

**Fast Flux PDP WG Teleconference
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 22 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 22 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-20090422.mp3>
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#april>

Present for the teleconference:

James Bladel - GodaddyRRc - Working Group chair
Greg Aaron - Afiliias Ry c.
Avri Doria - GNSO Council chair, NCA
Kal Feher - Registrar

Observers - (no constituency affiliation)

Jose Nazario
Rod Rasmussen
Randall Vaughn

Staff:

Marika Konings
Dave Piscitello
Glen de Saint Gery

Absent apologies

Joe St. Sauver
Paul Diaz

Coordinator: We're now recording.

Woman: Thank you. We have on the line (Avri Doria), (James Bladel), (Unintelligible), Jose Nazario, Rod Rasmussen, Kal Feher . And from staff we have Marika KoningsDave Piscitello and Glen Desaintgery. Have I missed anybody?

Thanks. (James)?

James Bladel: Good morning everyone - or afternoon or evening for (unintelligible). I wanted to take a look first at the agenda that Marikaprovided - the

proposed agenda - yesterday and see if that was acceptable to everyone and we - so we can immediately proceed according to that plan.

So does everyone have a copy of that? Okay, so the first item on the agenda is to discuss the comments that we had in Category 1. And of those, there were two that warranted some one-on-one conversations with Dave Piscitello and (Aubrey). And then there was a raft of issues that were investigated by myself and (Joe). So why don't we get started with Dave. Did you have any updates relative to 1A, a clear distinction, legitimate reason to have DNS records with low TTL values? And I think Mr. (Adkinson) was specifically speaking in the text of mobility.

Dave Piscitello: Yeah, well I did send an email to (Wren), I have not heard back from him. I'll try again. I spent a lot of time looking at his comments because they're very interesting and they're actually quite constructive. And I'm trying to formulate an email in real time here to the list.

So I'll summarize what I'm going to send in the email based on, you know, my review of what he's written. (Wren) makes three, I think, important points. One is that there's a range of applications that beneficially use short TTLs that we did not discuss.

And I has spoken privately to Marika and one of the things that I would suggest is that we incorporate almost verbatim, you know, part of that comment in the text about - in the area of the report where we talk about beneficial uses of, you know, of short TTLs.

The second comment that he made was that he had asked what the IETF or IAB had been invited to review. And this is somewhat problematic but I think, you know, easily addressed. And the reason why it's problematic is because there's no sort of single entity that we would contact in the IETF to ask for a review.

So one way to approach this would be to try to find every working group in the IETF that might have an interest in DNS and TTLs and positive applications which is a lot of work. The second would be to formulate a short message to the IAB chair and say, you know, we've published this in the report, we received some comments from parties suggesting that we contact you to determine whether or not there's interest in the IETF and simply throw it over the wall to them.

And the third way to do this is to simply respond that, you know, the public comment period is open for everyone to comment, including IETF and it's - and leave it at that.

So I'm willing to do, you know, do the groundwork on all three of those, like, you know, and I just - we'll put them on the floor for the moment.

Avri Doria: This is (Aubrey), can I say one thing?

Man: Go ahead, (Aubrey).

Avri Doria: And perhaps I missed it when I switching from mute to unmute. But on your first option, the one of contact all working groups, I think only two - one or two of the area directors would probably be a sufficient shortcut to that. And I don't even know that you'd have to send them the

document but merely a note saying there is this document with the URL recommendation and an invitation.

But then of course, there'd have to be a willingness to say when buy and hold off reconsideration until you got that.

Man: Yeah, we could actually contact the area directors. But one question I had in my mind was how many areas this effects? Of course, it's smaller than the number of working groups so it does scale the problem down but - up to this point.

Avri Doria: Yeah, probably the security is definitely one and...

Man: I don't know where mobile applications lie - or mobile IT lies in the current structure. But I can find that out from (Patrick) (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Probably look at it on the Web and tell you in a second.

(Greg): Hi, this is (Greg). So if we went out and asked questions, what question would we be asking or what area would we ask them to invest in?

Man: It's not a matter of asking questions, (Greg). What (Wren) asked to do was to just determine whether the - anyone in the IETF had, you know, had the opportunity to review it. And I, you know, I think he was just curious, you know, whether we came in from left field and ignored the IETF, more so that some concern that there were other people in the IETF who would object to what we wrote.

(Greg): Okay. If you're interested, I'd point you to some notes I wrote with feedback. I'll use the low TTLs. It basically looks - the ability to use low TTLs is written into the basic (unintelligible).

Man: Excuse me, (Greg), can I interrupt you just a moment? There's some background activity, I don't know if it's typing or something like that. If we could ask the - if everyone could mute their lines when they're not speaking, that would be helpful. I'm having a hard time hearing (Greg). I don't know if I'm alone on that.

Man: You are not alone on that.

Man: Thanks. Go ahead, (Greg).

(Greg): And it was designed - low TTLs were designed to allow services that require frequent updates. Mobility is certainly one of those because you're, you know, you and your phone are moving around. I see in my TLD blogs using low TTLs because they're updated frequently and services like Twitter probably are as well.

So I think if we're asking people questions - like the IETF questions, it seems like the question we'd be asking them is do they want to change their RFTs and not allow people to use low TTLs which - and I'm pretty sure that, I mean, my own feeling is they'd come back and say, no, we can't limit TTLs.

Man: I don't think that's really the goal of inviting comment. I would not be asking them questions about, you know, is - are - is there a need to go and reconsider TTLs. I would simply - I think what (Wren) had wanted to do - and I'll try to confirm when I get in touch with him - was that he

simply wanted other people in the IETF to know that the document existed and to have the opportunity to review it.

(Greg): Oh, okay, all right.

Man: And so what I think (Aubrey)'s suggestion is actually probably the most straightforward one. And if (Aubrey) can send me the area directors and, you know, the group agrees, I'll just add those to the people that I, you know, that I contact when I contact (Wren).

Avri Doria: Yeah, I was just looking at that. And it would probably end up through your forum with two area directors per end up a big list. It may - to further go on it, it may be worth sending it to (unintelligible).

Man: Okay, if you'll just send me the email that you believe is most appropriate, I'll forward something, you know, indicating that, you know, that we received the comment from an IETF member asking whether the IETF was aware of the document and would want to comment.

Avri Doria: Yeah - and just going (unintelligible) would probably be - okay, great.

Marika Konings: And this is (Maricka). Should we add a deadline with that email or first wait a response and then indicate that, you know, we are on a time line in trying to wrap up this report. I'm not very familiar with IETF so I don't know how quickly they could turn around and say, oh well, we seen this and this or we're fine with what you're saying or thank you very much for, you know, sending us the document.

Avri Doria: All right, we both did back off. It might be worth just asking, you know, if he could let you know when and if they'd have a chance to look at it. And then we could figure that into what we needed to do. But you know, I...

Man: There's two things that I think - two outcomes that could happen here. One is that since the IETF is actually individual experts, we could get a very large number of comments from individuals.

The second is that there would be at least one if not more working groups for areas that might want to impose a formal response. I imagine that what would happen in the time frame that we might be able to process is that we get more individual comments unless organized comments. So I think we just need to factor that in, in terms of what our expectation is about completing the document.

Man: Are you still typing?

Man: The typing sound has returned so if we could just issue the reminder for mute.

Avri Doria: I think the other possibility - and this is going beyond this - is that we include going to these experts for further comments and review in the next set.

Man: That would be a good idea. I like that. In other words, send the final report to them and, you know, along with some of the recommendations?

Avri Doria: We're not going to have a whole lot of definitives tot his stuff. We basically seem to have a set of recommendations of ways to proceed. And one of the ways to proceed is to get more in depth knowledge on various subjects. I don't know - it's one possibility.

Man: Okay. So those are the various approaches to addressing...

Avri Doria: There is a directory by the way. And that might be the place to direct it. The IETF mobility directory. I'll shut up now.

Man: Okay. So (Dave), do you want to take the action to reach out to the mobility director of the IETF and make them aware of this report and see if they would like to comment on it in a reasonable time frame?

Dave Piscitello: Yeah, I'll formulate a, you know, an email that I will send and I'll just post it for approval on the list.

Man: Okay, fantastic. Returning to the bulk of comment 1A, were there any other points that you wanted to address?

Dave Piscitello: Well the one - as I said, he makes some very good points about using the short TTLs. And my suggestion is that we, you know, I take the comments that he has and, you know, formulate an addition to the existing and appropriate section. And I'll just post that on the email list. I intended to do that by today but, you know, just, you know, things were, you know, too busy to actually accomplish that. But I'll do that if people believe that's an appropriate, you know, action.

Man: I think we would welcome that. Anyone else - thoughts or...? Okay...

Man: Then there was one other point that he made that I think is worth discussing. And that is that he and several others had made the observation that we didn't sufficiently distinguish, you know, fast flux from, you know, fast flux or tax from beneficial uses of techniques that are generally lumped under the term fast flux.

And I think this is - this actually turns out to be kind of artifact of the way that the document evolved and the fact that when we finally developed a taxonomy in the working group where we had been able - we talked about beneficial uses and fast flux attacks, the - that the bridge between that and the questions that were originally formulated and given to the, you know, given to the working group isn't tight enough.

And so somewhere I think in the document we might want to say that, you know, while we develop this taxonomy within the working group and we believe it is much more accurately representative of the way that the world ought to view the distinction between fast flux and, you know, and volatile networking adaptive techniques, we chose to retain the original formulation of the questions as presented by counsel in the document because that was our remit.

And if - hopefully if we can word that appropriately enough before we start to answer the questions, it will allow people to say, okay, while this does say fast flux, you know, what they're talking about here are the beneficial uses of techniques that have been usurped by attackers, not technically your fast flux attack.

Man: Okay, I think that some variation of what you've just articulated there would probably be an appropriate inclusion. (Maricka), what do you

think? Were you able to capture some of Dave's language there and maybe we could submit that to the list as a possible inclusion as well as an appropriate insertion point?

Dave Piscitello: I'll write that as well, just because it's unfair for Marikato try to transcribe what I say in real time. And I'm fairly eager to get, you know, to get rid of that blurred distinction and try to get people on the course of things. Fast flux equals criminal, you know, short TTLs and beneficial uses of, you know, of TTLs and other network adapted techniques isn't necessarily criminal.

Man: That would be excellent, Dave.

Dave Piscitello: Okay.

Man: Okay, so does that cover the points - that's fairly insightful and comprehensive comment from Mr. (Atkinson). Are we ready to move on to the next group, which is 1B through G and I? And is (Joe) on the line? Sorry, I don't have the meeting dues so I'm doing this the old fashioned way.

(Joe) and I were not able to connect this week so I just went ahead and went through these comments somewhat unilaterally. So I don't want to give anyone the impression that we agreed on these.

But my assessment, 1B, C, D, G and I are fairly well addressed or captured within Page 17 and 18 in the report and possibly in other areas which describe the possible legitimate uses of fast flux and/or short TTLs. There were a couple of points that I was able to pull out of this set of comments that I thought were not addressed. And maybe

you wanted to put those in front of the group for discussion and see if they warranted any other additional language or if we wanted to delve into these issues a little bit further.

I'll start off with question - I'm sorry - Comment 1E which was from - I'm probably not going to pronounce the last name correctly - but (David Griffia). And in this, the commenter mentioned something kind of interesting which is proposing a mechanism to evaluate in real time the status of any fluxing domains and then have some sort of a - I'm struggling with the translation here - some sort of a centralized mechanism to determine whether or not that they quote/unquote good (unintelligible) or legitimate fast fluxing domain versus an illegitimate fast fluxing domain.

So I don't know if we've covered that anywhere in the report but I thought that was an interesting proposal. Any thoughts from the group?

Woman: (Unintelligible) to consider that as a potential solution or...

Man: Consider that as a recommendation...

Woman: To address it.

Man: It's a possible recommendation for future first - future next step in the final report that we captured this idea for a fast flux alert system, if you will. And at least make sure that that - that part of his comment is captured in our final report. But I don't want to recommend that if I'm the only one that feels that it's not addressed, you know, in existing language.

(Jose): I don't think - this is (Jose) from (Arbor). I don't think that that's necessarily appropriate role for ICANN to be honest with you. I like the Knight Rider theme cell phone ring tone by the way.

I just - I mean, I think that that's, you know, certainly that might be valuable for anybody trying to do domain name takedowns or determining, you know, do I need to - do I (unintelligible) this through takedown or not? I don't necessarily see that it's being a reasonable role for ICANN here. I think there's room for third parties to do that.

Man: That's a good point and we should point out that the commenter didn't necessarily specify ICANN. But it's possible that that would be implied if it were in our report. So I agree with you, that's outside of the role of ICANN but it may have merit as a third party or industry tool.

Man: Yeah, but - so, you know, I, you know, with that comment, a whole host of other questions and issues, including for example the history of their historical use, the current use of it - 99% benign and 1% abused. You know, is that different than - harvest and abused, is that different than 100% abused now when it was benign in the past. What constitutes malicious activity? All those kinds of questions are far outside the scope, I think, of this report.

And having an external consensus on that, so there's not one person making sort of arbitrary decisions of oh, you know, I don't like those guys - watch those guys - watch shop and I do like those guy's tool shop, you know, I think is going to be key. But I think it's far outside the scope of this document, that sort of criteria qualification.

Man: Okay, agreement, anyone?

Rod Rasmussen: This is (Rod). I think that there are actually registrars and registries already doing this as far as looking and obviously security vendors. So you know, I think within the scope of some of - what are some at least recommendations of best practices. So we might want to (unintelligible) that one. I thought we actually had this - part of this in the document as well.

But I think there some room for at least mention this in the kind of best practices kind of a methodology.

(Kell): This is (Kell). The registrars actually do discuss an informal network of early warning and warning dialogue - nothing formal. And we have a participant already. We did discuss that as part of our off list ideas. But that never really continued to something that would be in the document. So there is scope, I suppose, to include some recommendation.

But I think where it all got sticky was again, in the definitions and how formal it should be, how it should be policed and that sort of thing in an informal setting. We felt comfortable that we could use common sense and we were only dealing with registrars that we trusted and would - could reliably say if there were warnings or something, then we knew that they're warning someone malicious, not someone they didn't like.

When it starts to expand and you start to not to have that trust, that's when it starts to become required to be policed a little bit. And that's where things got sticky.

Man: So perhaps including language in the document that states that, you know, registrars are already trying to apply sound criteria for screening these things. But that, you know, that's how they dealt with another document but that's an ongoing process as well.

Man: Okay, would it limit it to registrars or...?

Man: Well, registries, I guess.

Man: Okay, so just a brief mention, perhaps, that the registries and registrars are engaged to some degree in this as part of their best practices in monitoring and sharing information with one - with each other relative to fast flux for possible review and investigation and other actions - to see if other action is warranted.

Man: Yeah, I think both sharing between but also just as part of their own anti-fraud measures. I know that at least the registrar will lose a couple of registrars looking at fast flux domain and responding with their, you know, with their fraud teams.

Man: Okay. Moving to question or comment 1F which I thought was also fairly well addressed. However, there was the third paragraph where the commenter describes - talks about how to scope. You know, we're talking about country code activities. And I think that they raise an interesting point here that the registrar is, by law, unable to take down a fluxing domain without permission from a judge or I'm assuming other appropriate authorities and saying that the registrars should be granted more freedom to act against that flux domain.

I wanted to see if folks felt that this was - this limitation on how much action a registrar or possibly a registry, once a fast flux domain is detected, if we really discussed any external limitations on what they can or cannot do and whether this is coming from ICANN - probably don't want to go down the path of country code discussions because those policies are numerous and there's not a whole lot of commonality.

So I just wanted to point that out as another area that might merit some additional language in our final report, unless the team thinks it's covered. So tell us on that.

Anyone think that the report sufficiently covers this and we don't need to delve into that area? Okay, we can...

Man: I always thought that the report was respectfully differential to the various requirements for each of the registries and their obligations into the law, whether it be they need law enforcement to say if this can go or they can do it on their own - I don't know. I thought we were clear about that.

Man: Okay. With regard to Question G and I - Comment G and I, I felt that those were fairly well addressed with the - within the existing language of the report.

That brings us to Item 1H. And (Aubrey), I think you posted a message to the list earlier.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I did. I don't know if that was enough. I didn't bother to get in touch with KC on it, although I have actually sent a couple of

messages with her about some other stuff. But I read through it and it seems fairly clear and it seems - and she really seems to almost be making a second order point that, you know, from looking at the other comments, a lot of people are saying, hey, wait a second. It probably is possible to differentiate the bad from the good usage - at least to a very large extent. And perhaps, you know, more work should be done on that - on getting that differentiation done.

As I say, I don't - though I consider myself technical, I do not consider myself technically competent in this area. So I'm not making my own judgment on that but sort of trusting, you know, her judgment. And one of the things that perhaps we could sort of strengthen is again, in the future activities of basically getting some of these organization like (Kiada) and like you all that already have technical organization that are working on this stuff to actually look into a bit more of the - how one differentiates.

The other issue she made though is - so what if you differentiate unless you've got a set of policies and actions that can do something once you differentiate. And then that, you know, the question mark is, is it ICANN's business to do that? It's certainly not this group's role at the moment to figure out if it's ICANN's job to do that.

But it might be within keeping posing questions to be looked at by the larger community to ask that question. If it were possible to actually differentiate with a low rate of false positives and a low rate of false negatives, if it were possible to do that, what should be done about it and who should be doing that?

As I say, it's not a question for this group to get into as far as I can tell. But it certainly doesn't seem a bad question to pass on. And we kind of allude to it a couple of times. But I don't think we ever, you know, put it point blank in that way. But maybe I don't remember or maybe I missed when I was skimming, looking for stuff. But I didn't reread the report to try and answer my question. I sort of went on recall and a fast skim.

So my view of her comment and how to deal with it was basically to look towards our future actions and see whether we can't add a few things. And personally, I think getting somebody like (Kaida) who, you know, does more measurement of more different things than I know of elsewhere. And as I say, it's not my area - involved could be a really good thing.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you, (Aubrey). I'm wondering if it would be beneficial to, maybe as a group, reach out to the original commenter and ask if they would be willing to put together a few possible recommendations or ideas how to differentiate or how they're proposing to differentiate on a technical level. And then we can revisit those as a group and determine whether or not we should - we captured them with existing language. Or as you said, we can dance around it but we need to address it more explicitly.

Avri Doria: I mean, I can certainly recount and send an email saying, you know, how do you propose we do this. I mean, I can't even (unintelligible) than that.

James Bladel: I think Marika and I could probably take that just because I think we're already overburdening everyone here with takeaways.

Woman: No problem.

James Bladel: And that way we can reference the comment as it was received. And not to necessarily - well, anyway, we can take that.

Jumping into Number 2 - and I'm just trying to keep an eye on the clock here, we have about 20 more minutes of our allotted time. So I wanted to jump into Category 2 which we had a healthy discussion last week - sorry last call. And it seemed that everyone was in agreement that this is an issue that is very interesting and very intriguing and was not addressed at all in our report.

So rather than, you know, diving back into the substance of (Woody)'s comment here, I'd rather talk about we can best incorporate this into the final report so that we captured his ideas and his concerns relative to the issue of digital divide.

And we do faithfully - and maybe the only way to do so faithfully is to just take his comment verbatim and add that as an addendum or as an appendix - I'm fine with that as well.

But I just wanted to put that out on the floor for discussion - not the issue itself but much more of how do we draw a box around this idea and get it reflected in our final report.

Marika Konings: This is (Maricka). Wouldn't it be appropriate to incorporate this into a session on who's harmed by fast flux or who's impassive and mention their digital divide?

James Bladel: I thought about that as well, Marika and my only concern with that - and I think that's the most appropriate place, the body of the report. My only concern there is that we would want to make sure that we properly attributed this to the commenter and not necessarily give the implication that it was part of our deliberations. So if we can do that sufficiently in that section, then I think that's the most appropriate place for it.

Marika Konings: I'm happy to make a suggestion there on how to incorporate it and circulate that on the list. I think in previous reports, we've been able to do that as well and just refer to and, you know, some individual had suggested it as part of the public comments that this is an area that is considered as well in relation to this question. I'm happy to provide a draft then.

James Bladel:: Okay. And then just very briefly, does anyone on the call today feel strongly that this is - this doesn't belong, that this idea is out of scope or does anyone feel strongly opposed the idea that we capture this comment in it's entirety and work that into that section as Marika has pointed out?

Okay, I take the silence that we all think that he's really onto a good idea here. The next item on the agenda - and it looks like we have about 15 minutes remaining - is that I noticed - I'm sorry - I'm skipping ahead.

I'd like to deviate from what was sent out a little bit and find some assignments or volunteers for Category 3 and Category 4 and - because Category 4 is much larger. Perhaps we can look for a duo or a team of folks to tackle that category.

I'm just concerned that we need to - and this is just my opinion - I know we need to do - give this issue and this report the attention it deserves and those folks who took the trouble and great idea that they've encompassed in their comments. I want to make sure also moving forward at a relatively aggressive pace with the idea that we can have something to present to council at or before Sydney.

So just looking at the calendar there, I'd like to find some volunteers for Category 3, Category 4. And if anyone is really bringing interest into the two questions in Category 5 and I think we could be open to that as well. Anyone? Something for any of those categories?

Is there any remaining categories that someone feels particularly appropriate to address, either because they're familiarity with the commenter or some experience in the issue as it's being raised would like to toss their hat in the ring and take away some of this action and bring it back to the group for our next call?

I must be the least persuasive chair you've ever experienced,
(Aubrey)?

Avri Doria: Well, it takes a while.

James Bladel: Okay.

Avri Doria: But sooner or later they'll (unintelligible).

James Bladel: Okay.

Rod Rasmussen: (James), can you hear me?

James Bladel: Okay, this is (Rod).

Rod Rasmussen: The issues here are actually something I've been talking to other people about but my schedule is just brutal at the moment. I mean, I'd love to talk about some of the stuff. So if someone else is willing to lead it, I will be willing to (unintelligible) people on the team. But I can't drive it. There's half a volunteer for you.

Dave Piscitello: Why don't you just make it that whoever's phone rings during a teleconference, that's the action items that we're currently discussing.

James Bladel: I like the idea, Dave. I just wonder if any of you could tell us that.

Dave Piscitello: So ironically (James), that was my phone ringing in the background. That's you calling me, too.

Man: That's an interesting attack record, I like that.

James Bladel: Well if I could do a little bit of salesmanship here. I think that there are a couple of short categories here. And I don't think we're asking folks to, you know, for more than just an hour or so. I mean, (Rod), I completely empathize and I think that if I put my To Do list between now and Sydney up on the screen, it would probably look like everyone else's.

But also I want to have in a long term over the horizon, I want to have a fast flux meetings at some point in the next three months not be a part of my calendar. So I'm just working towards that goal.

So I will go ahead and I will volunteer for Section 3. And then perhaps if we could get one other person to raise their hand and work with (Rod) on Section 4, then I think that that's pretty healthy for the next call.

Man: Oh, I'll work with (Rod) on that. It's like I spend half my life with him anyway.

James Bladel: Thank you very much. So we have myself on Section 3 and the odd couple on Section 4. And if anyone has any interest on the definition issue on Section 5, I know that sounds like revisiting some very lengthy and robust discussions that we've had in the past. But just trying to make sure that we keep this moving forward and that we have some measureable process week to week and call to call.

Another approach might be - and I'll put this out to discussion - is that if we are going to tackle fewer categories in between calls that we increase the frequency of the calls to weekly rather than bi-weekly. Imagine how well that's going to go over?

Woman: Put on some pressure on people to get stuff done, I guess.

James Bladel: It might, it might. But that's a good point. I was just thinking that if we could get more of the work going offline and bring - and have these bi-weekly calls more of a regroup and bringing back to the - or reconvening of the very components of work that we could progress on the schedule a little bit more aggressively.

So I'll take Number 3, we have (Rod) and (Dave) on Number 4. And we'll leave Number 5 for the next call.

Marika Konings: And (James), what I can do as well, I'll write up the action items from this call and I can include in that, you know, a call for volunteers for other sections or joining, you know, one of the ones. I have (unintelligible) for the other items to join because as, you know, several people are not on the call. Maybe I should wait as well to get others involved.

James Bladel: Thank you, (Maricka), that would be great. And if you could also mention that, you know, if we don't have to take these necessarily in sequence if Item - Category 5, the definition, if folks are having, you know, flashbacks to that trauma earlier on in the process and they'd rather jump on Item 6 or 7, then that would be fine as well.

The next thing I wanted to address real quickly was the - I noticed in some of the sections - I'm going to try to pull up the draft report here. And if I'm working off a version that's not current then maybe this will be a very short conversation.

But (Maricka), I was looking at Section - I believe it's Section 8 and Section 9. And I'm trying to get to that quickly here. They seem to be somewhat placeholder section or stubs where we differed any sort of language until we received some additional input in the form of comments.

Do you know - does that sound familiar?

Marika Konings: I'm pulling it up as well. I think you're talking about the possible next steps. Is that correct?

James Bladel: Just a moment while I get there.

Marika Konings: Interim conclusions, I guess (unintelligible) interim...

James Bladel: Yeah, there's a paragraph or two where we verbally kind of deferred any response or work to something I think needs to be flushed out before we would continue or consider this report.

Marika Konings: I'm happy as well for the next meeting because we do need to as well update some of the other sections, of course, to reflect the public comments and the fact that, you know, this is now final report. I'm happy as well to then highlight those sections that the group will need to have a closer look at, you know, going forward. Where we refer to the - we need to review these public comments on where we say interim and things like that. So I'm happy to take that on and take on those action items.

James Bladel: That would be fantastic. And it's a text that we're - that indicates we're in one of those sections says something to be effective. This question is deferred until the next round of public comments. So if we don't necessarily find a good comment or category of comments that will help us flush out those areas, then we need to address exactly how we want to flush those out because I think those probably should be changed before we move forward.

Marika Konings: Okay, I'm happy to do that and send it around for the next call.

James Bladel: In the remaining few minutes, I just wanted to open up the floor for anyone that had any additional items they wanted to get on our agenda for next time or if they have any suggestions or recommendations on what we can do to keep this process moving forward and keeps folks engaged and make everyone excited and enthusiastic about coming back every other Wednesday which may be a tall order.

Woman: This is the question here as well, like, are we now talking about having a call next week or in two weeks' time or is that still open for discussion as well?

James Bladel: It seemed that there was sort of the idea that we should go for two weeks' time but I guess that would probably depend on whether we can get any response to additional sections on the list. Thoughts from the group?

Yeah, (Maricka), let's hold off on that at this time. If we don't have any additional volunteers for the open categories on the list, let's say, by the end of this week, then we try to get a call scheduled for next Wednesday, a couple of extra...

Dave Piscitello: Can I make a suggestion?

James Bladel: Yeah, sure, Dave.

Dave Piscitello: One of the things we were discussing, you know, recently trying to understand how to be efficient with teleconferences. And it seems that if we set a rule in the working group that if the chairman doesn't see evidence of actions being completed, we don't have the next call. Then

we're driven by people actually doing work as opposed as an obligation to attend a teleconference.

So I'm perfectly happy to have a call next week if we all can get some work done. But just going over a list and saying we haven't finished, you know, we all haven't finished what we promised probably isn't very efficient.

Woman: I'd like to bring up a problem with that methodology. For many of us - myself included - having a meeting is a forcing function. You know, I had an assignment due for today's meeting so at 2:00 in the night last night I finally finished because I had an assignment due.

If meetings are unpleasant and a way to avoid meetings is to not do my homework, well then what incentive do any of us have to ever do any of the work?

Dave Piscitello: Well, I guess I never thought of it that way.

Woman: Well you get paid for doing it.

Dave Piscitello: Okay, well, I mean, that's - yeah, a legitimate perspective.

James Bladel: And I think you raise a good point, Dave, however we - and I know you're aware of this - is that this working group kind of went into a bit of a slide for a little while. And I think, you know, we couldn't achieve a quorum on the calls and it wasn't a whole lot of action on the list. And so, you know, part of my throwing my hat in the ring to get involved in a bigger way was to try and kind of keep it moving and keep it - bring it to an orderly and successful resolution as quickly as possible.

So I am trying to use the stick of more meetings and more calls to encourage additional homework, really with the idea of just getting this off of everyone's calendar in the next three to four months. But I appreciate what you're saying, I just - I'm just trying to think of creative ways that we can do this without shortchanging any of the commenters or the final report.

Marika Konings: So where does that leave us?

James Bladel: We...

Marika Konings: (Unintelligible) does their homework - or maybe we shouldn't say that. So we have a call next week then.

James Bladel: Let's have a call next week unless we can pick up a couple other of these categories on the list. And if we can do that, then we won't need a call done until the following.

Avri Doria: I mean, one thing I have seen successful for people is that the meeting isn't scheduled unless all of the topics have been resolved before the meeting. And then you can cancel the meeting. And so that's one way to encourage using the list and doing things in your own time comfort - own comfortable time so that you don't have to deal with meeting and so you can have a meeting contingent on having not finished our work.

James Bladel: That's a good idea, (Aubrey) and I think we should do that, (Maricka), where we just schedule the call for next Wednesday. And if we're able to come to some sort of consensus on the list that we completed

Section 3, Section 4 and possibly delve into one of the other sections, then we can cancel that call.

Marika Konings: Okay, great.

James Bladel: With that, it looks like we're just a minute shy of the hour so I wanted to thank everyone and appreciate everyone who took away items from last week and who will be taking items away for this week. And let's, you know, see some healthy activity on the list. And otherwise, if there are no other concerns, we can adjourn for today.

Woman: Okay, bye-bye.

Woman: Thank you.

Woman: Bye.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Thanks, bye.

END