

**Fast Flux PDP WG Teleconference
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 6 May 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 6 May 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-20090506.mp3>

On page:

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

Present for the teleconference:

James Bladel - GodaddyRRc - Working Group chair

Greg Aaron - Afiliias Ry c.

Paul Diaz - Networksolutions

Observers - (no constituency affiliation)

Rod Rasmussen

Joe St. Sauver

Staff:

Marika Konings

Dave Piscitello

Glen de Saint Gery

Absent - apologies

Randall Vaughn

Jose Nazario

Kal Feher - Registrar

Coordinator: The recording has started, thank you.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you. I'll do the roll call, James.

James Bladel: Yes, please. Thank you.

Glen DeSaintgery: We have on the line, (unintelligible), James Bladel, Rod Rasmussen, Paul Diaz, Greg Aaron and we have apologies from Jose Nazario And (Randy Vaughn).

Woman: And (Kal) (unintelligible).

Glen DeSaintgery: And (Kal) (unintelligible).

Woman: And Dave Piscitello will be joining us a little bit late.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thanks very much and for staff we have Marika Koningsand myself, Glen. Thanks, (unintelligible).

James Bladel: And then looking at - did everyone have a chance to see the ambitious or some might say optimistic agenda that was posted this morning to the list? If not, I'll just jump in. The first item was to discuss some of the lines that Dave Piscitello identified and there was some conversation relative to - I believe it was line 256, as a starter, is that correct? And line 256 appears to be that was maybe working from an earlier draft and there were a couple of folks that recommended that line be deleted.

(Unintelligible) strong feelings that we should keep this line, it is I believe (the group) wishes to emphasis that fast flux need better definition and more research.

Marika Konings: James this is Marika, just a note in the draft that is posted from the wiki I already deleted this line as there seems to be support for it, of course if the group wants to do it differently it is no problem to put it back in there. Just a note that it has already been included as a proposed change and updated draft.

James Bladel: Okay.

Paul Diaz: James, it's Paul. I had no problem with that change.

James Bladel: Okay go ahead and leave it out, Marika. I just wanted to make sure we had a chance to engage the (board) on the other changes that have been proposed. And I apologize, I'm trying to find the line, but my line numbers are not matching up here.

Marika Konings: It is line 256. I think it has changed a bit because I think when (Dave) sent his comment it was still based on the previous draft, so it has changed a bit because there were some additions and deletions and things.

James Bladel: Okay. And there was also a question to line 269. Do you have that handy?

Marika Konings: That line number is the same.

James Bladel: Oh, that is the same in a different version?

Marika Konings: In the latest version, I think those comments were made in relation to the updated version, so. At least I have that link to that same line number. So actually I think I updated them myself to reflect the - to make sure people go to the right place. So that's the 269 in the latest version that is on the wiki.

James Bladel: What about the remaining items that (Dave) pointed out? The same situation or - I mean...

Marika Konings: Yes, the ones that were included in the email I sent out, those are the correct line numbers linked to the latest draft of the final report.

James Bladel: Okay, well we can move on then and if (Dave) joins us we can revisit that and check that. It sounds like I'm at (unintelligible) here a little bit. The next items was category 3 comments and I apologize my systems is still pulling up the draft report. In fact I think I may have frozen up here. But category 3 was I believe four comments. I will get that here. Category 3 were four comments relative to I think some of them touched on various items that were covered thoroughly elsewhere in the report.

One for example, discussed if you want to look at 3A. That the route cause of this problem was unmatched and compromised - a home machine and purposes various types of black lists, to mitigate that.

Second one for example, discusses various legitimate uses and I think we covered that in the group benefit section of the (chart) - (chart) questions.

The third comment was a little more interesting in that it made the distinction between trying to implement changes of the network layer to address problems in the application layer and how that has always been somewhat of futile exercise. I think that we've touched on that in section 7A, where we discuss the challenges relative to fast flux.

And finally, section or comment 3B was from a previous member of the working group. There were several points included that, you know, the (unintelligible) has many vulnerabilities fast flux just being one of them. Not all of which are within the scope of ICANN secure. And then the comment goes on to address some of the other comments that were submitted earlier in the comment period.

I kind of posted a synopsis of all these to the list and I wanted to see if anyone had any strong feelings. Was I off based on the thinking that we've covered all these topics although, barely thoroughly within the report or was there something that maybe I'm reading wrong and if, in fact, there is new information. Any thoughts on the list?

Paul Diaz: James, this is Paul. I concur with what you said. I don't think we needed to address beyond what we already have in the report. I think these questions are handled in the text that we currently have.

James Bladel: Okay. Thanks Paul anyone else? Okay, well, in that case then we were going to move on to section four, but (Dave) has not joined us, is that correct, Marika? I don't see that he has joined yet.

Marika Konings: No. I don't see him on the meeting yet.

James Bladel: Okay. And then there was a healthy exchange on this category on the list so...

Marika Konings: Maybe Rod is on the line so - I know he has kids running around but maybe - I don't know if he wants to comment or prefers to wait until (Dave) is on?

Rod Rasmussen: I'd actually like to wait until (Dave) is on, so. Give him credit and blame...

James Bladel: Okay and we have Greg as well, so that will be good deferral that (unintelligible) (Dave) jumps on, so we will skip ahead to category five which is also - fell under my lap here. And this was just two comments.

First comments was very critical of the initial report as lacking in any quantifiable data to form the basis of policy and you know, essentially saying that those were misusing fast flux or small. But just proportionally a small group that was just portioned in their effect and that a lot of this is probably best dealt with law enforcement rather than ICANN.

Then the comments seems to take a different tack in that it is the first few register's and registrars preventing the name from resolving in the (DNS). Rather than taking a look at the content, so that is clearly an ICANN issue and really in many regards is a description of what we do when detect something like this as a registrar, we suspend the domain name or cancel the registration.

I thought that this material was touched on in a couple of different areas in the reports. And for example, group benefits, captures most of legitimate uses - I didn't see anything new in this comment. Discussion of whether or not ICANN is the most appropriate body to work these issues was discussed in 7B which is under challenges and in the draft of section 8 and 9 which admittedly are up for rework in one of our final meetings so.

But overall I didn't see anything in here that was necessary to go back and revisit some of these - or recompose some of these sections.
Agree or disagree, discussion?

Man: Agreed.

James Bladel: And then comment 5B - once again, it numerates all the differences between legitimate uses of fast flux and some of the characteristics of fast flux as used for criminal purposes. And once again, I thought that these were covered very well in other sections of the report including how fast flux (unintelligible) and characteristics of fast flux. So I didn't feel that that comment (unintelligible) started (unintelligible) going back and changing that (unintelligible). So any strong feelings on that?

Man: Also agreed.

James Bladel: Okay, well - so that's category 3 and 5. Marika, I think that we have concluded as a group that there are no 3 and 5 comments that do not generate any new additions or revisions to the report. So we can - if (Dave) has joined we can move on to question 4, we have apology from (Cal) both for not being on the call, but also that he has category 6 to us later, so we can jump ahead to Paul, category 7 and 8 for discussion. And as soon as I pull that up here I'll turn it over to Paul.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Can I just ask one question because everyone is providing very good recommendations you know, why it hasn't already been addressed and does everyone feel comfortable that we include this information in the categorization document and maybe include it as an annex, so to provide other evidence how to go about to deal with the comments and keep them inclined as well where that comments actually happened and are addressed in the documents.

Would people feel comfortable with that, I mean of course that is a document that people can review as well and then you know rewrite as they fit if they are sentences they don't like or things like that and what do people think of that?

James Bladel: If I understand this correctly you are proposing that we capture not only the text and comments, but also our analysis of them in an annex?

Marika Konings: Yes, correct. What I've been doing basically doing the categorization document that we have been using is to track how is looking, and which categories and for some I've included like, what people have already posted and lists you know, why do folks feel that they haven't been addressed or the purposed tax that has been included. It would be ways to track with you know group comments and where they have been addressed or where they were already addressed in the initial report.

James Bladel: So you are saying, about capturing that last column - working group or whatever that is called in text. And I'm okay with that, but we can put that up to the group or ask for a discussion.

Rod Rasmussen: This is Rod I think this is kind of necessarily especially when we our conclusion of that is we have already covered it in the document and refer where the document is covered.

James Bladel: Okay, Marika. It sounds like we are on board with that. I sound like we are on board with that.

Marika Konings: Okay, so once you have gone through all the comments I'll include everything in this document so that people have a chance as well to review this and make sure they are happy with how things are reflected, so that's great.

James Bladel: Okay, taking a look at category 7 now. There were three comments grouped into this category and Paul did a very through analysis of those. So Paul do you want to start with 7.

Paul Diaz: Sure, thanks James. You know, I don't know how through because obviously from the list my memory wasn't as good as it could have been. Anyway, 7 and 8 are both similar in that the folks posted comments were taking issue with the fast flux used by free speak advocates. Note that we had made in the report and as Greg accurately noted - do you all hear me okay? I have some weird feedback.

Man: You sound fine.

Man: You sound fine. There is just a little clicking noise, but it's fine.

Paul Diaz: Okay, anyway the point is the - we do have the distance of the ultra reach service and there is - someone is supposed to have a list, other examples as well. Legitimate uses of (flux) techniques to forward those ends, so.

You know, the recommendation was -- and Marika has (put it in) -- the text actually that Greg had purposed, so it now reads, "The working group also identifies the use of fast flux, a service providers wishing to deal with situations in which government or other (acts are) deliberately preventing it access to services (unintelligible) in a country or region or is engaged in censorship. This is described as a possible 'legitimate use.'"

We also note that legality may vary by jurisdiction if the working group is not taking a position on the legality or illegality of any particular service provided by implementation.

So the key here is that we are underscoring that there could be these uses - these potential uses, legitimate uses and that we as a group are not going to comment on these legality or illegality of such uses as the (poster) had noted.

And, again, Marika, as I went through the report - you have already plugged these in right, I saw them outlined. What used to be 494 through 497, it looked like it is all there, correct?

Marika Konings: Correct.

Paul Diaz: So that's 7A and B. C was a very straight forward one. Dr. (Gary Warner) was just urging us to include on a list of those who benefit (make) explicit criminal entities. Criminals obviously benefit - can benefit from (that plug). So that was straight forward and we just plugged a new bullet at around on 151, I believe. Criminal entities is added to the list of those who benefit.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you, Paul. And I see that there were comments on the list from primarily (Dave), but Greg did you also comment on this or was it just an exchange between Paul and (Dave)?

Greg Aaron: Um, I think it's (unintelligible).

James Bladel: I'm sorry. I didn't catch that?

Greg Aaron: Yeah, there is a lot of feedback on this line are you hearing it?

James Bladel: Yeah, it's killing me.

Man: I'm having that too.

James Bladel: Glen, if you're on the line, do you think there is anything we could do asking the operator to take a look?

Glen DeSaintgery: (Unintelligible) the noise now (unintelligible) thank you.

James Bladel: Then perhaps everyone if you are speaking then make sure that you are on mute and if could not use the speakerphone if it's at all possible just to eliminate (unintelligible). It sounds like it's gone now. Or did we lose everyone?

Man: No, that's perfect James. It's clear now.

James Bladel: And I see that (Dave) has joined also. But he is also on mute. Hello (Dave). We are focusing on comments 7A, B and C and I noticed that you and Greg had some comments on Paul's inclusions or recommendations. Seems relatively straight forward to me but depending on if anyone has a differing positions that they would like get on the floor for discussion?

And, everyone who participated in that exchange is satisfied with the results? Okay, it sounds like we can move on.

Paul Diaz: All right then. I also had question group 8, who would benefit from cessation, again Dr. (Gary Warner) he wanted us to make explicit that

law enforcement investigators could benefit from the cessation of fast flux. And it seems very straight forward so it is just a clarification and we plugged in new text. It appears now on lines 203 and 204, a bullet that reads, "Law enforcement investigators who have to divert their limited resources to contain fast flux networks -- fast flux attack networks, pardon -- use to perpetrate various online crimes."

So it is just a straight forward one. I mean it's not new, just making it explicit.

James Bladel: And would that be the only comment in that category Paul?

Paul Diaz: I believe so. It was short.

James Bladel: I'm having trouble pulling up the documents.

Paul Diaz: Yeah, it was.

James Bladel: Okay.

Paul Diaz: It looks longer in the document just because we provide a lot of background text.

James Bladel: Okay. Well that seems relatively straight forward and reasonable. Has anyone had any thoughts on that? I see that Greg just voiced his agreement with that.

Okay, well for section 7 and section 8, it looks like we have a couple of minor changes. Marika, it seems like we have a couple of minor changes. Marika, it sounds like some of those have already been

incorporated in the document or could be relatively short ordered. Did you capture those?

Marika Konings: Sorry, which category did you mean?

James Bladel: Seven and eight, just in general, the additions of criminals, beneficiaries of fast flux and the addition of law enforcement and...

Marika Konings: Yes, those changes have already been incorporated in the draft.

James Bladel: Okay. And thank you Paul for taking a look at those two categories.

Paul Diaz: No problem.

James Bladel: Okay, well now that (Dave) has joined, can we circle back to category 4 and take a look at the items that were posted today. And I apologize. I didn't really have an opportunity today to take a look at them in depth. (Dave) perhaps you can start us with category 4A?

Is (Dave) still on the line?

Dave Piscitello I'm just sort of going through all the actions under category 4 and then I set sort of my ideas to Rod and Rod reviewed them and in most cases has complementary paragraph or observation, so what you see in front of you was posted by me, but it's actually a joint effort by Rod and myself as we were directed.

So 4A was a comment regarding strict laws in place so our registrars and hosting companies to terminate fast flux hosting. The (unintelligible) answer is essentially kind of scopes out what I can remit

and what is not with respect to legislation and regulation. And explain you know, some of the challenges and trying to find the adopt law or policy to determine fast flux. And I think what we mostly do here is emphasizes that this won't - one of the major things to the report, and again, tease out that notion that there is a difference between vital networking techniques using fast flux production applications versus the same techniques that might be part of the techniques that characterize the fast flux attack network.

So for a fairly long place, fairly long but you know, that is the general jest of it. I suggest that perhaps if it would be more useful to have people review it and then comment online, than try to comment during the conversation.

James Bladel: Okay. And I think that...

Man: James, I had a quick question.

Man: The question is, was your proposed answer both paragraphs or just the first and then the second paragraph was for the list sort of (feeling) out your thoughts?

Dave Piscitello Actually, I think whether or not it goes in - what goes into the report either in the main body or as part of the response that we summarize in the appendix, or as a part of the response that we summarize in the appendix is up to the committee. I think that the first paragraph certainly captures most of what I intend.

The second paragraph is largely Rod's perspective so perhaps he could comment on that?

Rod Rasmussen: Yeah, I don't have the benefit (unintelligible). I'm driving at the moment. But (unintelligible) what I was talking about the pharma bill or pharma laws US.

Dave Piscitello Yeah, that's right.

Rod Rasmussen: Yeah, I was just using that as an example of existing law that touches on the (unintelligible) what the questioner had in there which is - I kind of keyed in the word "allow" versus require -- I thought from the tone of the question the guy meant require. But allow brings up and point which I don't know if we really talked about very much and I don't remember talking about is the Safe Harbor Law, how it applies to (unintelligible) registrars and when we started the fast flux working group, we don't really have at least in the US a Safe Harbor Laws that touched registrars.

As of April 15th of this year we do, so I thought that was pertinent information and I know it is kind of late to through it in the paper. But it is actually a fairly major change in the framework around which we've been discussing this.

That question keyed that thought in my mind, so that's why I put that in there.

James Bladel: Can I raise a general question to the group, which is that I haven't really had a chance to examine these submissions in depth and I think that I'm possible not alone on that. And it sounds like there is a lot more to cover here and I wonder if we should allow these exchanges to continue on the list for our next call for category 4. Understanding

that that introduces a bit of a delay, but I want to make sure that we've covering these thoroughly and doing them justice and I want to make sure that we've not introducing new information at this stage in the game and I don't know, I just don't feel comfortable having not read them doing this on the fly. But if it's just me we can go on.

Paul Diaz: James, this is Paul. I'd appreciate a little more time. That's why I asked the question should I be thinking about both the paragraphs and the one. I need more time to think it through as well.

Dave Piscitello James, I actually realize that, and Rod does as well, that we weren't able to find time - in time to give people review time, so I didn't expect that you know we would be able to review and agree on all these in line - in time during the call. So I think it's - I would actually prefer that people get a chance to really - I guess what we've written because there is a lot there.

James Bladel: Okay. I think that's very sensible (Dave) and thanks to you and Rod for putting these together and it's clear that you guys put a lot of thought into these and I want to make sure we do justice to your work.

Greg Aaron: I concur with that as well and I apologize for the (verbosity) that (Dave) and I tend to have but (unintelligible) do that.

Dave Piscitello You know in our defense, these are really tricky issues. I'm sorry, some of the these questions were really, really tricky because they either show that maybe we haven't explored something carefully enough or that there were some other issues that we just really need to hammer home that we - that are reflected in some fairly insightful comments.

James Bladel: That's a good assessment (Dave) and certainly if something warns a little more work on our part, we are not afraid of that we just want to continue the balance of wanting to get his work wrapped up but also (ensure) the quality of whatever it is we need to deliver.

So why don't we - is it necessarily to - (Dave) now that you are on the call to circle back to some of the changes that you proposed, and you referenced them by line number and I really apologize folks, I'm having a lot of trouble bringing up the PDF.

But there was line 275, line 326 and line 344. Maybe, Marika, you can give us the status of have those changes been incorporated into the document or?

Marika Konings: Well they weren't actually changes I think that (Dave) proposed. I think it was more you know the group should maybe have a look and then admit there is maybe a need for clarification.

(Dave) 0 I think he didn't propose any specific wording or changing yet, no? It was more to flag that these lines needed a little bit more attention.

Dave Piscitello: Right, I think that there were some - and Greg (unintelligible) had actually commented on at least one. As I was going through it or introducing the changes that tried to clarify the distinction between fast flux attack networks and volatile networking, you know, I was trying to read a little bit more carefully and I sort of fell dumb I didn't do this before the interim report as carefully as I did this last past.

But there were some lines that just didn't seem to hold together with the remainder of the report. And so line 269 said something on the order of, encourage (ISPs) to instrument their own networks. It is such an open-ended statement, I wasn't certain what we wanted to say there and whether there was more that had been accidentally edited or did we have something specific to fast flux networking that we wanted to advise (ISPs) to consider. So I was just raising that as a question.

(Joe): I can go and address that when there is just a second. This is (Joe) and the idea there is often when you visit with (ISPs) it will say things like, "Well, I'd really love to help but you know, I really don't have any visibility into my network at all."

What happens there is essentially is you know a black box (unintelligible). And what I'd like to go ahead and do is make sure that (ISPs) receive encouragement to do things like (net flows), make sure they go ahead and do things like actually you know, save (DHDP) logs so they can actually map a customer to an (IP) address at a given time.

So the point is sort of just general best practices for things like being able to go ahead and detect and observe what is being done that is abusive on one's network.

Man: So if you want to change that to say, do (net flow) just to go ahead and make it very concrete.

Man: Maybe what you can do is capture what you just said in you know and put it on an email because I think there is a fairly wide spread of (ISPs) just as there are wide spreads of registrars in terms of capabilities and

expertise. And I know my local (ISP) would say, "What's (net flow)?"
So...

Man: That's precisely the problem.

Man: I know, so I think we are opening up or at least we don't have to say that this within ICANN's (unintelligible) but I think we can make the observation to just be certainly be beneficial.

James Bladel: Maybe we can get some proposed text...

Man: ...like that verbiage.

James Bladel: Was that Rod that was proposing that. I'm sorry. I'm not recognizing...

(Joe): Joe.

James Bladel: Okay. So maybe we can get some proposed text on (a list).

(Joe): Verbiage will be sent.

James Bladel: Okay. And is (net flow) a product or is it a protocol or - I'm not familiar with that?

(Joe): It's a technology, essentially what it does is give you a flow record so essentially where something came from, where it went and how long it was doing it and basically how much data was transferred with some other bits and pieces.

James Bladel: Okay.

(Joe): But in a nut shell, it essentially goes ahead and allows you to see for example, if you have bad guys abusing a host, you can see the traffic coming, you can see the traffic going out. Not necessarily the level of the content, but the level of the actual source and destination.

James Bladel: Okay. But I think that (Dave) is correct that that would just be a recommendation as opposed to anything ICANN can cause to happen.

Line 326 was the next one (Dave)?

Marika Konings: No, there was one before that, 275.

James Bladel: Oh, I'm sorry 275, okay. And if you have the report handy Marika can you summarize what that is about?

Marika Konings: Yeah, well it's basically one bullet that says, "Establish guidelines for the use of specific techniques such as (very low) (TTL) values." And (Dave) if you can maybe explain why you had an issue with that one?

Dave Piscitello just thought that saying "use" without a qualifier - appropriate use seemed a little nebulous and - because just "use" can be malicious use, so I just wanted to quantify or qualify that a little bit. So it's just insertion of the work "appropriate" before the word "use" on line 275.

James Bladel: Okay.

Dave Piscitello So then on line 326, I think this is one of the areas that simply point out that we have a statement that reflects the interim draft status of the prior report. And so if you read line 326, one of the questions that is

says is, "What is needed for these to be kind of final conclusions rather than interim?"

And I think that is a boarder action and looking at the line and saying yes or no, I think that's just sort of points out that there is text there that we have to decide probably through a mailing discussion, you know, how are we going to deal with this so that the recommendation is final recommendation as opposed to a -or final conclusion as opposed to an interim conclusion.

Marika Konings: And this relates to chapter 8 and 9 basically, these are the parts of the executive summary that actually summarize what was discussed in those chapters, so basically part of a next discussion that we need to have and need on those two chapters that some will of course be reflected in the executive summary accordingly.

Dave Piscitello Exactly, yeah.

James Bladel: The executive summary that refer to those - what we were calling those chapters that have been subbed out but no finished in sections 8 and 9.

Okay, well we will have to take a look at that and we have that identified for a future meeting on our - over the horizon, which is already looking a little rough because we couldn't cover 4 and 6, but that's okay. We can press on.

What I'd like to do next is take a look at category 9 and find some volunteers. Hopefully we can get three or four folks to sign up because it's such a large group.

Marika Konings: Dave, can I maybe make one comment first? There was some discussion - I think there was some relation to category 4 I think on the (Manheim) formula that it has disappeared from the report. I just checked and it is still there but it's definitely very hidden because it is basically linked through (Randy Vaughn)'s study that is in the annex now. So if you click through there you end up in his study which explains the (Manheim) formula.

But as some people mentioned it might be worth bringing it back into the document somewhere. So if anyone wants to make a suggestion where that would be appropriate and provide some text for that, that would be helpful.

(Joe): I would definitely like to see it back in there to tell you the truth. I think it is a real central piece of technology that people should be aware of. This is (Joe).

James Bladel: Okay and this is for category 4, Marika?

Marika Konings: I think it was mentioned in relation to category 4, but I don't know if it necessarily fits within any of the areas there or whether - I think Rod mentioned that if he wants to have a look at the document to see where it would be appropriate to mention it and then as well if anyone has a suggestion for some language that we put around that.

I'm happy to look back as well in previous drafts to see if we some (text) and put it on the list to see if people want to see that back in, either way.

Rod Rasmussen: This is Rod. I think that it was definitely depicted previously in the body. I was actually looking for the reference to it to - you know, as a response to one of the comments and (I did) a search and it was gone so that's why I brought it up. I think a previous version might be something to bring up and see where it was fitting logically before.

Marika Konings: Okay, I will look back then to see what was incorporated and where it was and I'll put it on the list so that people can comment whether that is accurate or whether they would like to see if phrased differently or whether they would like to see it in some other place in the report.

James Bladel: Well we appreciate the efforts to make that more conspicuous.

Rod Rasmussen: One other (unintelligible), I think there was at least one other comments that (Dave) and I have that basically says we've already covered this. We might be able to knock that on off today, so we don't have to do that one over the next week or so. I (forgot) which one that was.

James Bladel: Do you remember which one that was?

Rod Rasmussen: I don't off the top of my head. Unfortunately I'm still in my car.

James Bladel: Okay.

Rod Rasmussen: It was like 4G or 4F, somewhere in the middle.

James Bladel: Okay. I'm going through them as quickly as I can now. (Unintelligible) anyone (unintelligible). It's not G; it's not F.

Rod Rasmussen: (Dave) do you remember which one it was?

Dave Piscitello Was this the one from the (IPC)?

Rod Rasmussen: It might have been that one.

Dave Piscitello Actually then I misunderstood your email and I posted your comments (unintelligible) proposed response. Why don't we take a look at it and we'll post to the list if there is a clarification.

I'm sorry. I was just trying to get it out this morning and perhaps I did it a little too much in haste, so the best thing to do is for Rod to get himself situated where he can take a look at all the postings because if he received everything in one large email and I broke them up so that it would not completely overwhelm people and we could comment action by action.

((Crosstalk))

Rod Rasmussen: I haven't seen what the final looked like on that one, so. We will go ahead and do this review as stated before.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you.

That brings us back to category 9, which has 23 different items, Marika, is that correct?

Marika Konings: Let me just check, it is A through V so, yes.

James Bladel: I will go ahead and take the first seven - volunteer for the first seven, so that's (unintelligible) is that correct? Am I converting numbers to letters appropriately?

Marika Konings: Yes. I think so.

James Bladel: Anyone else want to jump in there? I know that fast flux is high on everyone's desired list of tasks for the next week.

Dave Piscitello: I'm not going to be able to take an assignment this week. I have two board reports to write and I'm heading out to Barcelona on Sunday night. So I apologize, but I just don't have any (bandwidth) the moment.

James Bladel: Understood. I think it's certainly understandable.

Paul Diaz: James this is Paul. I can jump in and take a chunk. I'm just a little curious - all these are focused on calls for more study and whatnot. Yeah, I guess I'm just left wondering how the draft that we have posted right now, we work off of that.

So if I go back to see what text we're currently - we're using in terms of references to other studies that are done, things that are available to us etcetera, can we refer to that because I'm just a little concerned that you know, if somebody out there in the community says there should be more study, how do we as a working group say, look we understand that - how some of us from the very start thought that we should have been doing additional research before a (PDP) process was kicked off.

And I just really don't want to create a situation where by recognizing these other folks (unintelligible) comments calling for additional work that we are kind of creating an open end for this particular process. I mean, I guess I'm just struggling with so many of them are like, do this, do that but where do we say - where do we draw the line?

James Bladel: Well I think that is an excellent point, Paul. I think we should probably agree on some sort of set of criteria or some sort of litmus test where we set the bar very high whether or not we include recommendations for further study into our report in the next steps or whether we just acknowledge it in the comments annex.

And I think that, you know just off the cuff, I think it would have to be new information that doesn't overlap or duplicate existing studies that are mentioned in the report. It would have to conceivably yield very narrow and actionable information to formulate a policy.

And if it fails on any of those accounts or if it's too vague, it needs to be tightened up. (Unintelligible) we can just acknowledge it and in the comments and move on but not actually promote it to a recommended next step.

Paul Diaz: Okay. So then you had through letter - what James, G? H?

James Bladel: Through G.

Why don't we just call it H?

Paul Diaz: Or I'd got the other way. Why don't you take through F, and then I will take G because if there are three comments from the (IPC)

constituency. I'll take G through - why don't I do P, that way I'll have Mr. (Overton)'s - all of his as well.

James Bladel: And then we need P through V, which is the last chunk. No takers, goodness. We're going to have to start bribing people, Marika.

Dave Piscitello If there are no takers and we can't get it done by next week, I can probably commit to doing some of them you know the week after. I just can't do any more between now and the 15th.

James Bladel: Why don't I just - why don't Paul and I just do the ones that we've signed on for and I will just continue as far as I can beginning at P and see how far I can get through that before the next (unintelligible). Does that sound reasonable?

Dave Piscitello Yeah. The other thing you might want to consider James is to just post your thoughts. And maybe we can resolve some of these through (unintelligible) on these conversations.

James Bladel: Sure. It's a good idea and I'll try and get those out this weekend and then that will give some folks some time to start a discussion if any is warranted.

Okay, so it looks like we have about eight minutes remaining and we've got a couple of items that we pushed off into next week. So we will tackle some of the proposed text changes and we are looking for some suggested text from - on the list and we will have a chance to digest category 4 and category 6 on the list and we will cover those first next week.

And then we will dive into category 9. Once we get through the comments then we can begin taking a look at those incomplete sections - sections 8 and 9 and start thinking about how we are going to tie this up with a bow and present it to council.

So please, I would encourage everyone to stay active on the list. The more we can accomplish in the period between calls the more - the closer we are to getting this wrapped up and getting our Wednesday mornings back and still making sure that we are doing justice to all the work that came before.

We can conclude a few minutes early if there is no other items of business, anyone?

Man: May I suggest that if there is a way we can start a couple of threads on the conclusion section that might not be a bad idea to just kind of if nothing else get the ball rolling.

James Bladel: Okay. So we can start that. I'm a little hesitant to do that until we have a chance to go through these last two categories. I think after next week that's appropriate just in case there needs to - but I mean, I guess, I don't even know where I would start with that - with these things outstanding.

Man: Okay.

James Bladel: But I agree, if we can do as much in parallel as possible that it's going to get us closer to our goal.

Marika, do we have anything at all in the sections now or are they just place holders?

Marika Konings: I think it was 5.3 or 5.4 or I think they were just place holder things. (Unintelligible) wait for further comments and constituency's statements have been received before reviewing this further.

James Bladel: Okay. Well maybe we can at least put together a format of what we want to recommend different categories of recommendations if we want to recommend further studies for example or best practices for (IT) entities or best practices for non-contracted entities or best practices for law enforcement or whatever we can put together a couple of different categories of recommendations and we can flush them out later once we've had a change to process the comments.

Okay well that's it. I think we've covered quite a bit this call and let's just keep it moving and I just would encourage everyone to work on the list and keep our eyes on the prize that we want to get through this as expeditiously as possible.

Man: Okay, good call.

Man: Thanks everyone.

END