ICANN Transcription
Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group
Tuesday 06 May 2014 at 2000 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group call on the Tuesday 06 May 2014 at 20:00 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-dmpm-20140506-en.mp3

On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#may

Attendees:
Marinel Rosca - Individual
Jonathan Zuck - IPC
Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC
Nenad Orlic – ISPC
Graeme Bunton – RrSG
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC
Pam Little – RySG
Kayode Yussuf – IPC
Andrew Merriam – RySG
Olevie Kouame – NPOC
Tony Onorato – Individual
Janiver Ngnoulaye - Individual
Sonigitu Ekpe -NCUC
Caleb Kow - NCUC
Farhat Abbas - NCUC
Magaly Pazello – NCUC
Jeremy Beale - Independent

Apologies:
Mouhamet Diop - RrSG
Klaus Stoll – NPOC

ICANN staff:
Mary Wong
Amy Bivins
Berry Cobb
Steve Chan
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: At this time I need to remind all participants for today's conference call it will be recorded. Thank you, ma'am, you can start your conference at this time.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This the Data and Metrics for Policy Making Working Group on the 6th of May, 2014.

On the call today we have Sonigitu Ekpe, Marinel Rosca, Janiver Ngnoulaye, Pam Little, Tony Onorato, Graeme Bunton, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Andrew Merriam, Caleb Kow, Rudi Vansnick, Jonathan Zuck, Nenad Orlic and Olevie Kouami.

We have apologies from Mouhamet Diop. From staff we have Berry Cobb, Steve Chan, Mary Wong, Amy Bivins and myself, Terri Agnew.

I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you, Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck: Thank you. Hello, everyone, and welcome. We've got pretty good turnout today so that's exciting. Is there anything that we need to deal with in terms of statements of interests?

Berry Cobb: Jonathan, this is Berry. Just to point out to the group what you see in the AC room is our latest list of working group members. There are a few members that still haven't submitted their SOIs. The Secretariat team has sent out warning messages stating that if they aren't submitted by I think the end of this week that they'll be removed from the list so if you are one of those on the call and listening to this please be sure to try to get your SOI submitted.

Afterwards then we'll do a final list that we can post into our wiki space for members to reference. Of course it won't have any email addresses listed

there but it's always a useful reference especially understanding affiliation. Thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: That's right. Well let's - should we dive in? Berry - did everyone get the email from Berry that was a first cut at answering our template questions for Fast Flux? Did people get a chance to look at it? Does anybody have questions? Because I thought what I would do is just ask Berry to start off by giving a kind of an overview of that PDP and then we might walk through this document and see where we ended up and hopefully open that up for discussion. If anybody - does anybody have any questions before that?

All right, Berry, you want to take it away?

Berry Cobb: Will do. Thank you, Jonathan. This is Berry for the record. So basically what we have that you see before you here in the AC room today - I'll share the cleaner version in a moment but I just wanted to highlight to members this is, you know, our first take at trying to fill out the analysis form after reviewing this particular effort, Fast Flux, which began in 2008 and concluded in 2011.

I think, you know, initial takeaways, before we get into any details, is, you know, for our first version of the analysis document about what questions needed to be asked and the like seemed to be fairly accurate or, you know, good pointers to look for things in the particular work products of that working group. I think there was a little of redundancy in some of our questions and we can certainly refine that as we move through here.

But what I just wanted to highlight for you with this version basically myself and Andrew had also submitted some comments into this form and just wanted to highlight that we're utilizing Track Changes so if other members are interested in submitting any other comments or suggestions to this form please do send them in to the list and I can incorporate them into the master version similar to what you see here. And we'll be able to track as to who

suggested what particular comment and maintain the version control that way.

Typically what I do prior to a meeting and sending these documents out - and I do apologize for only getting this out yesterday instead of a couple of days to allow members to absorb this. But what I like to do is send a redline version so that members can see exactly who changed what or suggested what type of text and then I'll also include a clean version which is typically the version that we'll review through our conference call.

And I'll take notes as appropriate from there and then post the working group call then I'll send out a revised version that will reflect any changes from working group deliberations.

So that's basically all I'll point out to here other than I did add one additional row or section to the working group report which is basically kind of a - just final outcomes which basically relate specifically to the resolve or resolutions by the GNSO Council when they considered this issue.

Right, so now I'll bring up the clean version for us to review through. Right one. And I'm zooming in on this and now I'm giving members of the AC room - you have control to scroll through the document and zoom in or zoom out how you see fit. If it's not very legible to you then of course we can please reference what I sent out to the mailing list last night.

So Fast Flux Working Group, this working group was initiated by the GNSO Council back in March of 2008. And what sparked this particular effort was based on a report submitted by the SSAC, which was labeled SSAC 025. And normally I would have had that uploaded in here for us to review but there's really not much that we can change to the particular document but there are links within here if you want to see more details of that SSAC report.

And typically - and I won't be the best historian here, but typically when reports are sent out of SSAC they're sent broadly across the community and the various SOs and ACs will absorb those documents and deliberate as necessary based on the type of issue and its relevance to that particular SO and AC.

This particular timeframe in 2008, which is kind of just prior to when I even knew what ICANN was, there was a really big debate and discussion within the community about the various types of abuses that were occurring on the Internet. Fast Flux is just one component of that.

And in very, very simplified terms, and I'm nowhere near an expert on this issue of Fast Flux, but in short what the SSAC report determined is that there were legitimate and illegitimate uses of Fast Flux and Fast Flux meaning that a particular domain name that is registered goes through a very fast series of changes to its name servers.

The legitimate uses I won't get into the details but the illegitimate use was basically to mask where the name was being hosted and obviously mask the abuses that it was trying to distribute such as malware, botnets and et cetera.

So the SSAC built this report and they did a - in my view at least they did a very good job of describing what the problem meant for the community and certainly focused in on the overall abuse of this particular feature within the DNS.

Their essential outcome from the document is that more research into looking at this issue should be performed. And while this effects not only the generic space I believe it's also an issue for the country code space. But like I said, there was definitely a lot of dialogue during that time about overall abuses of Internet names and so the GNSO Council started to deliberate the issue.

Basically in the GNSO Council's discussion it was agreed by the councilors at that time that staff should dive into the issue a little bit more and thus initiated staff to create an issue report.

That issue report I believe was submitted to - out for public comment on around March of 2008. And shortly after that the Council...

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: Kayode, if that's you please make sure your phone is on mute or if not whoever please make sure your phone is on mute. So with that the issue report was submitted as well as public comments that were initiated.

One thing I neglected to look at was how many public comments were submitted. But basically the final issue report was then deliberated on by the Council. And I think there's a couple of takeaways at this point. Staff is usually - or is responsible for creating the issue report.

Then of course, you know, we incorporate any public comments to finalize that issue report. But one of the key takeaways out of an issue report is that there are a series of recommendations sometimes one, sometimes multiple depending on the particular topic, but they're recommendations that the GNSO Council and the GNSO should consider especially when making a determination to initiate a PDP or any kind of working group effort to further address that particular issue.

So I think what is of note of the SSAC report leading up to the issue report is that again I'll reiterate the SSAC report did a very good job of describing the problem but based on the contents of that SSAC report it didn't list out much data to help describe the extent of the problem. It was more a qualitative analysis than a quantitative analysis.

And I think that that would have had some of that data been included in the SSAC report that may have been much more informative to the GNSO Council when they determined to initiate a PDP.

What we - in terms of the issue report itself the - one of the main recommendations from staff is that additional metrics and due diligence were required on this particular - on this particular issue. So you'll notice in Row 2 about the second paragraph - I won't read through all of this - but essentially staff recommends that the GNSO sponsor additional fact-finding and research to develop any best practice guidelines concerning fast flux hosting, et cetera.

Of course making reference back to the SSAC 25 report and then making note that staff resources can be made available to the Council as they see necessary to explore this issue further.

Within the issue report itself, as you move down through some of the language in Row 2 they created also a series of questions that may have first started from the SSAC report but were incorporated into the issue report as to try to really get an extent or an understanding of the extent of this particular problem, you know, again outlining the legitimate versus illegitimate uses and trying to quantify the issue itself how community members are involved in this issue from registries to registrars to registrants, and what are the aspects, you know, who's really ultimately affected and what kind of enforcement mechanisms could be put in place to try to mitigate the particular abuse.

So ultimately what happened is I think even counter to the staff recommendation here of obtaining more data before forming the PDP, the GNSO Council did vote for approval to form the PDP which then started approximately in April.

And typically for our newcomers here on the working group, typically what happens is after the issue report is deliberated on by the Council they'll make

a determination to form a working group or a PDP or non-PDP after which there's basically a small team that is formed to help establish the charter of what the working group is supposed to accomplish and then once that charter is approved by the GNSO Council then the working group will form afterwards and begin to deliberate the issues in detail.

So on the 29th of May in 2008 the charter was developed and approved by the GNSO Council. And the bottom part of row 2 is an extract of the primary components of what was to be accomplished by the working group here.

And again it's really asking a series of questions that are trying to determine, you know, what's the extent of the issue and all of the questions that I had mentioned in my previous statements.

So moving on through down to the third row, and this is kind of where we get into some of the details about the data and metrics. You know, this was a working group, I think that they met weekly. As Andrew had pointed out there was definitely plenty of on-list, mailing list activity as well as weekly working group conference calls.

I think at that time there were - it looked as though there were even several Council members that were heavily involved in this effort as well. I think the real take away from the overall working group effort is that they still struggled trying to grasp the severity of the problem. And I think that that was more confounded by the fact that in terms of not knowing exactly where to get the data from to even try to make sense of how big the particular issue is.

But you'll notice in a couple of the annexes of the final report is that there are references to two studies that were initiated. And they were two separate research firms; one by Arbor and the other one from Karmasphere. Unfortunately the research conducted by Arbor, the link in the report was broken. And I tried Google searching to see where there were other details or

if I could find that report and I didn't succeed in trying to do that. I'm sorry, I didn't succeed in finding it.

However, the Karmasphere research did dive into some of the details within that particular annex of the issue. And I didn't try to become an export in analyzing the graphs but at least there was some data to try to make a reference to the issue being discussed.

But I think ultimately it still wasn't concrete enough for any particular kinds of consensus policy recommendations to be developed. And ultimately when we go through the resolutions of those recommendations they were really more on to the best practices side. And I think another aspect of the - I wouldn't call it confusion but trying to develop a fine line between what is a legitimate use versus a illegitimate use of fast flux was difficult and how can you distinguish between some of those was a factor as well.

Moving on to 3.1.1 that talks about some of the primary sources of data, again, you know, it was the SSAC report that kicked this off. There are the annexes about some fast flux metrics.

There was also, just like with any working group, as to which we'll even do eventually once we have more information about the issues we're trying to deliberate on, it's pretty much standard protocol that we reach out to all the SOs and ACs and ask their input on the types of issues that are being discussed as well as any other information that the working group is trying to help them understand the breadth of the issue and how it affects the different communities that are active here.

So I'll continue moving on down through Section 4 which again kind of - I think this is kind of where some of the redundancy comes into play with some of our questions. But I don't really find that too much of an issue at this point. It's better to have more than less.

But it does refer back to the charter and, you know, that staff have made the recommendation about trying to collect more data. The Council did make the determination that the working group should be there to guide staff to be able to collect more data but I don't think it was ultimately successful.

Then moving into Section 5, kind of starts to touch on the final report and some of the recommendations that were listed in there pretty much ending up with Row 7, which I think is - I think it's important for us to consider because while the resolutions and recommendations don't necessarily or are not necessarily directly aligned to metrics for understanding the problem.

I think one component that - when the working group deliberates these issues is, you know, this aspect of continuous improvement or hopefully what we'll start to understand after reviewing these previous efforts is there were certain recommendations made as a result of this effort.

Some of them did result in consensus policies. And I think beyond adjust the working group it might behoove us to also review that particular outcomes and measuring the effectiveness of those consensus policies.

Now I don't believe it'll be our duty to say yes or no, PEDNR did or didn't do what it was supposed to do but more in the abstract of was their data there or a framework in place to measure whether a particular consensus policy did what it did or didn't do.

So I'll wrap up here. I'm not going to read through all of the resolve statements and/or recommendations from the GNSO Council resolution. So this effort basically concluded at the top of 2011 so it was almost 3 years in the making to come to these set of recommendations.

Just at a high-level looking at the resolutions what - the maker of this particular resolution what they tried to accomplish is the first level of bullets, A-G, are the six recommendations that were extracted out of the final report.

And then there's a sub bullet for each one of those recommendations that talks about the possible implementation of those.

This resolution was unanimously adopted by the Council. And again for each one of them it has a particular note about what should be done to address this particular recommendation.

And so to close off this conversation there was another effort running in parallel to fast flux which is the Registration Abuse Policies Working Group, which is the working group that created the very working group we are working on now.

but the proposed implementation was actually referring a lot of the fast flux recommendations over to the RAPWG because their particular charter was much more focused about a series of abuses that are occurring in the generic namespace all the way from cyber squatting and some of the recommendations dealing with a review of the UDRP to defining what malware and botnets are.

The RAPWG did spend time trying to further define and discuss the area of fast flux based on some of the recommendations that came from that working group.

And so what I tried to provide for the working group members here is in the comments section to the right and basically the outcomes of the RAPWG as they related back to the recommendations that were created here for the fast flux.

And I think for the most part, you know, these were softer recommendations that, you know, the RAPWG should review and discuss this further. They weren't full tangible recommendations; go to X and come up with Y and see if there is any consensus policies.

I think ultimately what the outcome of the RAPWG was mostly recommendations towards best practices which of course are not policy-binding from a contractual standpoint so after which there were a series of resolutions statements or resolutions from the GNSO Council to address the recommendations out of the RAPWG.

So with that I've rambled for a good 20 minutes. Hopefully there are a few questions that I can try to answer and if not hopefully there is some dialogue or some suggestions about other sources of data that may have been useful for the working group there or any other ideas that the group has. And I'll stop there so Jonathan back to you. Thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: Sorry, I was on mute. Thanks, Berry. Thanks for that summary. So as taking a step back from the details of this though it can be said relatively un-categorically that the problem was never ultimately quantified nor do we know now whether or not the situation is any better or any worse. Does that make sense, Berry?

Berry Cobb: Yes. In fact I should have mentioned this but, you know, since the conclusion of the RAPWG I haven't seen or heard that community and discuss this issue any further nor have I - I don't recall it in any of the future SSAC reports. Cheryl raised her hands so maybe she has more information.

Jonathan Zuck: Cheryl, go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks. Thanks. Cheryl for the record. If memory serves one of the things that damped down the issue of fast flux was action taken by a couple of industry players and led by one in particular which happened, I think if memory serves properly, with PIR Registry. And that was shifting a monetary mechanism which basically made the ability for black hat-wearing players, those that we do - were likely to be doing bad things with fast flux because fast flux can be used for good or ill, and making it financially less attractive to refer it to be used for nefarious means.

And so I guess by putting that on the table what I wanted to raise is a caution as we look at measuring success of outcomes because whilst there - with their nexus, so an interface, between the community and ICANN getting engaged and interested and looking at fast flux and Spamhaus and various other people focusing on it, it wasn't necessarily the recommendations of the working group that may have made the most significant difference to it being still a problem.

What, however, did happen was because the working group and the community were looking at things pressures were brought to bear and other sectors into the calculations and they were meaningfully - serious money was likely to be lost by people who only wanted to use it for ill.

And I think we just need to be cautious about how we measure outcomes as well. And of course you also need to make a value judgment then on does it matter whether a success, in inverted commas, is directly aligned in a one to one ratio or tangentially affected by recommendations or actions of the working group. Thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: Thanks, Cheryl. I guess before we go to you, Berry, I'm interested in following up with your point that there might have been some unrelated response that was motivated by the working group and so the actions of the working group may not have led to a result but the actions motivated by the working group may have had a result by changing the financial incentives.

I guess again though we're still facing the issue that if we didn't quantify the problem that even now we don't know whether or not...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We can't measure...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: ...those things were effective. I'm sorry, what?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, we can't measure. All you can look at is the things like how many names are dropped and picked up in what sort of refractory period and things like that. So, you know, it's - it's, yeah, it's a good reason why proper metrics should be at least established; they may not be the only metrics you end up using but you do need to have an establishment of some metrics as early in the process as possible. And hopefully even some standardized stuff.

I know, Jonathan, you'll think that's a good thing but everyone else needs to understand that as well. Thanks.

Jonathan Zuck: Well no but it's beyond that; it's also a commitment to go back and look later to see whether or not - whether the recommendations of the working group or, as you say, other things that people might point to that have happened since, have addressed the problem. Because right now we could be assuming the problem was addressed by changes in the financial incentives but we don't really know.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Jonathan Zuck: Right? I mean, I guess that's - so there's two parts. One is about getting a baseline and the other is about making a commitment to double back. Berry, go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Jonathan. This is Berry. Yeah, just to piggyback on, you know, your point, Jonathan, and I guess really even more specifically from a GNSO nerds perspective of curiosity if PIR, not to mention any specific names here, but if they were the ones that did shift the monetary mechanism to make this a less attractive abuse I am curious, did it become a best practice across all the registries or most of them?

And I don't know how we go about answering that question. And it's really not the remit of this working group. But, you know, it is interesting that after 2012, end of 2011, I've never heard of the issue again. We still hear about malware and botnets and those kinds of things but we definitely don't hear it in reference to fast flux.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Berry, Cheryl here. What I will do is - I think we can go back into PIR's world but that's more to satisfy curiosity than anything else. The facts I guess - it's not so much establishing the facts it's establishing the fact that sometimes satellite activities happen around working groups which have tangible and either positive or negative results. And we need to be open to measuring those in some way shape or form.

Jonathan Zuck: Which is an important point for sure. I mean, so that would suggest looking at those elements as well but also trying to determine whether or not the overall problem that was identified in the initial issue report has been mitigated by...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: ...by anything, right, I guess.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Berry, if you want to dig down into it in super-nerd mode you probably should look at PIR's restock fee.

Berry Cobb: I'm sorry, their what fee?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Restock.

Berry Cobb: Oh restock, okay. Yeah, I'll - I'm kind of curious, again, from the nerd perspective. And if I do find anything I'll share it with the list but again it's not necessarily our scope to make that determination.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Berry Cobb: And so I think personally, Jonathan, you pretty much summarized the entire aspect to this is that, you know, we need to quantify the issue up front and then your specific key word is to make the commitment to circle back and to measure the effectiveness of those outcomes.

Jonathan Zuck: Other people have comments or questions about this report or its implications? I mean, I guess I find myself most focused on 3.1.1 which is that it feels like, you know, that line from Casablanca of round up the usual suspects in many respects more so than a kind of rigorous attempt to quantify the problem.

Olevie, are you having trouble speaking?

Olevie Kouami: (Unintelligible).

Jonathan Zuck: Okay. And you want to go ahead?

Olevie Kouami: Yes.

Jonathan Zuck: And then Tony.

Olevie Kouami: (Unintelligible) the issue about the (unintelligible) so there is no any data (unintelligible) where we are now (unintelligible).

Jonathan Zuck: And that's a good question. I think - what we're doing is going through these various case that I to see - and like this one this is somewhat old. It's really to see whether or not this is an example where the collection of baseline information would have been helpful in identifying the scope of the problem, and the severity of the problems and also give us a means to measure the success of any recommendations that are made.

So our job isn't to judge this as much as to use it as an example of how we might do things differently going forward. So right now I don't think that we are in a position to go out and do the research on fast flux it's more a question of whether or not this is a good example of an area in which a more rigorous application of data would have been beneficial. Does that make sense?

Olevie Kouami: Yes, yes, I'm (unintelligible) now thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay. Tony, do you want to go ahead?

Tony Onorato: Yeah, hi Jonathan. I'm just wondering - this is Tony Onorato for the record. I'm wondering if we can get a little bit more insight if you know into how the polling mechanism worked, how that data was collected, that reference for example, in 3.1.1 from the various ICANN constituency groups.

I thought, in looking at the report, that some of the questions bearing on, for example, how many registrars were affected and how they might be affected seemed to be something that was easily translatable into kind of a quote polling device. Can you guys talk a little bit about how that data was collected; to the mechanism for doing that, how broadly the questioning vehicle goes out so on and so forth? Does that make sense?

Berry Cobb: Jonathan, you're on mute if...

Jonathan Zuck: Oh I guess I'm on mute. Berry, do you want to go ahead?

Berry Cobb: Yeah, I think I can at least answer the second part and maybe the first part of your question, Tony. The first part about the breadth of the questions that go out certainly the request for information across the SOs and ACs is, you know, limited to pretty much the ICANN community.

You know, I guess in some ways that could tie in to some of the MSI recommendations, the Multistakeholder Innovation group that was put together about trying to crowd source some of these issues and that's certainly in our remit to kind of take a look at some of those as possible options for the working group.

But I do believe at this particular time the breadth was probably as far as the ICANN community. Now there were two research reports - for the second half of your question - there were two research reports in the annex of this but it wasn't clear to me how those came to light; I'm not sure - I probably have to go try to talk to some of the veterans that were around at this time to understand how that made its way into the report unless somebody else read it and caught it and I didn't.

But so I'm not sure if staff asked for the research to be done or if it was these entities that existed out there that were just taking that particular topic on task themselves and caught wind of the particular effort and the issues being discussed with fast flux. But good questions.

Jonathan Zuck: Rudi, go ahead.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes thank you, Jonathan. One of the concerns that I have, and having an experience now with a working group and PDP working group that has been re-chartered, is the complexity if you have a working groups being re-chartered you have to go back to the initial working group to try to understand why that one didn't get the results as required.

And at the end you have to find the balance between the previous ones and the new ones. So I think that's something we have to keep in the back of our minds to figure out how to get the right matrix out of these situations.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes, so, I mean, if we're talking about re-chartering the working group necessarily unless it was found that the proposals made by that working

group didn't lead to the results that they believed it would. So, I mean, I think that's the environment that might exist with more data is to understand whether or not the recommendations worked or if the problem was still a problem. So, I mean, that's - so again we're not talking specifically about fast flux now or re-chartering it but trying to create that baseline going forward.

Tony, go ahead.

Tony Onorato: Yeah, thanks Jonathan. It's Tony Onorato again. Thanks, Berry, for that last answer. I wanted to ask a follow-up on that which is do we have access to - or can we get a sample of what that, for lack of a better word, questionnaire, looked like to that constituency groups?

And the reason I'm going at this is I think the mechanism for gathering the data is almost as important, if not as important in some ways, as the questions asked, as the data sought with an insufficient vehicle for asking that constituency groups, for example, for this kind of data, you know, the fight is almost lost at the outset.

So I guess what I'm thinking is I'm wondering whether or not part of our - and I don't know how much this falls in our remit so I'm just sort of throwing this out there - how much of what we need to do or whether or not we need to have sort of a subgroup thinking about the most efficient ways in which to disseminate these sorts of questionnaires to the ICANN community or subsets of the ICANN community; say the registrars, for example, so that we can guarantee that we're going to get sufficient feedback in numbers and in diversity.

You know, I don't think we're looking for statistical significance in the responses but, you know, I think that your data is only as good as the sources it comes from and I wonder how much we're tasked with and or thinking about taking the vehicles that we're using, the path, the type of questionnaire or something, and improving on that.

So I don't know, that's kind of a long question but I solicit your alls thoughts on that.

Jonathan Zuck: Well, Tony, thanks for your question. I'll take that chair's prerogative to say that I think it's squarely within our remit to explore those kinds of questions as well. I mean, I think in many instances it might be a two-part process to talk to the community about potential sources of data some of which they may have or believe that others have and some of which are internal to the community and to some that are external to the community.

And then it would be a phase 2, if you will, to go out and try and tap those sources of data. So I think there's a kind of informal poll that happens initially about where might we look for answers to these questions and then the second place would be to actually try to go out and search for the answers. And I definitely think that's what we ought to be exploring.

Berry, go ahead.

Tony Onorato: Yeah, okay.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Jonathan. This is Berry. So yes, Question A, Tony, is there is a copy of the questionnaire and the feedback from the SOs and ACs. And I believe that is Annex 1 and 2 of the report.

Tony Onorato: Okay.

Berry Cobb: The caveat there - and guilty as charged, I didn't read through all of the responses in detail because there's quite a bit there. I think that I, you know, in regards to at least this particular issue is it's much more technical and, you know, probably much more within, you know, caters to the audience of registries and registrars better dealing with this on the backend.

You know, clearly there is some input from the non-technical community to understand these impacts. So I think that was may be the kind of one barrier.

Secondarily the SO AC questionnaire requests for input was again much more qualitative than quantitative in terms of that kind of feedback. And then definitely agree with Jonathan's response, you know, I do believe it's in our remit to at least ask those questions and put the liberation to it.

And if a particular recommendation services that still remains in our scope than guess it's definitely in our remit.

Tony Onorato: Well this is Tony. Thanks for that Berry. Thanks for that Jonathan. I guess I'm sort of thinking ahead more than I'm really thinking about the fast flux scenario to how it is we can maximize the dissemination. So I agree it's a to face thing, identifying potential sources and then circulating to those sources the most accessible vehicle, the most likely to be responded to vehicle.

So I guess really I'm thinking ahead as much as anything else about the best ways to maximize response rates and ascends from the relevant communities. But that's very helpful, I appreciate that. I just want to think further I think that that is obviously an important part of what we're doing is trying to create the greatest efficiencies in disseminating our questions to the relevant community. So thanks for that.

Jonathan Zuck: Tony, it's Jonathan. Would you be interested in taking a closer look at this particular that the questionnaire side to that thinking of it as the qualitative phase 1 if you will of data collection in which we are in fact, amongst other things, seeking potential sources of data and see whether or not the questions looked appropriate for trying to elicit that type of feedback?

Again I think the idea would be that somebody would come back and say you know who collects data like this is Spamhaus. Oh, good. And then the second

phase is do we have money to go by the data from Spamhaus for example, right?

So, I mean, I think that first phase, which is what this 3.1.1 really refers to is just going out and asking the usual suspects within the community what do you guys think and can you think of areas where data would be available. And it could very well be that they weren't sufficiently data centric questions that were being asked in the qualitative phase. Is that interesting to you?

Tony Onorato: Right. Yeah, I mean, I'd be happy to look at that. I guess the predicate question really is are the usual suspects - is that too restrictive? Is there a way to elicit responses from a group beyond just the usual suspects for our we necessarily reliant on the usual suspects because they're the ones paying attention basically to these sorts of ICANN initiatives.

You know, the concern as we get down the road it seems to me, and we're looking for potentially more and more precise bits of data or something that is a bit unique that by going to the usual suspects obviously were missing out on opportunities maybe asking as all these new entities crop up in and around the industry and their crunching numbers and data differently how are we able to enlarge the pool of people we might be asking of in phase 1.

So - well that's a question I think we should take up as part of that. But, yeah, I can certainly...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: For sure. And I guess - and this is Jonathan again for the record. I guess, Tony, that we need to look at it holistically and polling the usual suspects is only one part of the process. The staff to do initial research about potential sources of data.

Tony Onorato: Sure.

Jonathan Zuck: And the group itself may when they get unsatisfactory responses decide to do their own research on potential sources of data. So there's probably three different groups if you will looking into what potential sources of data might be.

And then the next thing would be trying to acquire that data, right, which is a separate process...

Tony Onorato: Right.

Jonathan Zuck: ...altogether. So I do think it makes sense to look at the polling of usual suspects in the context of that will always be done; what is the best most efficient way for us to do it? Berry, did you want to answer that as well?

Berry Cobb: Yes, just real quickly and I see we only have five minutes left. Again as I mentioned in the chat, and I'll restate it here, you know, I think in terms of what Tony is bringing up does directly correlate with several recommendations of the Multistakeholder Innovation Panel that was put together.

So I will take the action to send the out from that group for the working group to review. I'll warn you upfront that it is a landslide of information a lot of which I still haven't even got through. But there are some intriguing recommendations from them in terms of taking a problem very much like this and looking at options to crowd source the issue to collect particular data.

And so, you know, I think that there is an opportunity to perhaps leverage some of that. And certainly the Council is deliberating the outcome of that MSI group as well as to how, you know, because a lot of it does directly correlate with our policy development processes so I'll send that out to the list.

And, you know, we won't have any near-term kind of deadline to have it all read by but it makes for a great bedtime reading stories.

Jonathan Zuck: Cheryl, did you have a comment?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. I did have my hand up; I am away from the AC room. I'm worrying about Berry and his bedtime reading now. I just wanted to be absolutely supportive of what Tony - we're Tony was heading. But I also wanted to suggest, and I'm glad I'm (unintelligible) after Berry, the crowd sourcing and looking beyond the usual suspects is important so some open ended or very inclusive analysis questions are probably going to be useful to build into future modeling.

And let me give you an example on something that would be difficult to measure but probably, because of lack of data, but probably could be sourced externally and that is if we look at the changes over the same period of time as fast flux was a major issue so circa 2006, '07 through to '12 where it doesn't seem to be as much of an issue, and that's the change in the banking industry on mechanisms to avoid credit card fraud because of credit card fraud was one of the primary sources of paying for your name to then exploit fast flux for malicious, you know, malicious purposes.

So we'd have to very much look away from the usual suspects to pick up that data. So it's kind of like our data doesn't exist but data itself exists in parallel will probably have a direct affect on the outcome. Thanks.

Jonathan Zuck: Good point. Anybody else want to speak up at this point? Berry is your hand still up or up again?

Berry Cobb: This is a new one since we only have one minute left.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay go ahead.

Berry Cobb: So if you don't mind me taking over for just the second? So if working group members have additional input regarding the fast flux issue please send it to me and I'll be sure to incorporate it into this document but I think we'll close the conversation on that one.

What you'll see in the AC room is our next homework assignment which is the post expiration domain name recovery PDP. This one will be a little bit more intriguing. It lasted - it almost ran in parallel to fast flux. It was a true PDP and it did have consensus policy recommendations that were implemented by staff and out to the contracted parties and became, you know, new language within the contract.

So this one will probably be a little bit more intense than the fast flux version that we had. And I'm also more familiar with the key players of that group as well and so is - after our initial review we find it necessary to maybe invite Alan, who was the former chair of that working group, or any of the other members we can certainly give that a try as well as long as we are prepared to ask some - the appropriate questions.

So I have the action to send the new PEDNR assignment out to the list and I'll make sure that data gets out so that we can review it at our next meeting.

Jonathan Zuck: Thanks, Berry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Berry, I'm not going to hand my homework in on that thing because I suffered enough through PEDNR. You can ask me questions though.

Jonathan Zuck: So we need it most from you, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You'll get opinion but I'm not bloody reading it again.

Jonathan Zuck: Well just look at the form. I mean, that is...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: ...question so you don't need to read it again because you already know it so.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I will respond rather than read, that's fine.

Jonathan Zuck: I will add to Berry's suggestion is as you go through this remember to look at the form itself and see if there's questions that have come up that the form doesn't address or refinements that should be made in how we're analyzing these case studies; if there's questions that we're not asking such as Tony's about what is essentially a two-phase, you know, exploration of the existing data, right, and maybe that needs to be divided into two parts poor example.

So get your comments to us of course on the framework for understanding these case studies as well.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: ...meeting schedule so...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Berry Cobb: Cheryl, did you want to say something real quick?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I was just going to say that PEDNR is one of those where there was a hesitation of industry players to share information. And that's something that we have to tease out separately that's all. Thanks.

Berry Cobb: Yes, that is very true. And as I'm partly responsible for why there's specific aspect to this effort in terms of collaborating with contracted parties on that data and trying to build a, you know, a framework for future reference with future endeavors.

So thank you, Jonathan. Our last agenda item is our recurring meeting scheduled. I don't think it'll be a surprise but the last Doodle poll that I did to try to make this meeting for the 29th of May imploded intensely. It was very difficult to find even a remotely common time across all the players.

So we are still going to stick to the alternating or biweekly schedule but there is one possible change that I'll bring up here on the call real quickly and also I have the action item to send this out to the list to see if this is acceptable to the working group.

So first and foremost our next meeting will be on the 20th at 2000 UTC, and I'll make sure that we get a notice sent out so you can get it on your calendars right away. I know that this time is not perfect for everybody however it has been consistent enough that we get a number of participants on here which is a good thing.

However what I will be sending out to the list is a proposal where it's kind of taking on our previous discussions of divide and conquer. And to the general premise is that we will actually have weekly meetings but Week 1 will be a time that is accommodative to the Asia-Pacific region and then the very next week, Week 2, is accommodative to the European and East Coast region.

And what will try to maybe do is split our effort especially in the review of some of these past working group effort. And the call time will still continue to be on Tuesdays and I haven't tried to determine an exact time but it would be something like Week 1 would be at 8:00 am and then Week 2 is at 8:00 pm.

And so then it's up to the working group members to pick whichever time is the most reasonable for you to attend. And if - well let's assume that you're 8:00 am, for example, wasn't a reasonable time and so you pick Week 2 it's just that we ask that the members that don't attend that call that you do listen to the mp3 and contribute on the list to that particular topic being discussed.

So I'll try to establish this in more detail on the list. Again it's only a proposal; it's up to the working group ultimately. Jonathan may kill me because now I'm doubling up his duty that he didn't expect. But outside of that I'm running into a brick wall trying to figure out a time that's accommodated to all the members so this was the middle ground that I could think of.

So with that I think I'm done, Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck: Oh you're done all right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That sounds almost a threatening. Hang on.

Jonathan Zuck: Well, don't worry, certainly wouldn't kill him until we're done with this working group.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh whew, that's all right then, Jonathan. I can support you on that one, that's all right.

Jonathan Zuck: So, folks, do give back some consideration. We really don't want to lose momentum by talking about things too infrequently and we want to try to maximize participation. So keep an eye open for that email and give your feedback as to whether that could work for you. And, you know, as far as the different timings that are essentially 12 hours apart.

And maybe we can split up some of the work that we need to do and then back in combination with the mp3s everybody can kind of stay up-to-date with what's going on. So give that a look.

Unless anybody's got anything they need to bring up right now I'll bring the meeting to a close.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: All good. Thanks Jonathan.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye, all.

Jonathan Zuck: All right. Bye-bye.

Berry Cobb: Thanks, all. Take care.

Coordinator: At this time all parties are welcome to go ahead and disconnect for today's conference. At this time all parties are welcome to go ahead and disconnect from the call. Thank you for joining and have a great day. Thank you.

END