

**Fast Flux PDP WG Teleconference
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 10 June 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 10 June 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-20090610.mp3>

On page:
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#june>

Present for the teleconference:

James Bladel - GodaddyRRc - Working Group chair
Paul Diaz - Network Solutions
Ihab Shraim - Markmonitor.com
Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC

Observers (no constituency affiliation)
Randall Vaughn
Jose Nazario
Rod Rasmussen (joined after roll call)

Staff:

Marika Konings
Glen de Saint Gery
Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:

Dave Piscitello
Kal Fehrer (for all Wednesday calls)
Greg Aaron - Afiliac Ry c.
Joe St Sauveur

Coordinator: This call is now being recorded.

Gisella Gruber-White: Wonderful. Thank you. We'll just start with the roll call.

Good afternoon everyone. We've got James Bladel, Jose Nazario on the call, Randall Vaughn, Paul Diaz, Mike Rodenbaugh, Ihab Shraim - say it correctly?

Ihab Shraim: That's all right. Ihab Shraim.

Gisella Gruber-White: We have - from staff we have Marika Konings, Glen DeSaintgery and myself Gisella Gruber-White. And as apologies today we have Kal Fehrer, Dave Piscitello, Greg Aaron, and Joe St. Seveur. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you Gisella. Good morning or afternoon everyone. And thank you for those who showed up here in the last 15 seconds; you saved the call. We had four folks join right after we were deciding whether or not we were going to continue.

So what we have scheduled for today and I apologize - Marika and I were discussing an agenda for today and I did not send out a proposed agenda. But we have several things to cover, first of which would be Mike did you want to include a statement relative to Section 5 8 and 5 9?

It seems like we had a rough consensus on the group that TTL metering was not really wanting - avenue we wanted to go down as a recommendation but we certainly wanted to make sure that yourself and if there's anyone else that's interested wanted to put in a alternative view that that would give you opportunities to do that.

Mike Rodenbach: I appreciate that. I mean, you know, to be clear I never suggested that it should be a recommendation. I just wanted to make sure it

wasn't completely foreclosed as a possibility because I don't think that we got that far in the working group.

That said I've reviewed the draft sent around by Marika, commented on by Ihab and with (Rod)'s comments incorporated. And I'm pretty comfortable with it; maybe a couple small changes that we can discuss as we go through it. But I don't think I'm going to put in anything separate.

James Bladel: Okay, all right, that's fair. And if you change your mind we were thinking that you probably could - if you could get something to us in the next couple of days if you - you're reading something and something significant causes you to change your mind then just let us know.

Mike Rodenbach: Okay, thanks.

James Bladel: Okay. And then, you know, just as an announcement we were really hoping that today would be the last teleconference for this group. And its further review could be conducted on the list. And for that to be a feasible approach - and I just want to put this out to the group for proposal. Of course if the majority thinks we still need further calls I'll go along with that.

But thinking that we can get through the changes that we have for today and then Marika can consolidate them into a document that identifies or highlights the differences between the interim report and final report.

We can go through those on the list put in our suggestions on the mailing list and then reach some sort of a deadline or consensus on the mailing list. And essentially that would be a wrap up.

We did the same of course for a draft motion which probably wouldn't be presented in Sydney but the first council meeting following Sydney which I think is in mid-July.

So I just wanted to put that proposal out to the group just to be clear that this would be the last call and that further review of the entire document, including the changes from the interim report would be down on the list.

How do folks feel about that idea?

Paul Diaz: James this is Paul. I think that's fine.

James Bladel: Okay. Thanks Paul.

I take the rest of the silence as no one has a burning desire to continue Wednesday morning.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I would just, you know, just like to leave the door open that in case there are issues that do attract substantial discussion on the list or whether there's no response I would like to keep the option open to at least have maybe one final call where everyone basically says year we're fine with the report as it currently is, it's ready to go out, we're happy with the recommendations, we're happy with the motion.

So I mean if we can resolve everything on the list I think, you know, it's fine, no call needed. But I just would like to keep the option open in case there's not enough feedback or not enough clarity whether everyone's fine with it that we can have that final yes we've done it, ready to go kind of call.

James Bladel: I think that's a good point Marika and I agree with you. I was just - didn't want to start off on that path because I think the precipitation might be too great to actually use that option.

But yes you're absolutely right. If we actually hit sort of an impasse on the list or the number of versions or threads became unmanageable then we would have, you know, just a brief conference to sort of resolve those - clear up the confusion. But otherwise I think we can proceed in that direction.

Okay. The next topic would be to review Ihab's document here. And I think it was also - contains some changes from (Rod). And this is - must be Ihab's version that was sent I believe yesterday evening, section - for the last two section recommendations and next steps. So I think includes the next steps.

And we went through the red and blue changes on our last call but we're right now focusing on the purple and yellow changes. Is that correct Marika?

Marika Konings: I don't think we went through any of the changes because I don't think everyone had had a chance to review them but I might be wrong. I'm not sure whether it's right to refer to the colors because I think they

might come out differently depending on this computer. Because I have green and purple for example. So...

James Bladel: Okay well maybe we should just go through the document here real quickly as an overview and just take a look at that. Because I apologize - I think that you may be correct that not everyone's had a chance to review that for our last call.

Marika Konings: I think we did the five point eight and five point nine. We did finalize those. But I don't know - anyone else was on the call last week because I remember that for example Greg didn't have a chance to read it and I'm not sure whether others - everyone else had read it.

So - because at least I don't recall and I haven't taken any notes at least from what was decided at that point. So...

James Bladel: Okay fair enough. Looking at the first paragraph then under the subheading "Conclusions" the first change is that the main registration was altered to read DNS use and modifications. Anyone have any concerns with that?

Okay. The next paragraph was heavily modified. It now reads, "The working group recognizes (the networking) technique and as such can be a (deployed) for enlisted or legitimate purposes." And that replaces several sections.

I want to make sure that everyone has had a chance to review those; that they don't believe we're throwing out any babies with that bathwater and if there's something from the deleted section that you want to preserve.

Paul Diaz: (A change) for the group - this is Paul - question.

James Bladel: Yes Paul.

Paul Diaz: The question is for the group, you know, I'm - I love that we're trying to boil the text down. The report is quite long to begin with. But does the group feel that perhaps we've maybe cut too much, particular, you know, the verbiage that talks about the challenges that the group faced in identifying all the various aspects?

And losing that in our conclusion section - I mean given the length of the report I can easily imagine people, you know, skimming the executive summary and then jumping to the conclusion just to sort of get the, you know, important stuff.

And if we've cut out any of the text that does address the - some of the challenges that we faced and the subtleties of the issues, you know, does the group feel that perhaps we're going too far? That perhaps we've edited a bit too much here?

Randall Vaughn: This is Randy. And no I don't think we've gone too far. I think it's obvious we went through a lot of changes and actually the verbiage we had here really doesn't address all the issues that came up during the group.

James Bladel: Okay anyone else on that topic?

Paul and Randy I think you both make valid points. The only change I had from looking at this would be possibly including followed by our,

“After numerous and spirited debates”, comma, “the working group recognizes.” And that doesn’t make it necessarily a lot longer but I think it captures actually some of the challenges that you were discussing Paul.

Paul Diaz: And just for the record again I love that we can boil this down, you know, just deliver our message. If the group feels that A., we’ve got all of that detail and all the substance in the body of the report and it’s good for it to remain there I’m fine with it.

James Bladel: Okay. So do we feel we want to leave that section alone as it reads now?

Or do we want to add any other (phrasings that)...?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. One question Paul. Are you referring to the paragraph that was deleted by Mike on the numerous and spirited debates ensued and whether it was possible to discern or the follow on one by James gaining a common appreciation and broad understanding or it’s more in general? I’m just trying to understand where...

Paul Diaz: In general Marika. I just...

Marika Konings: Okay.

Paul Diaz: We see a lot that was deleted. In some cases great, you know, it just makes the text tighter and delivers the message quicker. My only concern was for the group just to make sure that everybody’s thought through if people jump to conclusions and we haven’t touched on or we

don't include any of that sort of background. Does anybody on the call in the group maybe feel that we edited a bit too much - gone too far?

Again I don't have a strong feeling one way or another. I just wanted to make sure that it was raised.

James Bladel: Yeah I would just point out that Paul's correct that some folks will - this will be all they read but, you know, all they'll have time to read when faced with a 100 plus page report. So just that the executive summary needs to be very concise to capture all the challenges about any material omission.

Marika Konings: It's Marika. I mean some of those challenges will come back in executive summary. And then, you know, once we've finalized the report I'll of course update the executive summary and I'll, you know, would encourage people to read that thoroughly to indeed ensure that they feel that either it's covered in this chapter or in the executive summary.

And as you said Paul the report is so long probably most people are focusing on those two sections.

James Bladel: Paul could I ask that you make a note here of this section and that when we do the final read through if you don't feel that's sufficiently captured in the executive summary or in the conclusion that maybe we could come back to the section stores some of the language that captures that?

Paul Diaz: Not to pass the buck James but I'd ask maybe Marika makes the note. Because again I feel that it reads well. It's punchy, it delivers the

message, and that's good. My concern was do others in the group because we've had such spirited debates over this 12, 14 month process feel that we were losing something?

And I don't necessarily want to put any deleted sections back in.

James Bladel: Okay.

Paul Diaz: I'm not advocating for that. I just wanted to raise it on the call and make sure everybody was in agreement.

So there might be others who aren't with us today that have strong opinions one way or the other, et cetera. You know, I can raise it again later on or it's probably more appropriate just for Marika to ask question of the group when we do our final walkthrough.

James Bladel: Okay. Marika can you take that as a note?

Marika Konings: Yep.

James Bladel: Okay thanks.

And thanks Paul.

Moving to the next section looks like just basic wordsmithing. The list that I put together was modified to read a little bit better. And the material change was to include any other online businesses and it didn't have any, as I said, friendly edits.

So the next sentence changes - removes the sentence about no one category or type of organization is capable of unilaterally addressing the issue. And changes after coordination and cooperation is therefore necessary.

I think it somewhat waters down the point that I was trying to make but I'm fine with that; I don't have strong feelings if there's no other concerns from the group on it.

Okay and by the way thanks Mike for cleaning up this documents. I know I tend to be a little wordy. So reason number 47 why I never would have made it as a lawyer. So - but then the next section says key components of better understanding (unintelligible) data collections (data) monitoring and data sharing (unintelligible).

Then it kind of jumps down to the various parties section. Does anyone feel that we've lost too much in that deletion - (Rod), Paul, or (Brian) or do we feel that that's an appropriate jump?

Okay. I take the silence to mean that everybody's okay with that change.

Ihab Shraim: This is Ihab Shraim. I just wanted to - by the way I've read it and it's really a very well written conclusion. There are some, you know, like words that might probably reflect differently depending on the reader.

Are we looking for changing some of these words - I'm not speaking in terms of wordsmithing to the level of changing the content of a sentence. But I'm speaking of like for example we alluded here to go

Speak with you know, alternative - hold on let me just read this section for you so that it will be clear.

It says among the various parties, registrants, registries, et cetera, and then it says security service which eliminates security firm as in private firm. So probably maybe we will say services and firms so that no one will be excluded.

James Bladel: Okay and by firms you mean...

Ihab Shraim: Or vendors. I mean I'm not speaking the words here. I just don't want to exclude a vendor - one of the large vendors to be a member per se in the security space - security services don't include normally all the vendors who offer products out there.

James Bladel: Okay. Well I think somewhere earlier in the document we referred to the securities services providers - security services and service providers or something like that.

Ihab Shraim: I think that's fair.

Just maybe a more generic verbiage so that it will include everybody.

James Bladel: Perhaps Marika if you could see - refer to best type of organization earlier in a document it could make sense with that.

Marika Konings: Okay.

James Bladel: Okay. Thanks Ihab.

Ihab Shraim: You're welcome.

James Bladel: The next section changed fairly significantly. (If this research will be the) basis for future work in facilitating detection and intervention if circumstances (unintelligible) probably detrimental. I'm fine with that.

Key proposals merit further attention, particularly in areas where an unacceptable level of false positives proved detrimental for registrants affected by intervention.

And then there's some wordsmithing until we get to the blue section - I'm sorry I'll stop referring to those colors - where it says alternatively processes could be adopted such that the neutral expert would determine the validity of the claim of malicious (unintelligible) (exploits).

From my personal position I'm fine with that as long as we maintain the word "could" as opposed to "should" or "shall." And I think that's fine; that merits further development as an option but that's not necessarily a description.

Any thoughts on that paragraph before we move on to the changes by (Rod)?

Mike Rodenbach: James this is Mike.

James Bladel: Yes Mike.

Mike Rodenbach: One question - the third sentence that starts, "These proposals..." I don't think it's very clear what we're talking about there. Are we talking about the first of three proposals mentioned in the first sentence?

James Bladel: I think so. The proposals being (unintelligible) data collection, (being data) monitoring and data sharing among various parties.

Mike Rodenbach: Okay. So this - so the problem is in the next sentence says, "This research," then the next sentence says "These proposals." It was just confusing to me what we're talking about throughout there. So if you could clarify it a little bit.

James Bladel: That's a good point. Maybe a proposal is not the best term there. Maybe - I'm just shooting from the hip here. Maybe...

Man: Use the same word "component" so it ties it back to the first sentence.

James Bladel: Okay. These components? Or this component?

Man: I think it's still plural because you have identified three different things that they're doing.

Mike Rodenbach: Yeah and then maybe change the first phrase to "key components" rather than "a key component." That would make sense. Just keep it consistent.

James Bladel: Yeah. I think that's good Mike. Did you catch that Marika?

Marika Konings: Yep I did.

James Bladel: Okay. Okay so then diving into the next paragraph that begins, "Such a process." It's fairly lengthy here so I didn't want to necessarily read it

out loud. But has everyone had a chance to take a look at this and skim this? And (Rod) this was your insert, right?

Mike Rodenbach: I think it's (Rod). But again it starts out, "Such a process," and it's not really clear exactly what process you're talking about.

James Bladel: Right.

Marika Konings: Just to clarify these are added that (Rod) provided in an email commenting on I think the version that Mike sent out and I've actually integrated them here. (Rod) did confirm in an email that - I think he was okay with where I inserted it how I phrased some of these things. Some things were just more suggestions and not exact recommended changes.

James Bladel: Okay. Well and I think it's probably (unintelligible) wordsmithing just to if nothing else bring it into line with the changes we've made in the preceding paragraph. But I think as far as the material exclusion was there anything that anyone felt strongly about?

Okay so maybe Marika we could change some of the terminology to reflect what we've already changed in the previous paragraph. And we can keep that version.

Moving to the next paragraph...

Marika Konings: Sorry just to clarify so what would you like to change then? Instead of talking about process referring into components or...?

James Bladel: That may be not (unintelligible).

Paul Diaz: A question for the group James.

James Bladel: Yes.

Paul Diaz: Why not just begin instead of starting - having the paragraph begin, "In such a process," why not have it begin with that new final sentence from the previous, "Alternatively that's a start," and then, "Such a process" just follows from your second paragraph now reads, "Alternatively process could be adopted," just combine it that way. If you're going to have two paragraphs might as well have the thoughts combined together.

James Bladel: That definitely segues a lot cleaner.

Mike your thoughts?

Mike Rodenbach: Sounds fine to me.

James Bladel: Okay so let's try that Marika and then maybe we can see how that reads in the final read through.

Mike Rodenbach: So one thing and then a further question - the last sentence is, "Some proposals do exist," blah, blah, blah. Are we going to - are those referenced somewhere else in the report?

Or I guess - I think (Rod)'s referring to the dot Asia proposal which is mentioned in the possible next steps section. Is that - is (Rod) on the call or is that correct?

(Rod): I just joined the call actually like two seconds ago and heard my name used in vain.

Mike Rodenbach: Hey (Rod); no not in vain.

James Bladel: No in praise.

Mike Rodenbach: So yeah (Rod) we're on your inserts on the second page of this document that was sent around by Marika yesterday.

And you say, "Some proposals do exist for creating a balanced process across the board for handling malicious domain registrations in general and met further consideration for potential solutions for this particular issue."

And...

(Rod): Yeah (unintelligible).

Mike Rodenbach: Okay.

(Rod): (Unintelligible) was my inspiration there.

Mike Rodenbach: Okay so maybe we should just clarify that - what we're talking about there is solutions that are going to be - that are more broad based and perhaps be addressed by the other working groups?

Is that what you're trying to say?

(Rod): Well I think just a general recommendation to look at them. I don't know if there's any in particular that would be looking at it because I think this ties into the whole best practices argument (unintelligible).

The issue...

((Crosstalk))

(Rod): ...I think this gets to my overall arching conclusion that I've reached out of this is the issue we really we really have to deal with is the malicious registrations (unintelligible).

Mike Rodenbach: Right.

(Rod): So that (unintelligible) a subset of that. So if he's willing to take a look at this as a problem (unintelligible) to the point there (unintelligible) like we use (unintelligible) but it's really it's a matter of, you know, what are you going to do about that versus other things and rapid takedown process, you know, (unintelligible) your fundamental issue which is that, you know, a bad guy has registered and is using your domain name the only way to mitigate the problem is get the domain name removed.

There you go. That's at least the mitigation side. Prevention side there's other things you can do. But (unintelligible).

Mike Rodenbach: Okay. I mean I think it's fine the way it's written. Because the next section about potential next steps sort of explains more completely what we're talking about.

Marika Konings: Mike would it otherwise help to refer here to the best practices section that outlines some of the things in document earlier on?

Saying as discussed in section - I don't know - I think it was 5.10?

Mike Rodenbach: It actually makes sense. Are we referring also to the next section on (interim) on potential steps?

Marika Konings: Okay.

James Bladel: Okay thanks (Rod) and for the clarification Mike.

The next paragraph or two is primarily wordsmithing. Until we receive the last section there we changed a "must should" and I don't have strong feelings (about that, nonetheless) regarding the role ICANN, absolutely have no desire to touch on that today.

So it's been removed and my only concern is, you know, is we don't want to beat a dead horse but on the other hand we want to make sure it's at least indicated somewhere else in the report; I think it is.

Is everyone okay with those changes?

(Rod): My apologies for joining the call late. What changes are we talking about?

James Bladel: We're looking at the document that contains the Ihab changes - the Word document that was sent out yesterday. And well depending on where you're at within the last 12 to 18 hours.

We're looking at that section for conclusions and next possible next steps.

(Rod): Okay the one Marika put together?

James Bladel: Marika put one together but I think Ihab's version's more current. Is that correct Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes that's correct. But did you only change that he added I think to the last section of the document. So if you have the other version in front of you'll get a long way and have time to find the other one.

(Rod): I've got Ihab's too. I've got it. Thank you.

James Bladel: And we're kind of in the middle of that document here moving into the possible next steps. The reason didn't have too much of an issue with that last steps Mike is because we - the second bullet point or I guess now the first bullet point under possible next steps talks about scope. So I think that's probably are more appropriate place to dive into that.

Okay moving on then to the possible next steps. The first one relative to scope...

Marika Konings: Can I - this is Marika. Can I ask a question first? Because what seems to be missing here is some kind of introduction or some kind of or, you know, are these recommendations? Are they just ideas? Are these all supported by the whole group?

Because I think in the end it will come back as well when we start drafting a motion which set of recommendations we're making to the

GNSO council. So are these all our recommendations? Do we have agreement on all of these?

Because now it's called "possible next steps." It's not called "recommendations." So I think it would be helpful if the group could make clear what this section is.

James Bladel: Good point and then we just dive into bullets without really providing any background - laying any foundation towards that next item.

Let me take a stab at that on the list Marika because I think that's - may be a little bit more involved than what we can do on the call. And I'll...

Marika Konings: Do we want to have at least a quick, you know - do people still want these on a recommendation the group wants to make, you know, at least we're there it makes it easier as well to write that introduction. Or is this just ideas?

James Bladel: I mean my first inclination is to call it recommendations or possible next steps or recommendations and next steps.

(Rod): I would second that one recommendation and possible next steps and we can - depending on how you do that introduction take care of a lot of the (unintelligible) within the group of here's what we definitely want to recommend and here's what some others think are - would be a good idea.

I know there's - the - what should we do next is probably going to be the biggest (point of contention) if we can kind of get around it by

saying here's what we all agree on and here's what some others agree on and then let others decide what sounds good to them.

Marika Konings: I think that it council will look for a little guidance to this group to decide, I mean, what is the first thing they should do next.

So I think if you pass it on to the council I have the slightest issue that they might pass it back and say, "Well can you at least tell us what you think is the first priority?" I know Mike I mean you have more experience in this. I don't know what your view is on this.

Mike Rodenbach: Well, I mean clearly the better and more clear guidance we can give to council with our suggestions the better. I mean I think we should probably have some explanatory language up front here that says that we've basically reached consensus around all of these possible next steps, as potential things that could be examined and maybe we try to rank them in order of priority if we can come to consensus on that. I don't know.

But I mean I do agree with you Marika, but generally we should, you know, get a little more indication of what we're saying there rather than just have, you know, six bullet point suggestions with no context.

James Bladel: Okay. That's a good point. And, perhaps, you know, ranking them is going to take an inordinate amount of time. Perhaps we can categorize them into these that have strong consensus within the working group and then even capture as bullet points those things that were - had some support for something less than a consensus.

Marika Konings: James a quick - we could do a quick poll and just ask everyone to rank them and see if there are, you know, consensus on what should be (first write). And if not, I mean then we might have to resort to something else, but we would ask people, you know, you can send an email out, you know, tomorrow saying, you know, in your view what should be number one, two, three, four, five. I mean it might be clear agreement or not. Is there a quick way to see if that is an option?

Man: Yeah. Could we use Doodle for that?

Marika Konings: Yeah. I think it would be possible (unintelligible).

James Bladel: Or whatever you do is a...

Marika Konings: Yeah. I think Doodle is a good idea and it might make it easier.

(Rod): I think that will also reveal whether there's a real consensus or we end up with something that looks kind of a by mobile distribution which (unintelligible) could be one or the other. And that would help us finish framing out the rest of this (unintelligible) issues we could get addressed and get it done.

One other thought on this, too, (unintelligible) is that I know writing to the council within the ICANN offices is that there are a lot of people outside of ICANN that are looking for exactly this section as to, you know, what's going to happen?. What's the result?

So, I just want to make sure that the whatever we do we have that kind of in the back of the mind because it's not mature ICANN (unintelligible) in looking at this issue. It's has been a topic for a very

long time and this report has been anticipated. So, we want to make sure you do good job on this.

James Bladel: I think that's a good point, (Rod). I also see that the other audience for this is the council and what their going to - what their takeaways or if they're going to attribute as something that they're going to have to do to inform any motion put in front of them. So, I think those are the two audiences...

((Crosstalk))

(Rod): That is the primary audience (unintelligible). I just want to make sure we're considering other - there's a lot of other people looking at this, too.

James Bladel: Good point.

Okay, so our approach then is that we'll put together an introductory sentence or two to establish some contact and then Marika will put together a Doodle or whatever mechanism she feels is most efficient to check support for each of these.

Diving into the (unintelligible) that leaves us kind of the a - the opportunity to look at these somewhat in isolation and the changes that were done on each bullet point. And my guess is that is something we want to do now or do we want to wait and see what those rankings are because I think the language used to define these bullet points could affect someone's consensus. And that if we can tie them up now with the appropriate language we might find that they have more support.

Does that make sense?

Because someone might rank something lower, but it will be changed with say one or two words than it might garner a little bit more breadth of support. But I think I'll leave that open to the group.

Okay. Let's take a look at the first bullet point, Redefining The Issues (unintelligible). There are some wordsmithing here and then the last section references the possible (unintelligible) PDPs and mentions the registration abuse PDP by name.

Mike Rodenbach: Just to clarify there, if I delete the PDP because that's not a PDP working group, that's the pre PDP working group at this point - and maybe just say - so just say finally successor or working group, for example, registration of use policies working group and delete the word below because that may move above.

James Bladel: Good point.

So, just a finally successor working group?

Mike Rodenbach: Yep.

James Bladel: Okay.

Mike Rodenbach: For example, the registration abuse policies working group.

James Bladel: Good catch, Mike. I keep calling that a PDP and that's probably just a habit. I need a break at this point.

Mike Rodenbach: Maybe Sunday.

James Bladel: That's too long maybe, but okay.

Any other thoughts on the first bullet point?

Okay, then moving to the second one. The inclusion of (ssap) I think that is fine and my apologies for leaving them out.

And then the last sentence I think just identifies the open participation of the group. I don't think there's anything particularly contentious in that section.

The third bullet point - we're ready to move on. There were some wordsmithing in the first sentence. And, in fact, the entire thing is just really founding upon what some of the alternatives might be and ICANN's roll as a collaboration of outside support (station).

Mike Rodenbach: I mean this is not really a proposed next step. I mean all of the other bullets are potential other meanings to address the issue rather than a PDP. I don't know. Do we really need this bullet here? What is it saying?

James Bladel: Well, I think it's saying that, you know, just - or my take away would be that there are alternatives to a few PDPs - alternative mechanisms within the community.

Mike Rodenbach: Right and those are outlined here - several of them. I don't know. Maybe we just shorten this and put into the first sentence, you know, just to (form) contacts.

James Bladel: Okay.

Mike Rodenbach: I mean am I making sense? I mean it doesn't seem to be a proposed next step really.

James Bladel: Yea, I think going back to the dual audience that (Rod) pointed out, this is really not directed at council. It's maybe directed at those outside the ICANN community, but I agree with you. It doesn't seem to fit with the others.

Mike would you be open to the idea of shortening this to one sentence and including it with the one below, which highlights solutions that could be addressed by best practice or industry solutions?

I think that it would...

Mike Rodenbach: There's that and there's also the data reporting system. Both of those are non PDP potential next step.

I guess what I would suggest James is just really deleting it here, but up above when you have the introductory language for this section, explaining that, you know, there are other options other than a PDP that may be appropriate and effective and here are some of those options listed below.

James Bladel: Okay. Okay. I'll take that.

Next bullet point here, strike by the working group and then we just do word snipping in that last sentence. It doesn't seem like there's any thought - material changes there.

Next bullet point talks about empowering registries and registrars and the first suggestion was moving this to the top. I think that that will come out of the survey. If this is really the most obvious and practical solution, I think it will be shown to be such when we have a chance to review these other groups.

At the last paragraph or maybe that's a single sentence there that shows it by (Rod). It talks about existing examples of this for registries and registrars. For example, Dot Asia. Is that - is everybody okay with that inclusion?

Mike Rodenbach: It's like - I love it, of course. I would expand on it a bit. And why don't we also mention the affiliate frame work that has been implemented?

James Bladel: I'm okay with it, Mike. I just wonder if this is the right place for it and I don't really have strong feelings either way, but I sure don't want the bullet points to become the place where we want them to kind of capture and summarize things that are expanded elsewhere. I just wanted to make sure that this wasn't the most we discussed in this section. So, if it's included elsewhere and it's still has a little bit more - (Rod) are you aware of that somewhere else?

(Rod): I don't remember at this point. I don't know where, you know, - all the documents (unintelligible) down. You want to make sure we capture that, you know, the part of the sentence is fairly long, as my writing skill

can be long sentence. And if it's expanded somewhere else I think it would be good to a brief touch of that as an example here. And then have it expanding farther out there. I don't know what the standing (unintelligible) document.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I did recall that we included it before somewhere in the document, but I also remember that Greg wasn't very happy that, I think, (Ophelius) was being singled out. So, if we're to include something here, you know, I would suggest to ask him how he would like to see that reflected if at all.

(Rod): Yeah. I remember that now and - in fact, that's why I wrote it the way I did and purposely did not include him (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Mike, were you about to say something?

Mike Rodenbach: Well, I don't really understand what Greg's concern is and I don't that we have to agree with him. I mean it is what it is. It is a policy that is in place. It went to through a formal ICANN process to be put in place. I don't really see the harm in mentioning it in the report. It's extremely relevant.

James Bladel: Okay.

Marika Konings: I think it is meant in some of it - I think in the end in a footnote. I think it's described and I think we need to move back. As I recall well I think it is meant to someone in a footnote and more explained in the text.

(Rod): Mike, I will go back to Greg now because if I remember right (unintelligible) came up before the (unintelligible) policies were approved and he's been working on this for the (unintelligible) well, and I think at the time he wanted it to be called out because we were trying to (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Paul Diaz: James, maybe a way around it instead of saying, "And others", identify the actual TLDs as opposed to subscribing it to (Ophelius) and then we're talking about...

James Bladel: That makes sense.

Paul Diaz: ...registries, but I mean if it's a policy of a TLD, that's highlight because I know I wind up asking. People ask me which TLDs and it's easy to say them specifically than the back-end providers.

(Rod): Yeah, that's a great point.

James Bladel: Great idea Paul. We can certainly do that. And so Mike's point about expanding on that I mean - and (I know this topic) is starting to get fairly long, but we can certainly (use in an annex if that's)...

Mike Rodenbach: What I would suggest is an interest of keeping it very short. Delete the last part that (Rod) has here that says, 'Could be looked at as a general model for instant handling' and just say, 'and dot info has enacted a policy to deal with abusive domains' and put a link to it.

James Bladel: Okay. And then strike the "and other" for a parenthetical clause after (DotAgent)?

Mike Rodenbach: Right.

James Bladel: Okay. Did you catch that Marika?

Marika Konings: Yep.

James Bladel: Okay. Sounds good. Thanks for the inclusion (Rod) and the recommendations Mike and Paul.

The last sentence was for the next bullet point was relative to (unintelligible), but this is really about the Fast Flux Data Reporting System. Where do we want to start with this one here?

I think that at first inclusion of the word 'mandate' might - at least my first read was that that was a part of this working group's responsibility with actually collect data. And I know that's not the message we want to send, but we wanted to make recommendations about what data could be and should be collected.

Does that make sense? Mike, I think this was your change. Was it not?

Mike Rodenbach: It was my suggested change. I don't understand what would you change it to say?

James Bladel: Recommendations for data collection. Recommendations for Fast Flux Data. I just didn't think that - my take away from this was that the working group was actually going to sit down and collect data in an

ongoing capacity, but I see what you mean now when you're saying that, you know, we wanted to flush out the problem.

Mike Rodenbach: Okay.

James Bladel: Yeah, but I just wanted to make sure we're clear on that. Did anyone else read it that way or is it just me being silly?

Okay. We'll just leave it. It's me being silly.

(Rod): You (didn't have) to say it aloud, though.

James Bladel: I don't? I - okay. Note: just don't. Future self criticism should be (kept away). How 'bout that.

And then, let's see changing publicly or changing - striking formal from publicly available mechanisms or members of the ICANN community - I thought that was fine. And changing working group to a party that might action. So, maybe that's Mike put some distance there, but that would put that to rest - that concern that I had earlier.

Mike Rodenbach: Okay.

James Bladel: Before you jump down to the last sentence here ICANN should explore whether it can practically facilitate such a system (unintelligible) or industry and community groups to operate it.

Any thoughts on this subject?

Okay, well. That was a fairly painless bullet point.

And the last one is ICANN is the best practiced facilitator and I believe this is (Rod) and he has additions. Did everyone have a chance to review that?

Okay, I admit I skimmed this twice, but I really haven't dived in so...

Paul Diaz: James I have a question. This is Paul.

Just the use of the word 'audits' - I just - maybe it's me, but the way I define it in audit is something that is sort of like a - it implies the contractual responsibilities in my mind.

Is there another word, reviews or something like that? If we're dealing with best practices, these aren't necessarily things that are required of a person under review. Is it me or is audit just - does anybody else share the concerns that audit might have implications that are inappropriate here?

James Bladel: I do think audit is probably the wrong word, but I'm not sure what the alternative would be. Perhaps research...

((Crosstalk))

(Rod): A strong word.

Mike Rodenbach: The findings of this review...

James Bladel: Yeah, you know, review, perhaps, is just...

(Rod): Yeah.

James Bladel: ...as I imagine we are going to ask the compliance staff to conduct this, you know. It would probably be done by some other component within ICANN staff. Right?

I heard (Rod) and Mike gave up on that?

Paul Diaz: I'm fine with that. I kind of threw it together. So, a little word is not going to be a bad idea on that, so.

James Bladel: Yeah, Paul I agree and I like the word review better. Audit implies people showing up at your door unannounced.

So, if we could change audit to review. I don't know if it's a parenthetical of the formal company that (first said it but that's)...

(Rod): That's probably unnecessary.

James Bladel: Okay.

(Rod): When I was writing that I just wanted to convey that feeling so that people knew what I was talking about. And I don't think it needs to be there in the formal language with support.

James Bladel: Okay.

And then moving to Ihab's addition in the last two sentences. The only thought I had from reading this earlier is maybe it's just a - or perhaps it's just keep it consistent, but I think of industry being contracted

parties. And I think from this community (unintelligible) the industry. But that's a minor change and I don't feel very strongly about it.

(Rod): I like those changes and implemented by the contracting parties and feedback from the community - I think that makes it look better, makes it more specific and more inclusive (where you get feedback from). Anyway, in general the industry isn't what's been driving this issue, right? (Unintelligible) ultimately communities saying we (unintelligible) do something about it.

James Bladel: This is your section. So, I just wanted to give you an opportunity. Ihab you okay with that?

Ihab Shraim: Yeah. I wrote it too late, around midnight. So...

James Bladel: (Unintelligible)

Ihab Shraim: out loud.

James Bladel: Okay. Well, (unintelligible) bullet point. You know, catch anything in Ihab's inclusion that they'd like to address?

Okay. Well, we're coming up on our time limit here. What I'd like to do is we have a couple of action items from Marika's notes.

And then the last thing I wanted to touch on was that we had some acceptable language from the Manheim formula and where it should be included in the document. If you want to go (unintelligible) we'll go ahead and make that conclusion. And then we had some agreement that we would leave out any reference to the Safe Harbor Provisions of

the Ryan Haight Act. Because, in fact, they're not quite as specific as we would like them to be for support.

So, what is to do between now and the time everyone who is traveling leaves Sydney a little more list work to - for activity on the list will be, you know, call next Wednesday and that this would be our last call.

I think that what will be posted in addition to some smaller changes will be one, a report or a document that highlights all (unintelligible)

Two, a (juras) motion that we can review and does suggest edits for council.

And three would be a Doodle to help us provide some sequence to those bullet points in section nine.

And if we can get those reviewed and agreed to on the list and each of these items would be accompanied by a - some sort of a time in which the responses would be closed. So, we'd give each one say, you know, three to four working days to review and offer suggestions. And once, you know, we have agreed that issue is closed then that would be - and hopeful we can preamp the need for another call to sort that out.

Does that seem like a reasonable approach to everyone? I know it's more list work than we've done in the past, but I think it's wrapping up the loose ends for this working group so that when the Sydney meeting is secluded we can move on with the recommendations, putting this in front of the council and then using this research to inform further work.

Marika Konings: James, just one point I think there's - as you mentioned they probably will be done - I guess rehearsed our order - first have the poles - we know how to order the report. Then send out - update the report and send out a final version for review and once it has an agreed then drop the motion which includes the recommendations.

And I just wanted to ask the group as well because, you know, we're about to., you know, leave for Sydney how much time people think - what would be a reasonable deadline if we would get a final report - if I wouldn't be able to get everything in and come up with a final version of the report, you know, just before Sydney how much time will people need? Because I guess most of you will be traveling or be away and might not have time to review the whole document.

So, what would be a reasonable timeline?

James Bladel: I leave a week from today, but I know that that's not probably typical. So, can we put that out to those that are going to Sydney what is a reasonable amount of time. Do we want to try this to have this done by - what would have been our next call or is that too aggressive?

So no thoughts at all?

Mike Rodenbach: I think it's getting pretty close, but there's frankly not a huge rush to absolutely have this finalized, right?

I mean we can give report to the council on where we're at. We're very close to final. Even if we had it done, you know, if we put it out during the Sydney meeting who cares?

Nobody is going to read it until after Sydney, so. I guess I suggest we just let it lie with a final draft until Sydney is over and then revisit this and wrap it up.

James Bladel: I agree with you. The Sydney deadline was self-imposed because it's too late to get anything in front of the council for that working session on the weekend. But council didn't want us to render that deadline that easily.

Mike Rodenbach: I mean, you know, we're very, very close here, so.

James Bladel: Yeah. Paul, (Joe), (Rod) (unintelligible)?

Man: Nothing else here.

James Bladel: Okay.

Paul Diaz: Yeah. I'm with you guys on I think we should make every effort to get it done as soon as possible, but not unnecessarily knock ourselves out for our self-imposed deadline.

James Bladel: Okay.

I think if we're going to do all the rest of the work off list, then we should probably extend that time period a little bit longer give us both a generous time to review that, especially if they're traveling. And I know that everyone's schedule for that meeting is probably (book-ended with other topics), so.

So, let's just kind of play that one by ear. Maybe the Doodle poll will come out first and let's take a look and see where we're at with that and maybe we could add to - until Monday or Tuesday of next week to give us the chance to provide some ranking or priorities for the different items. And then we'll see how much that changes the interim report and the - that will then feed the motion.

Okay. Well, we're already over our time, but I did want to say thanks to everybody for being a die hard and sticking this out. I know the calls a - everybody has other things to do. And, you know, if this were a physical meeting, I would've made sure that we brought a cake or something to signify this as a milestone.

But thanks everybody and if we see you in Sydney, we definitely have earned a beer at this point, but thanks again and thanks for all the support.

This was my first time chairing a working group and I'm not sure that that's what's indicative for the way future working groups will go, but I appreciate everyone's support and help. And to the staff. I know this was a staff intensive project as well. So, I want thank (Lori Jess) who Glen, Gisella everyone from staff (unintelligible).

Marika Konings: Thank you, too.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you, too.

James Bladel: Okay. See you on the other side of the world.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Thanks guys.

Marika Konings: Thanks. Bye.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thanks James. Bye.

END