know, we've discussed it and we don't feel we have enough information to answer this question or whatever.

But, you know, if we set ourselves a deadline I think we need as well the willingness from the members of the group to commit the time to get the work done.

James Bladel I agree and I'm also looking at Category 9 which is the number of comments. One other thing is that - and I wanted to thank everyone that's been working on the list but I think that the amount of substance that we address on the calls is - and we're way off the agenda by now folks.

I think that (Paul's) really kind of, you know, a much needed interjection there but one of the things we should probably see a lot more activity on the list and then the calls are used just more as a touch point to go over those things.

But we still tend to use the calls to discuss some of the substantive issues, not so much this call particularly but I think the last two weeks. We only have a few minutes left and I have some (unintelligible) Category 3 and I know Rod and (Dave) worked on Category 4.

If we're to make the cutoff there for Sydney that means that we need to be through with these comments here in about another week or two. Actually probably this time next week we need to be running through these comments. That will give us sufficient time to work on the last two sections of the report and do a final read through. Is that doable?

Dave Piscitello Speaking for the, from my writing assignments yes I intend to have my writing assignments done by next week so.

James Bladel Does that (unintelligible) Marika? I'm sure this isn't the only report you have on your to do list for Sydney.

Marika Konings: No it's not but, you know, people provide me the input, you know, it doesn't take me that much time to insert the right sections and, you know, run through it. So I think from a staff perspective we're able, you know, as long as the rest is able to keep up.

Glen DeSaintgery: Hi this is Glen. I've just seen this note from (unintelligible).

Marika Konings: That's another group Glen.

Glen DeSaintgery: Oh, sorry, sorry, sorry. (Unintelligible).

James Bladel That group shares a lot of the same membership as this one. Okay well what I recommend is I will post items for Category 3 on the list and then I will move on to it looks like Category 5 is the next. Rod and (Dave), if you guys would put your information on the list and then I would love to take volunteers to just read through Category 6.

And by the way when we're doing these assignments, what we're doing or at least what I'm doing is taking a look at the comments that were submitted, reading through them and trying to discern if there's any new information in those comments. If we feel that the concerns or points that are made are sufficiently addressed elsewhere in the report.

If they are I'm just putting a checkmark next to them and saying, you know, these folks have reached some of the same conclusions or at least identified some of the same issues that we have. And it's only in

those comments that introduce new information that we're setting aside for a little bit further discussion on the calls.

Marika Konings: (James), to add to that it might be helpful because, you know, we might want to add this document to categorization as an annex or maybe post some on the Fast Flux wiki.

If you see something like well we've addressed this on page number whatever, please add it so I incorporate it here so people can actually look back saying oh yes, my comment was actually addressed on Page 5, section whatever.

And if suggestions are made for incorporations in the tags it would help as well if people would the same thing. Would you please add this on Page 5, Line 200 or something like that.

James Bladel Or we can address the comment with just a few sentences here with some suggested text. Okay, so I would, you know, assuming I have three and five and (Dave) and Rod have Category 4, can we get enough volunteers on this call to push through seven and eight and then start to divvy up nine?

Paul Diaz: (James), I'll take seven and eight, its Paul.

James Bladel Okay.

Paul Diaz: Just a question for the group and particularly the work (Dave) has already done to the list, you know, in terms of tightening definitions and providing consistency throughout. If I move forward on the assumption

that we're going to incorporate all of (Dave's) changes, I think seven and eight are very, very easy to address.

But is that a fair assumption. I mean we start talking about it but I'm not sure we really reached a conclusion in terms of how to insert the recommended (Dave) had posted on the list.

James Bladel I believe we'll accept those changes but I don't know exactly what form it'll take at this point Paul.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

James Bladel Maybe we can make that our top priority for the list work and that will then feed those other categories. (Dave), Marika is that possible?

Dave Piscitello Sure.

James Bladel Okay, maybe we can work something out on that and then - and Paul just so you're aware, the comment reaching out to Bill Woodcock - I was going to try and get a response from him today, not get to him on May 15.

Paul Diaz: All the better buddy.

James Bladel You know and I think that, you know, if it's going to take more than a couple of days or more than something that he can provide or if he doesn't already have this information handy, then I think we should just acknowledge it and move on.

And I think that's kind of - that's going to have to be somewhat of the SOP for some of these comments that really have the potential to be studied in isolation on their own, the effect on the digital divide, et cetera. Great information very intriguing comments but not necessarily conducive to what the path for this group might be.

Dave Piscitello So (James) if I can paraphrase what you said because it sound like a really useful guideline for where we want to focus our efforts.

If there's something substantive that we've overlooked that would alter the recommendations or influence the recommendations that we would make to the council, we should, you know, we probably should burn some cycles on those.

If it's just more information or more data on things that we already know then, you know, that's just adding work and we should kind of set that aside and just, you know, there's only so much we can address in a document that's not going to become the size of an encyclopedia.

James Bladel (Dave), that's a - I think that's very well said, in fact (unintelligible) - well no, I think you phrased it much more succinctly and that then causes me to go back and take a look at the question for - that we had for Ms. (Clappy).

You know, we talked for weeks, if I recall, about whether or not it was technically possible to measure Fast Flux legitimate versus illegitimate and all the different scenarios that would create false-positives and I mean I feel like that horse has been beat to death and buried.

So do we want to acknowledge this comment here and then perhaps (unintelligible). You know, reach out to Ms. (Clappy) because that would just be additional work and cycles for her that maybe, you know, if her schedules anything like ours I'm sure that it might not necessarily be welcome.

Dave Piscitello I'd also like to add that working with (Casey) on (unintelligible), I know that particularly in her world, you know, what you work on is - it is prioritized by where funding comes from. So...

James Bladel Well then that's an easy decision because we're free, right?

Dave Piscitello Well, yes. I didn't want to be quite so blunt but yes - as to say that, but I know that, you know, it's a real, real struggle for (Casey) to, you know, to find time to do data analysis outside of funding and I don't want to speak for her, I just want to set our expectations that, you know, somewhat correctly.

James Bladel Well the final report is going to be open for comment at some point as well. Correct Marika?

Marika Konings: There's no I think official public comment foreseen in the bi-laws. Normally there's a public comment period after the council reviews it and, you know, and adopts recommendations and before it goes to the Board, I think.

James Bladel Okay.

Marika Konings: But - I mean, if the group would recommend a public comment period to address specific questions, that could be as well one of the recommendations if the group says (unintelligible).

James Bladel Oh no. No, (unintelligible) what I was recommending.

Marika Konings: Well but I mean as a next step to say well, you know, these are some areas that need more research or could be, you know, subject to further fact finding and public comments. But not as a, you know, not a (stage two disc) report, I mean.

James Bladel Well, what I was thinking was that, you know, for these folks that were asking for additional information - maybe the appropriate step is to ask them to (unintelligible) additional information and invite them to participate in that in between the council and board round of comments and acknowledge that we're expecting some additional substance from them. And that way we can keep this group focused.

Marika Konings: Just to note...

James Bladel Not send them up for - not send them on a wild goose chase, et cetera.

Marika Konings: Just a note, I think and, you know, I have to apologize there because I'm not that long ICANN yet to, you know, actually have gone through the stage of, you know, a final comment period, you know, in between the council and the Board.

But I think normally that comments specifically requested as well on the recommendations that the council has adopted. So there's not as

much on the whole report, but I think it's more related on the - related to the recommendations of the council adopt on the basis of the report.

James Bladel Okay. So on the resolution necessarily from the council.

Marika Konings: Yes, I think. I mean I would need to go back and double check that, but I believe that's the case.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...open again the final report and add stuff in. I think once final report is final, it's final and...

James Bladel I understood that, I just was hoping there was maybe some other avenue where they could - we could just invite them to send their input and then move on.

I think that we can, you know, I don't want to take too strong of an opinion here but I wanted put it out to the group. I think that the issue of examining technical means to determine whether or not Fast Flux is legitimate or illegitimate is an important but endless discussion.

I think that the discussion about the digital divide is interesting, intriguing, something we definitely did not consider. But I think it is - can take us in a similar type of a direction.

So I want to put it to the group without something as formal as voting, but I wanted to just kind of gauge the level of support. Do we want to reach out to the Woodcock or (Casey) or do we want to just

acknowledge their comments and thank them for introducing some interesting new tangents and then just leave it at that?

Greg Aaron: (James), how would we acknowledge comments? Would we still be communicating with the poster?

James Bladel I think we would acknowledge the comments in the report where we're discussing the comments as a whole.

Marika Konings: I think Greg made a good suggestion for the comment by Bill Woodcock just basically saying well, this was introduced, you know, the working group hasn't taken a position on it, but basically providing the information but not necessarily taking stance on the - on it.

James Bladel Right. So anyone? Paul, I think I kind of have an idea of which way you'd like to go.

Paul Diaz: Yes, I mean not to speak for the whole group but I think we can recognize and move on.

You know, if it's not something that's particularly within the mandate or if it's nice to know but takes us in a new direction what not, I think let's just, you know, kind of focus on those things that are really good, creative, constructive additions to the report that truly add some value, work those in, enter all the others. Thank people for the effort and just wrap it up.

James Bladel (Unintelligible). Well we're over our time, by the way, but we have assignments now for the list, three, myself, four Rod and (Dave), five, myself, seven and eight Paul.

And dependent upon some language from (Dave) and then why don't you go ahead and put me down for number six as well Marika. So I'd three, five and six (unintelligible) the list.

So when we reconvene, we should be able to discuss - we should have all those issues put to bed except for any discussions or any of them that merit further deliberation similar to the three that we've been discussing with (Casey) and (Woody's) comments.

And then we should be able to tackle Number 9 which is large. We're probably going to have to do it (unintelligible) for Number 9 and, you know, begin the process of putting a bow on this working group and finishing up the report. So that's the immediate (pass forward). Does anyone have anything else they want to add?

Paul Diaz: No, that sounds good.

James Bladel Okay. I was going to say silence or else Skype failed for me. So, okay well we'll adjourn for today. We certainly have a lot of takeaways and maybe we can - since we didn't have an assignment, maybe we can have (Cal) look at item - Category 6 Marika.

Marika Konings: Okay.

James Bladel Just because he volunteered. We could have given him Category 9 but that's kind of sadistic. There's almost 20 different sections in Category 9. So let's reach out to (Cal) on that and just see if he'll take Item 6 on the list. Thank you everyone and let's just keep it moving. The goal is to bring it to a close.

Paul Diaz: Sounds good. Thanks (James).

James Bladel All right. Thanks.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Thanks.

Coordinator: Thank you for participating in today's conference call. You may now
disconnect.

END