

Coordinator: **Fast Flux PDP WG Teleconference
TRANSCRIPTION
Friday 14 November 2008 16:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Fast Flux PDP WG teleconference on Friday 14 November 2008, at 16:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-fast-flux-20081114.mp3>

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

Present for the teleconference:

Avri Doria - NCA, GNSO Council chair, Interim chair

Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC

George Kirikos - CBUC

Greg Aaron - Afiliis Ry c.

Paul Diaz - Networksolutions RRc

James Bladel - Godaddy RRc

Observers - (no constituency affiliation) Joe St. Sauver

Dave Piscitello

Rod Rasmussen

Staff:

Liz Gasster

Marika Konings

Glen de Saint Gery – absent apologies

Absent Apologies

Randy Vaughn

Martin Hall

Coordinator: The recording now has started. You can go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. Okay, so looking at the list here we have - I'm just starting at the top of the list, (Marika), (Liz), myself, (Ehab), (Greg), (Martin), (James), (George), (Paul), (David) and (Rod). Anyone missing from that list?

Okay we might as well start. As I mentioned I have at most 90 minutes...

Coordinator: Excuse me, (MikeRodenbaugh) now joins.

Avri Doria: Hello, (Mike), we're just starting.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Hey, Avri.

Avri Doria: Hi. As I mentioned I have 90 minutes at most because I have to get myself ready for a doctor's appointment and then I have to go. So we might as well start in - I figured that at this point we have a document that's essentially been completely gone through at least once. We have a reworked eight and nine based on our conversations last week that we should make a first pass through today.

We also have a contributed section, (15.10) on the email, that didn't make it into the text yet but I think it'd be good if we have the time to talk through it when we get to (15.10) so that - I mean (5.10) in the order. But I think I'd like to, unless there's some reason not to, start with - back at the beginning.

Now most of what we've got there is just quick confirmation that what we did last time is still fine and then move into talking about (5.10),

talking about any other new text and then talking about eight and nine.
Does that seem a reasonable approach to people?

Man: Sounds good.

Man: Sounds good.

(Marika): Avri, just to point out you'll next text changes is nine, eight is still in the same state as it was but there is a note that, you know, that might need work...

Avri Doria: Oh, okay.

(Marika): ...based on the rest of the report that...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Okay. Hold on, okay thank you. In which case, and if I miss something or notice one or, you know, miss noticing one of the changed places let me know. So (unintelligible).

Okay I find our first on Page 9.

(Marika): Page 7.

Avri Doria: Oh, okay.

(Marika): Has some strikethrough text that doesn't come up...

Avri Doria: Oh, okay.

(Marika): ...under...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Okay, Page 7 we crossed out - oh, in how fast flux works in the (end b). One of those, again, the working group wishes to emphasize the need for the study and refine operational please look to the body of this report for further discussion.

((Crosstalk))

(Marika): There's a strikethrough above that...

Avri Doria: That'd the same one there, right. Oh, no, it's a similar one. Indeed one of the major conclusions of this working group is the need for further study. We struck both of those and we have discussions of further studies elsewhere in the document. Is there any objection with deleting those for real? No? Okay, then moving on.

Then Page 9 is the next?

(Marika): Yes.

Avri Doria: Okay. On Page 9 we have some new text. Certain service providers and registrars provide a name resolution service to enable Web-hosting service for individuals and organizations or assigned (Internet) IP addresses to be (unintelligible) scenarios are typically assigned low (TPL) values. The IP addresses assigned individuals and organizations

by such providers commonly fall within a single autonomous system number, (ASN).

This was in there before and just edited last time, correct? Or was this new text as of last time? No, this has gone through and this is the second check for this text.

(Marika): I believe so, yes.

Avri Doria: Yes. Any objection with leaving that text in as is?

(Tom): The only thing that's missing there is there's not really any kind of conclusion to the paragraph; something like this is another example of potentially legitimate use. If you look at the preceding paragraph you'll see it kind of conclude with a - this is a potential legitimate use and then we kind of have another description of something but no real conclusion as to what it is or to infer from that.

Avri Doria: Although it is in a section called Legitimate Uses of fast flux.

(Tom): Granted.

Avri Doria: So anyone object to adding that or, you know?

(James): No, I support that that is also added.

Avri Doria: Okay, any objection to adding that? Okay great. Okay the next I have is one Page 10, I have a - some changes fast flux networks are robust is underlined. And then they make it difficult for system administrators.

So basically it was a long sentence turned into two sentences with a they referential put in; any objection to this change?

Okay great. Moving on. Next in Section 4, Page 11, we have a correction - just some spelling corrections and whatever. But we get to - on Line 245, "Accept for marked differently the positions outlined in this document should be considered in agreement by the working group." Meaning that there was...

(Martin): Does 238 have a wording problem?

Avri Doria: Yes, 238 has a wording problem. "Where no agreements are there," seems extraneous. Now I have one question about this and that's that it strikes me that in rough consensus one can have an alternate view and still have most of the group in agreement. And I think we've run into a couple of cases where that was the case.

So I think we need to indicate that an alternate view can exist. In other words, I would recommend, and see what people think, changing that one to, "Where no agreement could be reached the following label has been used to indicate level of support for a certain position." Support. And then, "In either the case of agreement or support there could also be alternate views." Or something like that. Do people accept that?

Mike Rodenbaugh: It sounds good to me.

Avri Doria: Any objection? Is that okay with you, (Marika)?

(Marika): Yes.

Avri Doria: The second sentence I gave was a little awkward but I'm sure you can make it un-awkward.

(Marika): Yeah, I'll try to figure something out.

Avri Doria: Right.

(Marika): But...

((Crosstalk)).

Avri Doria: Okay, yeah. Okay, thank you. Okay and then this (list) of names, I'm sure everybody is checking out their names, making sure that they are properly reflected.

(Martin): Avri?

Avri Doria: Yeah.

(Martin): This is (Martin). Myself and (Jose) are not on there. I don't know whether to complete the (unintelligible) given we joined the working group late we should or should not be on there but I'm just...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: If you're participating you should be on there even if it's with a asterisk saying Joined At or a footnote saying Joined At.

(Martin): Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay, make sure that (Marika) has the proper entry for you.

(Martin): Okay.

Avri Doria: In terms of, you know, constituency slash other in affiliation. Okay, thanks. And notice constituency could be individual, so. Okay. Then on Page 12, is it? No, Page 14 we have crossed out in a note, actually the whole note is crossed out. Any objection to that being actually crossed out?

No? Okay. Okay, (unintelligible). Okay then on Page 15 we have some changes at 318 through 321. Under poor quality who is, "There's support for who was record but fortunately cleared it for example using stolen identities or payment methods."

And then there's - any objection to that? Okay then there's 324, 327 - give me a second - 324 through 327 there was an addition, which has already been talked about once but confirming, "The domain name is one of the possibly many domain names under the name of a registrant whose domain and administration account has been compromised and the attacker has altered registration information in particular DNS information without authorization."

Any objection to that one especially the agreement and of course this is under Additional Characteristics.

(James): Avri, this is (James).

Avri Doria: Yes.

(James): Just one thought on that should we possibly replace, "Registration information in particular DNS information," with just domain information and leave it at that? Because there could be - I'm just looking at how that reads and I just thought it could be simplified a little bit.

Avri Doria: What do other people think?

(Ehab Fraim): No that makes sense because DNS information could pertain to an IP address also (unintelligible) alias attachment to an IP address but it also reflects that you can take it further and get the (errant) or (right) record, which has nothing to do with the domain name record.

(James): It could also mean altering Whois information and other types of compromised attacks. I just think making it simpler is better than trying to list all of those.

(Ehab Fraim): That make sense; keep it on the domain name level because that's mainly what normally is being hacked or defrauded.

Avri Doria: Okay, anyone object to making the change? Okay. Moving on. Spelling corrections. On Page 16, note crossed out completely. Any objection? Okay, confirmed. On Page 17 privately operated as opposed to private. Any objection? That's under Alternate Viewpoint. Okay. Does the person with the alternative viewpoint here (too) not object? Okay, not.

Okay. (Unintelligible) okay under 405 there's, "The discussion on this issue can be found at that and a to be provided (late)."

(Marika): Yeah, I think someone on the previous call mentioned that there were other discussions on this issue and they were going to send a specific link to it but I haven't received that so...

Avri Doria: Okay.

(Marika): ...if the person who mentioned that could do that it would be great.

Avri Doria: Okay, well I - excuse me?

(Joe): That was actually me, (Joe), and I went ahead and looked and I actually think that that was probably the primary discussion.

(Marika): Okay, so I should just take out and so just leave it at that one?

Avri Doria: Yeah.

(Joe): I think it's a lot that to be provided.

Avri Doria: Okay.

(Marika): Okay.

Avri Doria: Well and the end also. Okay. Then there's - so that's accepted with the change. Alternate Viewpoints, there's several alternate viewpoints listed under here. Any objection to that as stated? Confirming that? Okay. Moving on. We have a sentence - a grammar correction at 430 on Page 18. I don't assume there's any issue although it is some of the working group as opposed to the working group. Any issue? Okay.

We get down to Page 19. "Change has been discussed before looking for confirmation. The working group does not suggest that mitigating fast flux attacks would eliminate the need for other anti-abuse or law enforcement work. Nor do we intend to exaggerate the (unintelligible) technique to would-be malefactor that (unintelligible) rather we call attention to these attacks in markedly strong manner to emphasize that fast flux attacks have considerable influence in the duration and efficacy of harmful activities."

I remember we talked about this a bunch at the last meeting. Any objection to that wording or is that wording now comfortable with everyone? Or is everyone comfortable with that wording would probably better the better sentence. Okay.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah, Avri?

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Mike Rodenbaugh: (Mike). I got a just a question about alternative views...

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I'm just wondering should we identify who or at least how many people held that view in the group?

Avri Doria: I don't know that it's necessary. I think as long as one person held it I tend to think it's adequate.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well I don't suggest that it should be there I just suggest that, you know, sometimes alternative views might be supported by five people, sometimes they might supported by one and that might...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Well I think once we get the five people we're in supported territory.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Oh I see, well, all right.

Avri Doria: Right. So I think when we're talking about alternative views we're talking about ones and twos.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay.

Avri Doria: By and large. And at this point while it might be an idea to talk about in future methodologies to always list the names of the alternative views and then we'd have to consider do we list the names of everyone who was in support and not support and then it really gets very messy.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah, it certainly adds a lot of (text).

Avri Doria: And a lot of tracking and basically it would all be in footnotes and...

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah, all right.

Avri Doria: ...in another place where I play secretary I do that and the footnotes take up half the page sometimes.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Got it, all right.

Avri Doria: Okay. Next one, 470, we promoted from note to regular text, "And there were changes to the working group offers the following initial working answers to the charter questions but would like that emphasize the continued work is required in the following areas." And that was the discussed compromise to the difficulty of the charter questions, whether we have full answers or whatever, that they're working that of course can change over time with new information, new analysis, new whatever.

So is that acceptable? Good. Okay. The next change I see - I really like the way this document is starting to look; I don't know how other people feel.

Mike Rodenbaugh: It's long.

Avri Doria: Well yeah it's long and the council will have to deal with reading it all. Okay, the next I found - and the constituencies and everyone else. Page 24 I've got 637, was there anything before that that I missed? Okay, there's a note targeting an IP address, which replaced (unintelligible), rather than a fully qualified domain name, (S2DN) so this was basically clarification changes.

(Greg): Handling the (IPV6) case.

Avri Doria: That's right, that's right. There may be problems there someday. Okay, any issues? I accidentally shut my (editor). Okay, (54), which is Page 25, down at the bottom we have actual new text and we have something that says, "Agreement support alternative view to be

decided.” And then this was contributed text that I guess has been on the list but this is the first time it shows up in the document.

So we should probably talk through this and decide first of all whether we have agreement or support within this group on it. Whatever we decide today this text will be something that we come back to again one more time at least.

(Marika): Just to know there has indeed been discussion already on the list about this...

Avri Doria: Yeah.

(Marika): ...and I think some changes made to it, so my position is more decision to agreement and support than an alternative view because I think we're already...

Avri Doria: Yeah, that was my impression also.

(Marika): Especially the number of people involved in it to, you know, upgrade it to support at least.

Avri Doria: Right.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Could we have just a little background who wrote this text and who suggests the edits to it please?

Avri Doria: I think, (Dave), you were spearheading it, no? Can you maybe clarify who else was involved?

(Dave): Yes I wrote it. And I believe (Joe) and (Greg) and (Paul Tiaz) - I'm trying to remember who the other person is; there was at least one more person who had a chance to review it.

(Tom): This is (Tom).

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: And then it was on the list so we all had a chance.

(Dave): Right, no, I mean, he was asking for the origin so...

Avri Doria: Oh, okay. Sorry.

((Crosstalk))

(Dave): ...and then there were a number of people who fine-tuned it before it went to the list.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Oh, thanks.

(George): Have there been any data on fast flux domain by registrar? Like is there any evidence that they tend to be at certain registrars? Because, for example, there's that (EST) domain that's been recently suspended or - and there's been talk, you know, that there was some criminal involvement although it's totally unfair given a lot of it hasn't been shared with the public. Is there any like private research data from (Nuton) or some of the other people that...

((Crosstalk))

(George): ...links fast flux to certain registrars?

(Dave): Are you asking me or are you asking generally?

(George): Generally, like, the work group has no hard evidence; like does that evidence actually exist anywhere?

(Dave): Are you saying the - say for example the scammers would target a registrar to initiative a fast flux attack or through a registrar to launch such attack?

(George): No I mean maybe they've - they kind of congregate at certain registrars that turn a blind eye to the practice?

Avri Doria: That would still be different than intentionally facilitating wouldn't it?

(Tom): Yes. The only way a registrar would intentionally facilitate would be on a double flux attack, which involves changes to the name server records into the registries. And double flux seems to be more rare than single flux right now anyway and...

Mike Rodenbaugh: But we've seen it, right?

(Tom): And then there would be a conscious asset on the registrar's part. I just don't know if we know anything about that kind of thing.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Really? What about the - what about the - I've heard of registrars that advertise themselves as, you know, bulletproof hosting and maybe not registrars but they're resellers anyway?

Man: Yes there are.

(James): There are although that brings up an interesting topic because hosting services have nothing to do with ICANN. We're talking about registration services and in the ICANN context. We were saying bulletproof domain name creation, not just bulletproof hosting.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah, absolutely. I mean there's registrars that advertise themselves as, you know, bulletproof basically. I consider some of them to be intentionally facilitating and I think that there are several members of the working group that do have that sort of evidence. But if I'm wrong, you know, let me know.

(Tom): Oh just because is out there it's not well qualified other than the (Nujon) report, which listed the top 10 registrars for those kinds of domains.

Avri Doria: It sounds almost like an alternative view that, well, if I'm hearing correctly, that there is support that there's no hard evidence in terms of - like the kind of evidence one would take to a court and say here, see, evidence. But that some believe there's an alternative view that some believe that it may be supported as opposed to alternative view that there's anecdotal evidence.

(George): Right, anecdotal, yeah.

Avri Doria: That there's anecdotal evidence that some registrars may be intentionally facilitating. And this one of those cases where even if there's agreement that there's no hard evidence an alternative view,

which would be consistent with acknowledging that the evidence is not hard but still saying, you know, anecdotally we think, you know, and then there's either alternative view or there's support for that.

(Dave): Avri?

Avri Doria: Yeah.

(Dave): I'll tell you why I worded it the way I did. I wasn't comfortable putting an allegation in even as thinly veiled as we just suggested because I didn't really think we wanted to open up that rat hole at this point. And it was - I didn't want to pull away the focus from what we've accomplished by having some people feel like, you know, like we were putting all the blame on registrars.

Avri Doria: Right.

(Dave): And so I didn't go there.

Avri Doria: I understand.

(Dave): If people feel that it's appropriate that's fine; I just didn't feel it was the right thing to do at this point.

Avri Doria: I understand and I think that you're probably quite right in the writing of, you know, the rough consensus or at least the support statement. And - but if there are people in the group that do have the alternative view and believe that there's anecdotal - it seems like it is not inappropriate to list it.

- (George): Another thrust of data might be the Whois data problem reporting service whether they classify fast flux as one of the reasons or - that people report on a certain domain name.
- (Dave): That's not something that's explicitly captured on that unfortunately; that would be an excellent recommendation I think to encourage the ability to tag something like that as part of the process.
- (George): Right.
- (James): And Avri, this is (James), can I get in the queue?
- Avri Doria: Yeah. I think at the moment people have just been talking. The queue hasn't been unruly so I haven't had to keep one but go ahead.
- (James): I support (Dave)'s original language. And if we are going to strengthen that or put an alternate view may I recommend that we have some sort of data since we're talking about collecting additional data sets as well later on in the document that we put together some data that supports that beyond anecdotal support?
- (Martin): Can I - this is (Martin), can I just interject something? So we've been doing some work on looking at fluxing domains and their association with certain registrars. I don't have the sort of current results at hand, we haven't looked or sort of focused on whether or not we think there's any kind of hard evidence about deliberate support of fluxing that (works) from registrars but there is some ongoing work (at Comonsphere) on this.

And then I just want to come back to one other point that was made about double flux; we think there's more double flux out there than we certainly first saw when we got into this space. Again, I don't have the specific numbers right now but somebody made a comment about there being little double flux. I think there's more double flux out there than many of us realize.

(Ehab Fraim): This is (Ehab Fraim). I just want to interject here. Deliberate - by the way we deal with this on a daily basis and we do shut downs across the world. And I deal with fast flux networks practically - I would say daily. And what we saw and we did do thorough investigations for our customers that is - we didn't see any deliberate or intentional actions being done by registrars.

What I can summarize I would say it under one work, it's pure negligence is what I would classify these registrars as they allow it to make it - or they make it so easy; they don't investigate enough, they don't collect the right information etcetera to allow such registrations to take place.

And they don't allow - of course I don't think they do it from what we have seen deliberately. As for the single flux/double flux we see a lot of both. And in fact there are newer tactics than single and double flux now that have been interjected into the mainstream of how things are being done nowadays.

((Crosstalk))

(George): ...techniques documented in this document or are - is it too sensitive to publicize?

(Ehab Fraim): It's a bit too sensitive to publicize due to the fact that it will expose a couple of our customers. But the tactic is really...

(George): This call is being recorded by the way so you don't want to necessarily...

(Ehab Fraim): Yeah, I'd rather not go there because it may not be (realized) again and we're hoping that this will not be a mass attack against (FI)s out there.

(James): This is (James) again and if we're going to continue down this track can I recommend that we insert a paragraph describing those types or groups or registrars that are hostile or viewed as unfriendly to fast flux attacks - that those folks that do have their house in order and, you know, I'm just not comfortable presenting just one side of this picture.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think that's a great idea.

Avri Doria: Yeah, it sounds to me like there is an alternative view that needs to be expressed. Now whether that alternative view is one or two people or there's - it's a supported alternative view - a supported view is hard to tell yet. But until that text is written - so I would recommend that those of you that have an alternative view work together.

I mean, I think if I'm hearing correctly, I don't think there's dispute on hard evidence. But I do think there's a question on what goes beyond hard evidence. And I think that that statement is one of those that probably calls for more data and more research to determine whether

there is any hard evidence on these things or whether they are in deed the case.

(George): On Line 1027 we actually say publish summaries of unique complaint volumes by registrar so that just perhaps...

Avri Doria: Right.

(George): ...already covering that base.

Avri Doria: Right but you might want to just point to it at this point.

(George): Right.

Avri Doria: But anyway so I would recommend that those of you that have - because I don't want to tie in words (and miss) a paragraph, you know, live at this point but sort of accept it and tell me if I get this wrong - accept the paragraph that's there as something for which there is agreement but that a modifying statement is either an alternate viewpoint or support and we'll determine that over the next week by what's written and how many people are willing to say yeah I support that.

Is that a reasonable approach to take for this now? And so this is a paragraph that would slip in as a alternative view or some support in the 689 position. I'm already pretty sure that it won't be a full agreement statement.

(James): I agree Avri and I'd just like to add that if the alternative viewpoint includes let's say stronger allegations of registrar involvement then that

may change what - how I feel about the original wording and we may want to modify that as well.

Avri Doria: Okay. I would caution people that write something that is accusatory to, you know, without hard evidence to make it careful, is the right word,

(George): Defamatory.

Mike Rodenbaugh: So, Avri, I've taken a shot at two sentences. Can I just read them and see if people generally agree with the gist?

Avri Doria: Certainly.

Mike Rodenbaugh: If it's balanced: some members of the working group believe there's evidence that at least a few registrars and/or their resellers intentionally facilitate fast flux domain name exploits particularly double flux attacks. On the other hand many registrars take affirmative steps to ensure that they do not facilitate fast flux exploits.

(George): I would add the adjective anecdotal before evidence as a - friendly amendment.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well I don't know, I mean, my understanding is that people come across these sorts of resellers or registrars fairly regularly that are actually advertising that they...

Avri Doria: But that's anecdotal...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: That's the meaning of anecdotal. If somebody's having gone away and measured and determined and investigated that the turns it from anecdotal to hard evidence. People...

((Crosstalk))

Mike Rodenbaugh: I do think people have done that investigation and whether or not they are in this working group is an issue and maybe we need to talk to some other folks. But...

Avri Doria: How about there is at least anecdotal evidence and so it leaves open the possibility that there is...

Mike Rodenbaugh: All right, I like that.

Avri Doria: Will the friendly amendment of anecdotal accept at least anecdotal?

Mike Rodenbaugh: So, you know, we don't have to work with this now, I'll send it around to the list for comments. But, you know, I - I don't know.

Avri Doria: Okay, and we'll determine whether this is alternative view or some support though, I'm getting the indication that it's support but we'll tell by discussion that goes on.

(Tom): Yeah and make sure we print out there's a spectrum here where we have everything from say the worst of the worst of (S) domains down to simple incompetence or lack of attention. I think that's...

Avri Doria: Right. And that might be a good middle sentence to add...

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah.

Avri Doria: ...in many cases this may not be intentional but just negligence. And I also would wonder and question if you're saying - and I'm not stating an opinion - whether in the last sentence it's many or most. But those are things that you all can discuss.

(Tom): Yeah.

(Ehab Fraim): Again, I truly believe that based on the registrars that we have been working with across the world specifically on fast flux networks there needs to be - or parts of the fast flux network attacked; that needs to (read) disabled. It's - and I mean in 99% of the case we have seen either pure negligence and bad practices within the registrar to verify the identity of the people who have registered these (domains).

We haven't seen yet one case where the registrar was attempting or contributing to an actual attack against any of the (FI)s - or not (FI)s...

(George): Some folks would argue that willful ignorance though...

((Crosstalk))

(George): ...facilitates.

Avri Doria: Right, yeah, and then we get into all the negations of the laws...

(George): Yeah.

Avri Doria: ...you know...

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah.

Avri Doria: ...what's criminal negligence versus negligence versus...

((Crosstalk))

Mike Rodenbaugh: Right, well I mean what about the registrar - I think - was that (Jose) or (Martin), I'm not sure who's talking but what about the registrar that, you know, facilitated (rock phish) attacks, you know? I mean, they have people who called and called and called and they wouldn't do anything.

Avri Doria: Right but...

(Tom): I think that was mainly in just not paying attention but I think the case of the (S) domain there may have been some willful ignoring of the problem.

(Dave): What was the phrase the (Greg) used, willful negligence? Was that (Greg) or was that - I can't remember but it seems that that's an appropriate term.

(Ehab Fraim): Actually I like the term; I like it a lot, willful negligence.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Really it doesn't really make sense but willful ignorance does make sense, is that what you're trying to get at?

(George): Turning willful blind eyes is a...

Mike Rodenbaugh: I mean willful negligence is literally an oxymoron.

(Liz): (Mark), (Mike), gross negligence wouldn't be.

Mike Rodenbaugh: That's true - gross negligence is - probably willful ignorance.

Avri Doria: Okay, we'll get - we're getting to the point of words (missing). I'd suggest that people who want to work on this work on it. I think we've gotten certainly a certain idea of what the container looks like.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay.

Avri Doria: For a statement that you'd probably have support for. I don't know if you'd make it all the way to agreement but you'd probably have support for.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay, I'll send that out to the list shortly.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. Any other issues in this - in the known attacks - some of the known attack (vectors) listing, are people comfortable with that as stated? It goes on to say the list is not exhaustive and then goes on, you know, registrars are directly involved in assisting customers, in production networks for self beneficial purposes, there's a paragraph on that. Some registrars are aware of a range of attacks that can be permeated against registrars and customers and take proactive measures. So it talks about the ones that try.

It talks about the various things they can do try, which is really good especially if there's some not-willful negligence out there but just, you

know, try not to attribute to malice what is just ignorance. But so it's good to talk about things that can be done. So any other issues or objections through 761?

We'll come back to it one more time after, you know, and next time we'll also talk about the new paragraph that's been suggested. Okay, if not, moving on. Starting at 763, a (55) section, How are Registrants Affected by fast flux hosting. Again we're in - is this agreement, support or alternative view.

And by the way on the previous section I would leave - I wouldn't change the agreement, support or alternative view line just yet; we can do that next time. Although I'm getting the impression that we have close to agreement with the supported extra statement but let's see how it goes next time.

So on this one any issues on 765 through 784? Is everyone comfortable with that as it stands? Again we'll come back to it again. Okay I'll move one. Next change I see - and by the way thank you for the people that contributed the text and worked on (turning) it during the interim period.

Eight fifty-seven on Page 31 is it? "Spammers do not actually replicated," the sentence is still awkward. Spammers do not actually replicate I guess it would be, drop the D. Is that correct?

(Tom): That is correct.

Avri Doria: Okay. And then there's a note later, "Insert suitable illustration here showing reverse proxy setup here." We either need to insert the suitable illustration or we need to remove the note.

(Tom): I think I may have actually found one. Did people have a chance to look at that (Thorston) presentation I mentioned the other day?

(George): Oh, yeah, I did.

(Tom): Because he's actually got a couple of illustrations in there that are pretty good. I don't know if he'd agree to going ahead and having them included but if so that would take care of that one.

(George): Or just link to the document with a page reference?

Avri Doria: That's probably - especially since somebody commented on the length of this paper...

(George): Yeah, I did.

Avri Doria: ...it might be just as good to put a, you know, illustration showing reverse proxy setup can be found here and then give a URL. If people are willing; are you willing to do it that way as opposed to trying to get permission to include a picture?

(Greg): If that's to me I'm certainly flexible about that.

Avri Doria: Anyone else have an opinion to do a URL pointer? That could even be a footnote. Okay so for now I think we can operate on the thing that we'll put a URL there. Okay, moving on, next change that I see is that

some line fix-up around 990. We have a deletion. And we did not reach consensus - deleting that and having it start with the section, "Summarizes ideas solutions that were discussed," which it then says that, "fast flux needs better definition and more research. These ideas are presented here as a draft; record incremental progress." Are people comfortable with that set of changes?

Okay.

(Marika): Avri, this is (Marika). I don't know if I just missed it but did we cover Section 5.5, which was also highlighted in blue in front of the section we just had a long discussion about?

Avri Doria: Yeah we did.

(Marika): Oh we just went through, okay.

Avri Doria: And then I asked if anybody had any issues, corrections or comments and no one did.

(Marika): So I can list that as agreement? That there are no comments?

Avri Doria: Any objection to listing it as agreement? I didn't ask the question; thank you for coming back to the question. Any problem with listing this as agreement, that (5.5), 763 on Page 28? I hear no objections. As I say it'll still be marked so we'll come back to it one more time.

(Marika): And I'll just move the highlighting.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks for taking us back there. Okay, where was I? Did 997. Okay next I find is 1064, we have again agreement, support or alternative view on registrant verification procedures. And there's a note that is highlighted, "The working group did not answer the follow charter questions due to lack of robust technical process and definition of fast flux, reliable technique, reliable information, reliable information again, an assessment of need and a definition of requirements to design a proposed solution."

Any objection to that bullet? Okay. Then moving to (5.8)...

(George): For 1066 is there agreement, support or...

Avri Doria: Well the agreement and support is the whole section here, is it not? Or is just...

(George): I think it was just for Line 1066.

(Marika): No, no it's just for that one bullet.

Avri Doria: Oh that one bullet, okay.

(Marika): For the rest of the section we initially said that the comment is at the end...

((Crosstalk))

(Marika): ...further work would be needed on these sections to see if...

Avri Doria: Right.

(Marika): ...we could come more than just to support and like (5.10) we're working on the text. But the blue part and the agreements is just for that bullet point I was...

Avri Doria: So is there agreement on that? Is there any objection to agreement on that?

(Marika): There was a question on the list on this and I asked people to provide further wording if they wanted to but nothing further has come up. So this is I think the original proposal by, I think, by (George), no?

(George): Right.

Avri Doria: Okay, any objections to calling it agreement? We can always come back to it if there's no objection. And in fact we will come back to it at least once. Okay, thank you.

(George): Great.

Avri Doria: Is there acceptance of the note of 1068 through 1075?

(Greg): I'm not a huge fan of that note, I got to say.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Note of 1068, that should...

((Crosstalk))

Mike Rodenbaugh: ...all of these notes.

(Dave): Yeah, I thought those were gone?

Avri Doria: Yeah, well this one doesn't have the scratch-out so I wasn't quite sure whether...

(Marika): Yeah, I think we left it like that because we were still working on (5.10). And I think there was as well before discussion on whether (5.8) and (5.9) we need a bit more work to actually get to an agreement if possible instead of now having just the support.

Avri Doria: Good.

(Marika): I think it was a bit left like this.

Avri Doria: Okay, do people...

(Dave): Okay.

Avri Doria: Are people in favor of (lining) it through and then we'll confirm next time that we want to delete it?

(Greg): I think there are a couple of sub-bullets that are relevant to this one, which would be the lasting assessment of need and definition of requirements. What we're really talking about is stronger registrant verification procedures, I mean, it's a big area and you're talking about possibly...

Avri Doria: I thought this was relating to (5.8)...

((Crosstalk))

(Greg): Yeah, (5.8) to (5.10).

Avri Doria: It's not relating to (1066).

(Greg): Okay, I'm sorry.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I thought what you were getting at, though, (Greg) is maybe 1074 and 1075, those should probably get captured in the possible solutions, the next step section, right?

Avri Doria: Yeah, that would seem to be where they would below.

(Greg): Yeah, that would work.

Mike Rodenbaugh: So that's (unintelligible) 1068 to 1073, we're passed that I think.

Avri Doria: Okay so line it through and we'll confirm the deletion at the next meeting. Okay, on (5.8) we now have a support level statement. (Unintelligible) with that? Are there any alternative views that need to be also attached or is it fine just as a support statement? Okay we can leave it as support with no alternatives.

Under (5.9), we have a new text that there's support. I have a question going back to (5.8): if there's support and there's no alternative views are we at agreement or are we - just have discomfort that doesn't have a specific viewpoint?

((Crosstalk))

Man: The latter.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah, who supported this actually? I thought this was old language. But, no - and this is basically just copying the note that we just talked about.

(Tom): It is indeed legacy language from the former chair.

Avri Doria: Right, but we don't have anything else for (5.8) yet do we?

(Tom): I think it's a good note.

Avri Doria: Right, I mean, if we're not answering it - and I guess it would be support because some people felt we should answer it or is there agreement on this language? No I guess there's not agreement on this language. So as someone said it the latter just general discomfort with...

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah but I think, because there is reliable information already on scope and penetration of fast flux networks and there is reliable information as to the financial and non-financial impact of these networks. There are also reliable techniques to detect fast flux networks while at least minimizing the possibility of false positives, you know, you're never going to completely avoid them.

Avri Doria: So it sounds like you've got an alternative view that you would like to get put in there.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think it's hopefully more than alternative view that would be agreed. But...

Avri Doria: Right, but if you write it up as starting an alternative view then see what level of support there is but at least at the moment it seems like there's something you would like to see added.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Right, I'm adding it to this email.

Avri Doria: Okay and that would be an alternative view and then we'll see if there's stronger support.

(Marika): (Mike), can I maybe ask you to make it a separate email so people can respond to the specific languages so we don't get everything into one email...

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah.

(Marika): ...make it a bit easier.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Sure.

Avri Doria: As I say, my goal is not to get a complete consensus here, an agreement on everything but to make sure that we have an accurate snapshot of the viewpoints that people are trying to express.

(George): Yeah, that language is consistent with Line 994 where we've had - the work group would have to emphasize that fast flux needs better definition...

Avri Doria: Right.

(George): ...and more research? We can't necessarily trash all that language. It's still consistent with that language.

(Tom): Yeah I think what we're looking for is a better reason as to why we're punting on this particular question rather than support that.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah, I think that's right.

(Dave): Avri, this is (Dave).

Avri Doria: Yeah.

(Dave): I wanted to ask (Greg) a question. Did you help prepare the registry constituency statement? Is (Greg) not on?

Avri Doria: Let me check.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think he wrote it, though, I'm pretty sure.

(Dave): I haven't read it recently but it seems to me that there were a number of points made in the constituency statement from the registries that are very relevant to this section and...

((Crosstalk))

(Dave): ...perhaps we should, you know, or we could take a look at that and see if there's something that we agree to and include in this section to flush it out.

(George): The thing is the answers to (5.8) and (5.9) directly go to things in the previous sections that we don't agree on - that...

Avri Doria: I'm not sure what you meant.

(George): It was the section on how if we didn't reach consensus on what the solutions are but here's the ones that were discussed.

Avri Doria: Right.

(George): So (5.8) is saying, you know, how do these solutions impact things and we didn't I guess agree on all the solutions to begin with?

Avri Doria: Right but we could have support for various positions or we could have alternative views of various positions. As I'm saying, get those things captured. That make sense? I'm not trying to say this is agreement where there isn't but if there's statements that are relevant in terms of alternative views or support it probably should be captured.

And then I'm not even saying that we should take out this statement that is supported, you know, if there's support for should be deferred, you know, until that - then if that ends up a - alternative view or that ends up an agreement then we can upgrade it. So I'm not suggesting that we remove that since there are people that believe that that's the correct statement for this point.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Do people agree with just the basic statement like this, "Answering these questions should be deferred until constituency statements and public comments have been reviewed. There has been assessment of

need for proposed solutions and the requirements for further work have been defined.”

(George): What we could do is we could have a table because we'll basically take the items in (5.7), the active engagement and information sharing, and list the pros and cons of each one, like is that one way of handling (5.8), positive and negative impact on establishing each of those suggestions?

Avri Doria: We would probably have levels of support inside each one of those answers.

(George): Right.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I just don't think we're at this point of really analyzing this yet because we haven't really discussed all the various possible restrictions or practices.

(George): Technically because we didn't reach some consensus or endorse any of them should we go through and say what the pros and cons of each one are, like, is that the way of handling it or starting at Line 1044 like does it - at the enumeration of the active engagement ones.

Avri Doria: Oh dear. I don't know but (we) could do it that way.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think we should leave that up to - and so we have public comments and constituency statements and then we aggregate those and put them in there.

Avri Doria: What I think at the moment you've got is basically you might want to reword the support statement a little in terms of saying, you know, the next round of constituency statement, does it work or perhaps you may want to add yet another alternative view on support that supports some of these things or explains it.

But I don't know that you want to go table-building and a line-by-line discussion of the others. So do people want to contribute some other statements? I know (Mike) does - and see if there's support or whether it's just an alternative view?

Some people will contribute statements and we'll get back to them next time. Because (Mike) already said he was going to contribute one. We have the same exact question with (5.9). So I expect that the same answer would be - is that correct? That if somebody has either an edit to the support statement that they're to update it or if the statement is still generally supported but not everyone's comfortable with it...

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah, okay.

Avri Doria: ...there may be some edits and there may be an alternative statement that's either an alternative view or a supported statement that someone will contribute. Is that correct?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah, I think that they should have the same answer basically.

Avri Doria: Right. Okay, then I'll jump to (5.10); (5.10) just to give a quick discussion to what's on the list so that maybe we can - if people are willing have a little bit of discussion to see how people feel about this or are people ready to see this go in? This was the statement sent by

(Rod), who was - literally for getting it into the (5.10). Have people had a chance to read it? Or should it just be cut in and next time we'll discuss it.

(James): Yeah, that's probably the better approach.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I agree.

Avri Doria: Okay then, (Marika), just please cut it in as a change and we'll get to it next time.

(Marika): Just to note if anyone has any comments they first want to share on the list I'll probably send out the next updates like I did not like either Wednesday or Thursday so if in the meantime...

Avri Doria: Okay it'd probably good...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: It's probably be good to get people your deadline for new language.

(Marika): Yes...

((Crosstalk))

(Marika): Wednesday close of business so I can send it out on Thursday or post on...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Wednesday close of business LA?

(Marika): Any time.

Avri Doria: Any time...

(Marika): Any time Wednesday so I'll finish it up on Thursday for posting it.

Man: Thursday morning is not good enough, which I found out.

(Marika): No that was (unintelligible) to give people an opportunity to...

Man: Yeah.

(Marika): ...discuss the text on the list so if that changes we can actually put a text here in the paper that is already towards agreement that instead of having - reworking it in the document, which is more complicated, so that's one of the reasons. Not only just because it was Thursday.

(Tom): (Martin) had a comment on that that he'd sent around I think...

Avri Doria: Yes.

(Tom): ...it's very relevant so we should.

Avri Doria: Yes.

(Tom): (Martin) if you want to expand on that we can (unintelligible) up here.

(Martin): Yeah, I don't know if people saw that on the list, (Tom), but I'm happy to continue the conversation on the list or use a few minutes here whichever makes the most sense.

(Tom): Probably the list I think.

Avri Doria: Yeah, since we didn't discuss the main one we probably should just continue it on the list.

(Martin): Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay? So where did I put it?

Man: Is anyone leaving as we reach 12 o'clock or - the top of the hour?

Avri Doria: I can give it another half hour if most of you can.

Man: Me too.

Avri Doria: Okay. Six - so on Page 39, first paragraph was lined out; any problem with deleting it for real?

(Marika): Just - I would point out this was a section that we basically said we would leave until the end until we reach the end of the document or almost to the final - final initial report to give some of the constituency some time to see if they can come up - get agreement on the statements because I don't know if you remember I think it was (Greg) who didn't agree with taking this out. And I think then we said that we should leave it for a bit and...

Avri Doria: Well we're getting pretty close to the end now I hope.

(Marika): Then I guess it's a question - because I think...

((Crosstalk))

(Marika): ...submitted by the registrars or the individual registrars whether (Dave) managed to get agreement on this text or not. I don't know - I think (Paul) is on the call; I don't know if he had a chance to follow up on that yet.

(Paul): No I haven't.

Avri Doria: Okay, so we'll skip over it...

((Crosstalk))

(Paul): I didn't realize how close to the end we were. I didn't want to reach out to folks until we were sure that we were pretty solid on the language.

Avri Doria: I think we're getting close but, okay, I'll - we can push it off to the next meeting and skip over it again or I'll keep coming back to it (unintelligible) order, try and get it dealt with. Okay, in seven, Challenges? Was that note at the beginning of Challenges something we were leaving? That's not a bad note. But I don't know.

(Marika): I think this chapter as well that we basically...

((Crosstalk))

(Marika): ...didn't touch until the rest of the report had been more final shape and I think some people in the past commented this was still needed seeing that progress has been made or so - I don't know if it needs...

Avri Doria: I'd like to get an answer on that fairly soon because I think while we're still arguing over - or discussing certain language I think we're pretty close to an end game on this document at this point. So I'd like to start - and if people aren't ready this time we can come back to it next time but I'd really like to get this section taken care of.

(Tom): I think you sort of alluded to one correct option for it, which might be to go ahead and delete that section, because as you say there's a lot of, you know, a lot of things that have occurred since it was originally written.

Avri Doria: Okay. How do people feel about deleting (seven), Challenges as it currently stands? Is anybody vehemently against it?

(George): All of seven?

Avri Doria: Or is anybody against it at all?

(George): All of seven or just the first five lines?

Avri Doria: Well there's certainly the note but I have a feeling people were talking about the section.

(George): I don't mind.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think the whole section should go.

Avri Doria: Anyone else?

(Greg): I think it should stay in.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Who was that?

Avri Doria: Are there parts of it that - okay so we have - at least one person that wants to keep it in.

(George): If we do keep it in I'd like to remove Line 1230 to 1231. I don't think the affiliate abuse (final) got a lot of attention and I think a lot of people disagree with that.

(Greg): But it really does have a model approach to going ahead and dealing with the fast flux issue. I mean, it's not very long; it's not very complicated but it really does kind of just, you know, come right to the point.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah, absolutely.

(George): I thought it was a horrendous document, personally, I vehemently opposed it and - of course ICANN fast tracked it so...

Mike Rodenbaugh: I know you did, (George), but most people supported it and, you know, it certainly is information that ought to be in the report.

(James): That sounds like we have an alternate view.

(George): Yeah, we an alternate view.

Avri Doria: Yeah and so...

(George): Because the thing about if you read the affiliate's abuse - thing it basically left it entirely at the prerogative of the registry operator to delete the domain? And, you know, total lack of due process I think if certain other people on this call they'd say the same thing.

Avri Doria: So it sounds to me like we actually gained more by leaving it in and by including...

(George): The alternate view...

Avri Doria: ...the alternate view, which may be stronger than an alternate view once we look at, you know, everyone speaks up on it. So actually we probably do have a stronger, you know, as I say, if this document is mean to capture a snapshot of the viewpoint and if that is really one of the main, you know, main purposes then we gain more by including it then by deleting it especially since it, you know, has a certain reality.

Okay, so at the moment we're not quite lining out this. Are we lining out the note, 181 to 185? Was there any objection to taking that out?

Talking about the...

(Greg): Why were we taking it out?

Mike Rodenbaugh: The notes.

(Greg): One eighty-one to one eight-five.

Avri Doria: Eleven eighty-one to eleven eighty-five, sorry.

(Marika): This is just an introduction to the paragraph.

Avri Doria: Right and basically we've taken out most of these (fuzzy) notes.

(Marika): I mean I'm happy as well to just make it an introduction and not a note and just have it as normal text.

Avri Doria: Well I'm not sure - I mean, I'm sure we've all had great enthusiasm and dedication. I don't know that we want to identify everything as stumbling blocks that prevented progress on answering charter questions because we have tackled things, you all have tackled things.

(Tom): I think that this is correct language, it encountered a number of challenges period.

Avri Doria: Right. Okay so...

Mike Rodenbaugh: That's good.

Avri Doria: ...change it from note to paragraph and take out some of the flourish.

Mike Rodenbaugh: A number of challenges period, that's a good suggestion.

Avri Doria: Right.

Mike Rodenbaugh: And then the rest is struck out. And then I guess we need to take a look at A and B and decide if there's agreement or support or alternative view around any of this text, right?

Avri Doria: Right, I would suggest that we take that to the list...

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah.

Avri Doria: ...on A and B.

(Marika): And I would need as well a volunteer to write something about that (unintelligible) request and if there's someone who...

Avri Doria: Well, yeah. So we need a positive and we already have I think a volunteer for alternative viewpoint who may also want to work with some of the other folks around here to produce that. So who would like to help...

Mike Rodenbaugh: (Marika), really I think if we could just have the factual information about it put in there and a link to the document and, you know, that it was approved by the ICANN board on XX date; that's what was meant there I think.

(Marika): Okay, I can try to find that information and put it in here.

Mike Rodenbaugh: And then (George) has a different view I think, and others might share...

Avri Doria: Right and others might share in that so there may be support for it but it's definitely an alternative view. (Just a minute). I had to go on mute to

cough. Okay and we'll discuss A and B on the list if people have got comments then next time we can - so if people want to rephrase any of that or put in alternate views on the challenges.

Interim Conclusions - I know we're skipping for the moment - or are we, yes. I think we'll come back to that on the next pass. But people should re-read Interim Conclusions and decide, you know, whether they're comfortable with this language or not before our next conversation so we could decide. And so it's probably also worth discussing on the list. Anyone want to comment on it now?

We did have one strikeout that - "This section attempts to draw conclusions from a study that can in some respects be characterized having placed the working group in the losing end of a (race) condition. Simply put the working group was at a disadvantage having been assigned the task of studying a moving target." And I guess we already marked that one for deletion; anyone object to just deleting it?

Okay. And then the rest of it please read through and talk about it during the - on the list in the interim so that we can get, you know, what do we need to add to it. I have a feeling that in the (inclusion) section we should end up with several variant of statements that have support, statements that are alternative views because it strikes me as weird that we would have agreement on the conclusion with everything else in between. So it seems a good place to get some of the variety of conclusions listed.

So I would suggest people think about wording for some of their interim conclusions. Okay. Nine, we did a bunch of work on in Cairo. We have new text between (13.10) and (13.15).

(Marika): Maybe if I can just explain because what I did is basically try to rework the different possible mix-ups that were already there but basically shortened them and include some of the ones that we discussed in Cairo because as most of the people that were there thought that this chapter would really be a list of ideas with no real, you know, recommendations attached to them yet but more to get the discussion during the public comment period going.

And so I think this is how this chapter should be seen and if there are, you know, any changes or anything how this would - it should be reworked would be helpful and any other ideas that should be added would be appreciated.

Avri Doria: Have people read through this?

(George): Line (13.13) to review the input that will be received during - because it hasn't been received yet.

(Marika): No that's more for people for during the public comment period when they...

(George): Oh.

(Marika): ...read this chapter that the input will be - and this chapter will basically be re-written at that stage. So it was with that in mind.

Avri Doria: Right but basically this is something that will occur in the future?

(Marika): Yes.

Avri Doria: Right. So that's what you meant by will be to review the input received?

(Marika): Yes.

Avri Doria: The "is" is confusing I understand.

(Marika): Well - to make that clear...

Avri Doria: Have people read through it with - I mean, in terms of accepting at least the restructuring of it?

Man: Can I jump in with comments?

Avri Doria: Please.

(Tom): The one concern I have is I'm not sure we have a formal structure proposed for accepting input from folks, hard data. I mean we keep on hearing about the need to do more than anecdotal stuff and yet I don't really see us proposing a, you know, a serious channel whereby people can actually submit data. So if I go ahead and find a fast flux host how do I communicate that to the group to provide data to help the process?

(George): Wouldn't they send it to the mailing list?

(Greg): Well...

((Crosstalk))

(Tom): How about if I do that for thousands of different, you know, domains; I don't think anybody's going to like having that mailing list, you know, come to their mail.

(Greg): Well what (Dave) and (Rod) and myself had suggested is if there's an aggregated set of data that somebody would like to submit they can submit that way and that's a lot better. We've had a few people do that like (Arbor) and I think (Richard Clayton) and (Cambridge) and so forth. Ones-ies and twos-ies are not useful but aggregated data to help us understand the scope of the issue, for example, would be really useful.

(Tom): Well (Greg) the same for example if you think about the Whois data problem reporting service, I think that's really a model for the way that the public can contribute data to an analysis project. And the fish tank is another example of that sort of thing. And I don't really see us articulating any sort of mechanism of that sort.

If we want to proceed without being data-based that's fine but otherwise I think we really should have some mechanism for collecting that data from the public who made comments.

Avri Doria: But that sounds like you're suggesting yet another possible step, which is to define a clearinghouse or a method for collecting data to make future analysis more data-based?

(Tom): Correct.

Avri Doria: Okay so you're suggesting another bullet point essentially?

(Tom): Correct.

Avri Doria: Okay. Any objection to adding that bullet point?

(Greg): I'd like to just see the language.

Avri Doria: Okay, can you submit a proposed bullet point?

(Tom): I will.

Avri Doria: Okay then. So back to my question on the restructuring of it; is there any objection to object to accepting the restructuring that (Marika) did so that the next pass we wouldn't see all the structural stuff but we would see the - the recasting of the issues as is done?

Okay, then going through them, the first one we have was redefine the issue and scope. How do people feel about that statement as expressed?

(James): I think there might need to be some word-smithing in there.

Avri Doria: Okay and it does mention the fact-finding, which, you know, is consistent with the other bullet that was just mentioned.

(Marika): I've left the text of these different recommendations on purpose for any hypothetical to really make sure that this is not recommendation by the group but these are options that could be explored, you know, any recommendations on how to better word it are definitely appreciated.

Avri Doria: And then the next one was explore the possibility to involve other stakeholders in the policy development process. (Unintelligible) one.

(George): Are we allowed to put back in things that were (classed) out because I, for example, I didn't participate in Cairo and perhaps others didn't but I objected to some of the things being removed entirely.

Avri Doria: Okay, which ones specifically?

(George): Option P2 line (13.32) through (34). And...

Avri Doria: Okay, so...

(Marika): Would you like to make that into a separate bullet or you would make that a sub-section of the redefined issuing scope?

(George): I'm not sure.

(Marika): Maybe something you want to think about and make a suggestion to the list of how you would like to present because, I mean, I guess we...

((Crosstalk))

(George): ...strikethrough (unintelligible) here or will...

Avri Doria: Once we...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Since this is the first time we've actually seen the strikethroughs they probably should appear for one more trip, one more meeting.

((Crosstalk))

(Marika): I mean if people are happy to make this a bit clear I'm happy as well to move all the light blue text underneath each other and leave the strikeout text at the end of the section so...

Avri Doria: Oh that's a good suggestion. So it's still there but we get to see what things are and then things can be moved up as bullets as people care. Any objection to that? I think it's great.

(George): Because - like readiness those are things I think some people don't want deleted because I don't think necessarily ICANN was the right place (for that).

Avri Doria: Okay. So what I would suggest is anyone that doesn't see the bullet there that you want contributes some text for the bullet but the strikeout will still be there for the next pass.

Okay just going back, so, we talked a little bit about the first two bullets, yeah, and the - the bullets for redefining issue and scope, the bullet for exploring possibility to involve other stakeholders and policy development process; although that is a broader statement than just fast flux so I don't know if it needs to be tightened at all.

I mean, it's a general statement that we all accept so that the - one of the apple pie statements of ICANN.

(Marika): I can make it (end) of fast flux policy development process to clarify that is related to this one so...

Avri Doria: I would recommend that because otherwise it really is, you know, our general statement of what we're trying to do and...

(Marika): I'll add fast flux in there.

Avri Doria: Okay, explore other means to address the issue instead of a policy development process. That was one of them. Issue with the way that's phrased at the moment?

Mike Rodenbaugh: (Unintelligible) any specific questions on that we should put those in there too.

Avri Doria: Well one of those may be the one that was related, of course, to the collection of - the data clearinghouse or whatever as I'm' calling it, but, yeah, that's always good. Highlights in the report, which solutions, recommendations could be tackled by policy development, best practices or industry solutions. Now that's in this report?

(Marika): Yes, I think it was one of the suggestions made at the meeting in Cairo.

Avri Doria: Right so it would probably - I don't know - would be that what we're talking about is in a later version of this report.

((Crosstalk))

Mike Rodenbaugh: ...the words in the report.

Avri Doria: Right. And if we include report then it's, you know, a later version because we're not making a recommendation for what we want to do in this initial report. And I think it is actually good to take out in the report there because then we're asking the constituencies, we're asking the public, we're asking everyone to basically look at that question.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes.

Avri Doria: The next one, consider whether registration of these policy provisions could address fast flux by empowering registries, registrars to take down their domain involved in fast flux. That was one of the bullet points; any issue with the wording as it stands?

Okay, so in which case next time we'll see all the bullets together; we'll see any bullets that anyone recommends added to those. The crossed out text will still be there but it'll be down at the bottom of the section. Okay. I think that's it for now. Any other issues? I want to talk a little bit about the next meeting.

Okay so we've got a bunch of action items on people that are going to write a bunch of things, send them in sections that'll be discussed on the list. It actually might be good if (Marika) - if we can put out a - you can put out a sort of a list of the things that were (unintelligible) like seven I guess it was A and B that people were going to read and comment on, that we were going to look at eight and, you know, discuss and comment on in the list and the other stuff so that there's a reminder to sort of drive the work during the week.

In terms of next week's meeting I'm going to be attending the (IETF) and I'm going to be, let's see, Central Time, what time is the meeting? I just want to make sure that I've got the timing right. Sin Central Time this meeting happens at 9 o'clock, right? No, at - what?

(George): Can I ask about (Annex) 4, the individual statement that was...

Avri Doria: Certainly.

(George): ...by (Michael Conner). Should that be in the document at all, like, why would we have individual statements and only have one? Are we all invited to add our own notes or should that be...

Avri Doria: I think anyone is invited. I think that's been sort of a normal practice on things that anybody participating in a group can basically add a statement in an Appendix.

(Marika): We still have two other individual statements, one from (Christian Kurs) and one from (Eric Brinder-Williams). I want to go back to them once we have the report on what's finalized to ask them whether they still want to have their statement included or whether they feel that some of those concerns have already been addressed...

Avri Doria: Yeah, I...

(Marika): So there are two others that might be added as well and I think anyone else...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I tried to approach the subject with (Eric) last week in Cairo. I got a very unhelpful answer but anyway. Yeah, okay, no, no problem with the meeting. I just realized I have to check out of the hotel by noon. But this meeting is at 10 o'clock Central Time so I should have no problem with it - (doing a couple of hours if necessary).

But, yes, in terms of statements at the end, in terms of the appendices (unintelligible) or other people that have taken the effort to write a coherent statement they're appended to the end. There's no, you know, judgment of this is appropriate, this is not appropriate, this is, you know, it's just basically there for people to read.

(George): So if (Jeff Williams) joined this group we'd have 500 pages.

Avri Doria: If (Jeff Williams) joined this group - although (Jeff Williams) probably would have difficulty joining the group because we do check for having abused the privilege of being part of groups or lists beforehand. So the groups are open but basically we always do a check first on that. But even so a statement attached to an end is a statement attached to an end. And sometimes his stuff is actually quite informative. I find all kinds of URLs and Web stuff I never would have read if I hadn't read his messages. And I read them all.

(Unintelligible). But anyway, any other issues before we close the meeting today? Okay I think we're getting close; I'd really like to get as much language in and as much of the close-down as possible so that we can take the next step and get this out to constituencies and to the council.

(Martin): Very good.

Avri Doria: I thank you all for your time and I'll talk to you again next week.

Man: Thank you very much. Talk to you soon.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Bye, bye.

Man: Have a good day.

((Crosstalk))

(Marika): Bye.

END