

**Fast Flux PDP WG Teleconference
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 10 September 2008 15:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Fast Flux PDP WG teleconference on Wednesday 10 September 2008, at 15:00 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-ff-pdp-20080910.mp3>
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#sep>

Present for the teleconference:

CBUC

Mike O'Connor - WG Chair CBUC

Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC - Council liaison

NCUC

Christian Curtis - NCUC

Registry Constituency

Greg Aaron - Afiliis

Registrar constituency

Paul Diaz - Networksolutions

Observers - (no constituency affiliation)

Joe St. Sauver

Rod Rasmussen - Internet Identity APWG

Randy Vaughn

Staff:

Marika Konings

Glen de Saint Gery

Absent - apologies:

Dave Piscitello - SSAC Fellow

George Kirikos - CBUC

Kal Feher - MelbourneIT

Coordinator: This is recording is (unintelligible) you can now go ahead.

(Mike): Thank you very much. Glen why don't we do the role call?

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay I'll do the role call for you. Just a minute. We have on the call (Mike O'Connor leading the group. (Unintelligible), Christian Curtis, Rod Rasmussen , Mike Rodenbaugh, (unintelligible), and Randy Vaughn. And I do not see any other people on the (adult) connect. Have I got everybody?

And Marika Konings.

(Mike): All righty. I posted a link to the agenda in the chat area. And today's call is pretty narrowly focused on (Marika's) fabulous document. Hat's off to you for pulling it together. An amazing piece of work. I think very helpful. Does everybody have a copy of that available to them for the call? That's going to be very important. I sent - I put the link to it out there as well.

Anybody who does not have it chime in right now and we'll figure out a way to get it to you. Okay. One piece of old business before we dive into that. I'm going to take a moment to sort of confirm that we're not going to try to get out to public comment and constituency review (more) of the (Cairo) meeting. That just turned out to be way too hard.

So we're going to go to the (Cairo) meeting with initial report rather than the final. And this is the chance for anybody to say - last chance to say no let's keep going. But given the ties of the review task that we've got and the quality of the work that's done I'm quite comfortable with the idea of (Cairo) meeting with initial report. So this is sort of the last chance to oppose that.

I don't hear anything right now.

Man: Could I ask - last week you had said that if things went beyond (Cairo) that you would want to step down a chair. Are you willing to see this through till we have a final report?

(Mike): I'm feeling more confident that the after (Cairo) work will be fairly brief. My main concern is just personal time. I don't - I was beginning to feel as though this was a death march that was never going to end, and feeling a little more confident that it actually is going to end.

So I'd be willing to stay on after (Cairo) and see that last (oration) through. On the other hand if you want to throw me out that's fine but...

Man: I'm certainly not proposing that.

(Mike): No, I'd be willing to stay on. I really just don't want it to extend for another three months because I am putting an amazing amount of time in it. I had no idea that that's what I was signing up. But I am willing to carry on.

Man: Great.

(Mike): Any other comments on that point or on the schedule? Okay. I think that's what we'll do then. All right, the rest of the call today is devoted to (Marika's) list of changes to the report. And given that we're a little light in terms of (forum) I think what we'll do is we'll go through these changes and if we all agree that they're fine we'll accept them.

But we'll treat any disagreement as defer until next week rather than try and hash it out today because we just don't quite have enough

people on the call (Erik), (Greg), you know, a bunch of folks who are pretty strong contributors.

So if that's all right with folks what we'll do is go through - because a lot of these -- I think -- are fine or only need to be changed in a minor way. And then we can sort of knock off a bunch of these and narrow the focus for next week's call -- which will also give us time to collect a few things.

I know that (Dave) has some writing that he want (just) can't do it this week (better). Is that okay with folks? Is there any other approach that people want to...?

Man: In a nutshell (Mike) are you saying that we're going to go through this, get rid of the stuff that's non-controversial amongst those on the call, and then we'll have another round next week to talk about controversial stuff and new stuff that (Dave) or I or anyone else might put forward and meanwhile?

(Mike): Yes. That's exactly right.

Man: All right thanks.

Man: What if something's approved this time and then somebody comes on next time and is interested in revisiting it? I assume you'd permit that?

(Mike): Yeah I think so. I think the presumption would be that what we'll produce today is a list of approved stuff and that everybody will have a chance to speak and revisit something.

Man: Super.

Man: I don't know how fast (Marika) could go through this just after the call today and put in all the stuff that's been agreed and then circulate a new version of the report. But that might be...

Man: I think that would be fantastic. I think a lot of it depends on sort of how much we get done today.

Woman: Just a quick question there. Would you like me then to do that and track changes so people can see clearly what has been added to the first - compared to the first version?

(Mike): Yeah. Why don't you do that?

Woman: Okay.

(Mike): That'll work at least for the folks who are using (Word).

Woman: All right. But I think it comes up as well and if I put in the PDF I think you can still see as well what has been changed because the thing is underlined so.

(Mike): Oh great. Okay yeah. Let's do that. That'll make it easier for folks to review too. Great suggestion. Any other thoughts before we dive in?

Now I'm going to tend to talk a lot on this call. And if that starts to get in the way feel free to interrupt me and say, wait a minute you're talking too much. But I think this particular case since what we're really looking for is uncontroversial items I'm going to sort of breeze along.

And if you want to declare something either controversial or at least clarify it by all means interrupt me.

But in the - for the sake of expediency I'm going to sort of chug right through this because we do have a bunch of these. And - so that - at least when I sort of imagining how this call was going that's sort of what I arrived at.

So if that's stopped working for folks by all means slow me down and figure out another (way). So I'm going to just start out with number one. This was the suggestion by (Greg) that essentially says that this is not anecdotal. And anecdotal was my word. I wrote that. And so I'm going to take that as a friendly amendment.

I was using anecdotal mostly because I never actually wrote up formally the conversations that I had about this with (Roiters). And so I'm willing to accept this friendly amendment. Is that all right with everybody?

Man: How are we going to vote? Are we just go ahead and say nothing if we're okay with it, or?

(Mike): Maybe the way to do votes is I'll do just aye and nay. If we get any nays we'll call it a controversial one and so all in favor say aye.

Everyone: Aye.

(Mike): All opposed say nay. I hear none. We'll call that one okay. And I'm going to treat the second one pretty much the same way. Friendly

amendment where the problem with that sentence I think is that it focused too much on (short TTL). Again all in favor say aye.

Everyone: Aye.

(Mike): All opposed say nay. Hearing none we'll accept that one. Same deal with number three. All opposed say aye.

Everyone: Aye.

(Mike): All opposed say nay. Accepted. I think what I'll do is I'll get rid of the ayes. That way you don't have to labor along with that. I'll just call for no's. The next one -- number four -- on page two (George) was suggesting that we expand the list of (working) group numbers. Fine to me. Anybody opposed to that?

Okay we'll approve that one.

Man: Before we move on from that one, one question I wasn't clear about was the extent to which folks actually are representing a working group. That was something I think came up and I never really heard a definitive resolution of that.

(Mike): Yeah. And was it that they're representing the working group or representing their constituency group?

Man: Or constituency I should say.

(Mike): Yeah. I think let's take a note (Marika) and maybe I'll stick Glen with this one. Let's put that back out to the list. We never did get an answer on that.

Man: It might be resolved by being able to look at the constituency statements and comparing them to the various (unintelligible) within the working group?

(Mike): Yeah I'm not sure.

Woman: Do you want us to send out a note to the working group in which everyone can indicate whether they're representing the constituency or they're on an individual title? Is that what you would like us to do?

Man: That was sort of the question I never heard resolved. I mean someone went ahead and rose, you know, brought up the issue of whether or not folks indeed had the authority to go ahead and speak on behalf of their constituency or not. And that was something I never really heard anything definitive resolved about. And since this is sort of the section where that connection seems to be getting made it seems like that would be an appropriate place to resolve it.

(Mike): Yeah. Let's put this one on the controversial pile and add that note to it and hit the list with that question. I'm going to back off on that one.

Woman: You - would you like a plan to send out a note to the end - to the group?

(Mike): Yeah. That would be great.

Woman: Okay.

(Paul): (Mike) it's (Paul). You know, since I was the one who probably stirred up that hornet's nest I would just repeat I don't know if it's necessarily a controversial issue.

ICANN's rules for a working group anybody can volunteer. Therefore the opinions expressed are the individual representative's opinions. It's only when -- like the registry constituency -- when they go through a process and put whatever position statement to their constituency to vote they then explicitly state this was a constituency position.

Anything else should be understood as the views of the individual members that are either making the point or have signed their name to the document. It's really very straightforward. This is unlike a task force where constituencies elect representatives to the task force in which case because it's an election they have the authority to speak for the constituency.

That's it. You know, volunteers in a working group, everybody's opinions are their own and it's only when it's gone through by the constituency by-laws their internal process and they explicitly state hey we went through our process, here it is. Like the registry constituency did for example on their statement.

Then you take it and say constituency (view). Otherwise -- again -- always individuals. Really very basic so I don't think it needs to be deferred. It's straightforward.

(Mike): Okay. Does that suit everybody else? That works for me -- in which case we could go back to accepting number four.

Woman: Should I maybe then just insert a line to that end basically explaining the working group and indeed that it's, you know, statements being made on individual title apart from the constituency statements just to clarify that? I guess I can take that up from the by-laws somewhere.

(Mike): Yeah. I think that's right. It'd be a good thing to remind folks.

Man: I can certainly live with that.

Man: Sure.

(Mike): Do that. Okay so four is accepted. And then in addition to that (Marika) will add that reference to the by-laws. Anybody opposed to that? Cool. Way to go (Paul). Thanks.

Number five was - that's from Glen. Look - what's the link (to Gwen)?

Glen DeSaintgery: The link is being sent to the list. And it's also on the (unintelligible) but it's quite easy to be put in. It's to all the segments of (interest).

(Mike): (Of interest). Right. Anybody opposed to including statements of interest? Accepted. Number six. (Dave Sciscitello) to the list. And I'm fine with that. (Marika) we had this question from the general counsel. Did we ever get a resolution on that?

(Marika): Yeah I think it's as the note is written. I mean I can (task) and participate in a working group when invited as a non-voting member.

So we would propose to add a line and saying that indeed they participated but not adding them as a formal member of the working group of such just to avoid that there's any, you know, perception of conflict of interest down the line.

(Mike): Okay. Anybody opposed to that? All right. Number six is accepted. Number seven is - I think this is one of (Dave's stubs). So I think what we'll do (for) seven and eight -- goes on -- numbers jump on my copy -- oh there they are.

Getting a bunch of (Dave Sciscitello's) (stubs). I think we're going to defer eight through 11 because (Dave) wanted to re-write those anyway. And so rather than try and vote them up or down now we'll (wait) on those. So the next one I want to consider is 12 -- which is (Joe's). Talking about (short TTLs).

Man: Since that one explicitly references the ones that we're skipping for now do we want to wait and see what changes are made to those before we address this one?

(Mike): Yeah I'm fine with that. Anything that falls in that category let's just wait. So we'll skip 12 as well. (Joe) are you okay with that?

(Joe): I'm fine.

(Mike): So we'll leave that one for next week. So then we're on to 13. Different - adding the case study. (Greg) do you want to...

(Greg): Oh yeah it's just referencing an example. There is a statement below that said that there was no evidence. And so I just thought it might be a

good idea to just reference that link as something we'd looked at in some depths.

(Mike): Yeah okay. Anybody opposed to adding that? Okay hearing none, that's accepted. Fourteen -- I'm sure what's - not (unintelligible).

Man: I think that's a reference to the fact that there is some other approaches that people may be using to try and avoid detection such as going ahead and using (TOR) for example or other, you know, circumvention approaches.

(Mike): That's a great clarification. Let's insert that clarification and accept it because I think inserting such as (TOR) is a great - rather than saying not (fast flux) is - clarify that. Anybody opposed to doing that?

(Marika): Could you just clarify that for me -- (TOR). Is it T O R?

(Mike): TOR. It's all capitalized. It's essentially another way that's not (fast flux) to avoid discovery.

Man: What exactly does (ditch) refer to in that sentence?

(Mike): It sounds like maybe your (ham-handed chair) got in there and screwed up one of (Marika's) sentences. (Three)...

Man: Bring up the link of the PDF?

(Mike): Can you see the chat or do you need an email with it?

Man: Chat will be fine.

(Mike): In the chat window, the long one, above (Greg Aaron's) sorry I'm late.

Man: No I'm saying for the original document or for the 42 page list of changes. I'm looking for the original document.

(Mike): If somebody else can do it faster than me by all means list it in chat.

(Marika): In the meantime just to clarify the - it refers to the sentences before that. Some indicate that there is a lack of evidence to actually support this category as benefiting from (fast flux) (free speech advocacy) group. All techniques are used by these groups are for discoveries of evidence has been provided to support this.

Man: This being the assertion that there's a lack of evidence? Or this being the assertion that there are the groups in this category benefiting from (fast flux)?

(Marika): Let me copy into the chat window so people can...

(Mike): Why don't you copy it into the notes window (Marika). That way we can...

(Marika): Okay. I'm not allowed to do that.

(Mike): What?

(Marika): I think.

(Mike): Paste it into chat and I'll paste it into notes.

(Marika): Okay.

(Mike): All right. There's the (facts). That's both sentences, or just one?

(Marika): Yeah.

Man: I might suggest a re-write for that sentence because it is confusing. How about dropping the other first? Just change it to techniques other than (fast flux) are used by these groups to avoid discovery.

(Mike): Put the (such as TOR) in there. How does that look? Do people see the changes that I made?

Man: Looks fine to me.

(Mike): Given this new wording can we accept it? Anybody opposed, say no.

Man: If we're re-wording I generally would prefer to defer given our low numbers.

(Mike): Yeah. Okay. (Job) 15. Immediately after (lines) -- wow. This is - I think maybe this is big to accept - to approve. I guess I'd be inclined to wait on this one. Anybody feel otherwise on that for number 12 - or 15?

I - (version) on page six of the document bottom of the page six I have a number 12. It points then to something that starts on page seven by (Dave). Again this is a big one. I think I want to defer. Is that just a numbering glitch (Marika)?

(Marika): No I think 12 refers to (Dave's) proposal.

(Mike): The numbers go 13, 14, 15, 12.

(Marika): Oh. Yeah I note that as well. Yeah I guess that's a numbering...

(Mike): Yeah so we have two number 12's. And I think that we defer the first number 12 as well -- yeah. I think (we'll defer) for both numbers.

Man: Why don't we call it 15.5.

(Mike): Yeah that's a good idea. (Marika), do you want to renumber the 12 that's on page six of the document?

(Marika): Yeah but the whole document will be updated anyway because my proposal will be to take out the ones on (unintelligible) and actually adjust the numbering I guess. Or while - actually now that I'm saying that I guess I might confuse things.

So I'll just give this and I'll - what was the suggestion? What number do I give this -- 15a?

Man: Fifteen point five or 15.1 or whatever you want.

(Mike): Yeah or 15a. Anything that indicates that it's between...

(Marika): Yeah.

Man: Is this one really objectionable? I (unintelligible)...

(Mike): You know, the ones that I think we can accept are really the minor - almost editorial and grammatical changes today (Michael). The pretty big...

Man: Well I guess I don't think we need six (people) on the call to do that then - or seven. However many we have.

(Mike): Well but we, you know, this little one that we just did I think is important. And -- I would hate to make those all on my own. And if you want me to I can. But, you know, you've already heard me propose some things that got fixed by the people on the phone. So I would - back a little bit there.

On the other hand I'm a little uncomfortable taking something this big and sticking it in without a larger group.

Man: Are we talking about the same thing? The second number 12 -- changing the words avoiding false positives to maintaining an acceptable rate of false positives?

(Mike): I'm read -- oh I guess the rationale is quite long.

(Marika): Yeah I think that's my mistake. I think I put in a part here that is already covered in another amendment. So you should basically not consider what follows the first line of the rationale. It comes up in another amendment. So basically needs just confirm that first sentence on the top.

(Mike): So really on page seven we should just be reading the first two sentences?

(Marika): Yes.

(Mike): Okay. I think you're right (Michael). I think this one is pretty...

Man: Thank you. I thought I was going crazy.

(Mike): Yeah. No, no you're not going crazy. I can, yeah. Let's accept that. Anybody opposed to accepting that?

Man: I am. I'm - the idea of an acceptable rate of false positives I actually find kind of objectionable and think would need a lot more clarification and discussion.

(Mike): Okay.

Man: I mean maybe it's just another paragraph indicating that there's another view on it. But just throwing it in I'm not comfortable with it.

(Mike): Okay. Good enough for me. Let's defer that one and then (Marika) if you could sort of (key the part) - the extra part that...

(Marika): I'll take that part out because it, you know, it reappears in -- I think -- section -- where are we at -- at 18. So it comes back there.

Man: One point that I kind of note however is that sometimes the rationale is actually excellent text. That would really probably merit working into the document itself ideally somewhere. Or at least I find it often, you know, quite informative. Do you have thoughts on how to handle that (Mike)?

(Mike): I don't have thoughts about that. One incredibly lazy thought is to hand (Marika) the job of trying to figure that out. I'm not sure whether that's fair. (Marika) do you?

(Marika): I must say I don't think it's really fair. I don't feel really comfortable in being the judge there on what is good rationale and what is bad rationale. So if people there would like to make proposals and suggestions I would prefer to go down that route.

Man: Yeah but one easy answer is to footnote it or endnote it.

(Mike): I think what we would need to do is figure out which ones we want to footnote.

Man: Basically or just consider the rationales as proposed endnotes for now. And if people have problems with the text then we can deal with those.

Man: I actually like that. That's pretty nice.

(Mike): Yeah that's not a bad scheme. I could go with that. So what would we do? Would we pick rationales that we want to include as endnotes? Nominate them essentially?

Man: I suggest we assume that all are proposed as endnotes by the drafters and then if people want to knock them out for some reason then -- consider that. So I agree these are thoughtful notes. There's no reason to lose them.

(Mike): Right. Would we attribute them to the drafter so that they would be separate from the opinion of the group?

Man: Of course it could get really crazy if there's endnotes for every sentence.

(Mike): Yeah. I don't know.

Man: Review articles.

(Mike): Yeah right. I mean we could go for a record number of pages.

Man: We might hit that anyway, you know?

(Mike): Yeah we might. What if we nominated all rationales by default as endnotes and we attributed all of them? So the people didn't have to feel like we had to arrive at any kind of consensus about the endnote. I think if we have to do that then we've really signed up for a lot of work.

Man: That's a good idea.

(Marika): Doesn't that complicate it, because if everyone accepts a certain amendment I would assume that they also agree with the rationale. So if you attribute every rationale it almost looks like that only the opinion of that one person who has provided the rationale. Or am I wrong here?

Man: I actually would challenge that assertion. I think there's going to be a number of places where we're able to agree on things but for different reasons. Now maybe the case that - there are many cases where we

can reach consensus on a footnote. But figuring out which is which might just be a lot of work.

(Mike): I think the way to maybe - (Rick) I think you make a good point. If we don't accept a change maybe we don't insert its endnote in document by virtue of the fact that we haven't accepted it. But if we've accepted it we'll take the rationale as well but we'll attribute it so that we don't get tangled up in having to actually edit all the endnotes.

Man: But the originally described process was that would be preserved albeit disclaimed as not the work of the group.

(Mike): Right (that being the thought). You know, the thought being that if we could attribute the endnote that would - that issue. That work?

Man: That works. It gives everyone a chance to say they don't want their note in there or change their mind also.

(Marika): (Mike) could you just repeat what the agreement is on this?

(Mike): Yeah. So let me summarize and make sure I get this right. So what we'll do is for any modification that we accept we will (insert) the rationale as an endnote and we'll attribute it - the person who wrote it.

Man: One thing that we should remember is that if we're making the rationale in this we'll want to play with the grammar just so that they make sense.

(Mike): Yeah and some of these are written in first person and some are written in third. Is that what you're thinking of?

Man: Yeah. Things like that.

(Mike): (Marika) can you - there are some which are very first person and very rambling. Maybe what I will do is grant you the power to go back to the person who wrote the rationale and ask them to re-write it if it's too much for you to re-write on your - that help you out? I don't want to leave you with an impossible writing job.

(Marika): Well one way to do it as well I mean for those that we accept today I can already include them as endnotes and then people can see how it is. I'll just basically copy and paste what they send. And then people still have time to, you know, re-write it as they see fit -- as it is attributed to them - to individuals I would prefer as well that if there's any re-writing they do it themselves - as a - in their name.

(Mike): Very good point. Let's handle it that way.

Man: So (Mike) let's come back - I was just going to say go ahead and clarify then if a amendment is not accepted what happens to it? It is endnoted? It's not endnoted? It's inserted at the bottom of the page?

(Mike): No I think if an amendment is not accepted then its rationale is also not included.

Man: So does it not get included in any form as well then?

(Mike): The amendment that was rejected?

Man: Correct.

(Mike): Well those could be preserved in these documents.

Man: Because the original process that was described was quite a bit different.

Man: Yeah this is (Mike O'Connor), you know, building the plane while it's in flight.

(Marika): Just to clarify because I don't understand. I mean we haven't gone (down or) rejected anything. But as understood from earlier emails rejections would only occur if everyone would reject the amendment. And otherwise one could consider including it as a minority position.

Man: That was my understanding.

(Mike): Yes sorry. That's my fault. The right way to do it.

Man: I just wanted to indicate I'd be fine having that minority position essentially expressed as an endnote or footnote or wherever the text ends up going. I mean I don't think it's necessary to have it interrupt the flow of the document. So that was why I was confused by the discussion of not having some of those appear as endnotes.

(Mike): Yeah. And that - well that's a thought. I was assuming the minority positions would be in the main flow of the document. How do people feel about having them appear entirely as endnotes rather than in the document?

Man: (If anything) I think maybe they should be separately stated as a separate annex. And then the endnotes to the text could be different annex.

Man: I think it's okay if you can hyperlink them. Put them in an appendix or anything like that as an endnote.

Man: I actually disagree with that. I think that given the amount of disagreement we've had in this group if we do the minority view something of a disservice to exclude them from the main body of the text because the main body of the text really reflects the amount of disagreements we've had.

(Mike): Yeah I'm drawn to that rationale. I think what I'd like to do is leave them in the main body of the text -- essentially the way that I was originally thinking they would go. But partly because I think that way you as the reader get the sense of the degree to which there are different opinions. But also it keeps them all together so that you can eventually review the whole argument at the same time as you read it.

Man: That sounds good.

Man: I assume then that the minority use would be attributed also. In other words it'll be clear if it's one person's view or if it's 45% of the group.

(Mike): Interesting question. I guess I hadn't thought that through. How do people want to handle that?

Man: One way it's handled in other working groups is you basically develop gradations of consensus -- like five levels.

(Mike): So do you - in those documents were they by name or were they by number? In other words...

Man: Oh I'm sorry. Well they were not attributed. Instead there was an assessment made that was agreed by the group as to what the, you know, what level of consensus there was. I'm thinking specifically of the (who-is) group that (Philip Sheppard) last one I think was.

(Mike): I mean one way we could do it is just essentially record a number of people supporting. I think it would get a little tedious you reading everybody's name over and over again. The only reason (unintelligible).

Man: Yeah you're right. No, the other - a good way to do it - we should look back at the way (Ron Mohan) did his work on reserved names I think it was. I'll find it.

(Marika): (IBN).

Man: (IBN). Yes, (IBNs). That's the way it was Glen? Do you recall?

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes I think (unintelligible).

Man: I don't remember. Yeah I can't remember the detail. (Ron) did handle it well but I forget exactly how.

Man: I'll find it and report it.

(Mike): Let's assign an action item to get that identified and described and out to the list (EDQ) so that we can take a look at it and give it a nod, because if there's a good example in a process that worked really well I'd really like to (do) it.

Man: (Unintelligible) connect go ahead and let you actually have sort of a ballot and folks can just go ahead and record their positions on each of the items. And then that can be transcribed if need be?

(Mike): Yeah that - it's partly the way the report would read that notion of sort of degrees of consensus or whatever it is. I'd really like to see what that report looked like because I don't want this to be distracting. And it - but at the same time don't want it to be unclear.

If there's a good compromise between them.

Man: I'm actually a little nervous putting something to a vote now because we're - we seem to be bleeding numbers.

(Mike): Yeah. We are bleeding numbers. We've exhausted a lot of people. And I think that part of the reason that this call is so lightly attended is because I didn't promote it well. I'm hoping that if I can shout a little bit at the mailing list we'll get a pretty big turnout for next week's call.

Man: There weren't people who had problems with this time were there?

(Mike): I don't think we had a lot. We lost (Randy Vaughn) he had a call - or a class at this.

Man: Yeah I kind of gave my lab (unintelligible) today. This is probably - very seldom I'll be able to come at this time.

(Mike): I think (Randy) was the one. I didn't get a lot of regrets. Glen do you remember from the...

Glen DeSaintgery: Oh (Joe) is also one. But (Joe) is on the call.

(Joe): I made it.

Glen DeSaintgery: And we got a regret from (George Kennebecot) and (unintelligible).

(Mike): For this time?

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes. No, no, not for this time, for this call. But as far as I can remember I think everybody is on the call. I mean nobody is not on the call because they said they couldn't be on it at this time.

(Mike): When you did the (doodle) were there any folks who said - I remember (Randy) saying on the (doodle) poll that he couldn't make this time and that (Joe) couldn't.

Glen DeSaintgery: And they're on the call.

(Mike): Yeah. And are those the only two?

Glen DeSaintgery: Let me check and look.

(Mike): Best that you can find. So while (Glen's) hunting that down let me try and summarize where I think we're at. (Unintelligible) attribute

endnotes, going to do attributed rationales as endnotes. The - we're going to research the degrees of consensus models that (Ron) did in (IBN) and perhaps adopt it. At least get it out on the mailing list.

We're going to keep the (minority) views in the report in line. We're not going to put (unintelligible). Is that a safe summary of where we're at?

Man: Yes.

(Mike): Okay.

Man: On - going back to the question of footnoting the rationales. I just want to make sure that we leave a step for reviewing and pulling out ones that seem unnecessary. If we make just small grammatical changes that don't actually represent, you know, substantive judgment (as to what's being said then I don't think that we really need to footnote this rationale.

(Mike): Yeah I think that's right. Maybe we'll leave that to (Marika) to sort out. And then if anybody's rationale gets deleted and they feel strongly that it should go in they can petition to get it back in.

Man: Okay. I just posted a link to working groups.

Man: I had a hard time hearing that.

(Mike): (Michael Rodenbaugh) just posted a link to (Ron's) report in the chat area. in the notes area just...

Man: This is a really large networking group. A lot of folks - really well done.

(Mike): There's agreement for (alternative view). So there were three grades. Agreement was essentially consensus where it was (feuding) positions may exist. So was it (Michael) that in the case of support that's where alternative views also appear? Or were there alternative views?

Man: When you look at the report the way it was laid out I think also it was basically (uses) them separately. Here are the areas of agreement. Here are the areas of support. Here are the alternative (views).

(Mike): Okay. All right. Well let's take that as something to ponder on the list over the next week as a possible approach to the format of our report.

Man: I'll put (unintelligible).

Glen DeSaintgery: (Mike)?

(Mike): Yes?

Glen DeSaintgery: It's Glen. There's four people who had problems with Wednesday were (George Kennecot), (unintelligible), (Randy Boone) and (Joe). And we've got (Randy) and (Joe) on the call. (Dave) is traveling, and (George) sends his apologies.

(Mike): One option that we - I was going to suggest that we might go back to Friday for next week's call but of course for Friday next week is my state-wide commission meetings. That's -- let me promote the next call on the list and see how we do getting people on the call next Wednesday in terms of developing a big enough group to vote.

Now another approach to this would be to do some sort of offline - rather than doing it by phone to do it via the list. In (unintelligible) have done this kind of thing have they ever done that? Or is it always...

Man: Done both ways. Working groups (unintelligible).

(Mike): How do they do it if they do it asynchronously?

Man: Well basically you do a draft of the text and take expressions of (unintelligible).

(Mike): Could we use (Marika's) document essentially as a ballot and have people reply to (Marika) with...

Man: I think that would be good after we finish (this step) we're in now.

(Mike): Yeah.

(Marika): But then it might be helpful to circulate the word version so people actually can go in and take out the (why) or the (and) because it's not possible in the PDF.

(Mike): Yes I agree.

Man: You don't mean (Marika's) PDF document today. You mean (Marika's)...

(Mike): No I was thinking actually (unintelligible).

Man: I was thinking (unintelligible) then we have something that's not (unintelligible) whether we agree with the text or not. There might be still friendly amendments (unintelligible) after that but.

(Mike): Not sure - so would you put the - essentially the yes/no...

Man: Let's finish what we're doing right now.

(Mike): Okay. On the call.

Man: Then we have a text - an initial report go out to the group to decide whether they agree or support or have an alternative view as to any of the sections of the report.

(Mike): Okay. That means that we have to get this done on the phone, right? This first phase.

Man: Well I think it'll be helpful just to narrow down the issues. I mean like we were starting to do today -- just taking out the...

(Mike): Yeah, picking out the ones that are fairly straightforward.

Man: Then the other ways I mean I think that if it's pretty clear from our call that there's going to be two strong - two positions that are supported basically then we need to (take text)...

(Mike): Yeah. And hopefully what we'll wind up with we can get through -- how are we doing on time? Another half hour. If we could get through the non-controversial stuff today maybe by the end of the call next week

we'll know the (gradation) of support and the degree to which there is going to be multiple opinions on each of these issues.

Man: That'll give people another week to review (email threads) and...

(Mike): Yeah. And give (Marika) a chance to get another draft out.

(Marika): I'm just wondering though about the new draft as there are several amendments that are linked and related, whether it would make more sense for me to actually update the proposals list indicating the ones that have received agreement here.

So we first focus on the list before starting to introduce things in a text - -I mean when we start introducing. Once we have everything agreed or agreed or at least clear whether (unintelligible) people can review the report as a whole and not have pieces in and certain pieces missing that are - that still need to be discussed.

(Mike): That works for me. So we'll focus on this - on the PDF document until we finish it. And then update the draft once. That's what you're proposing?

(Marika): Yes that would be my proposal.

(Mike): I think that's a good idea. Okay let's - anybody opposed to that idea? All right. Well let's carry on (can). We're actually doing pretty well -- non-controversial ones. I'm up to number 16 -- which is on page eight.

Man: I suspect that's not in the non-controversial pile.

(Mike): Yeah it's pretty big. Let's defer that one. Seventeen, page ten. Oh I know what that is. I'll bet this is (potentially) a (stub). (Marika) did you do this for each of the...

(Marika): Yes but just to point out that basically alternative proposals for that same section. So I'm not sure whether that one goes in the un-controversial or controversial pile. But the 17 and 18 and I think 19 as well are all -- or no the 18b question are all linked to the same section - - 5.2.

(Mike): Right. So what I did is essentially put a (stub) into each section where people proposed, you know, it's essentially in the first draft of the report. One answer to the question is there was no answer. That's what this proposal is. And so this is controversial for sure. We certainly can't accept this today because this is one option for section 5.2. So no, we couldn't answer it.

Another option is 18 -- which is (Dave's) response to that section.
Another option is (Joe's) -- which starts on page 14...

(Marika): To clarify that's an addition to (Dave's) proposal. So that's why it's A and B (unintelligible) (Joe's) proposal to (answer an elements) to (Dave's) proposal.

(Mike): Right. So I - none of these can be agreed to today and the only thought I've got is (Joe) if you could re-write this -- one of yours -- some of this is in first person. And some is in third person. Some is in a form that can go directly into the report but some of this isn't. I'm looking now on page 18 -- bottom of the page. It says (number four) Internet Access

Operators. I'd probably call them Internet Access Providers or Service Providers.

Man: I think that was sort of meant in the sense of suggesting a change to that line. And I don't know how to really connote that.

(Mike): The best way -- and this...

Man: See what I'm saying?

(Mike): Is essentially to propose an alternate text.

Man: That was what I was attempting to do there, I think. But I mean I just never hear the term Internet Access Operator but I do hear people routinely talk about Internet Service Providers.

(Mike): Yeah and so what I would do is just propose an alternate text there that says suggested alternate text is number four Internet Service Providers.

Man: And you want that as a separate proposal?

(Mike): If it doesn't overly complicate things.

Man: I think it will.

(Mike): It might. You know, essentially what we're looking for is chunks of things that we can insert into the report pretty much as-is rather than instructions to a drafter. So - but what would be nice is to sort of go through that whole four or five pages that you wrote and sort of

reduced however many suggested texts are required to insert your ideas.

Man: Can I go ahead and go as one chunk to the list rather than having to be like 40 separate emails?

(Mike): Leave that to (Marika). It's sort of a question of if you're proposing a whole text that's essentially a whole section of the report then I would say it's one chunk. If it's a series of edits to the report I would still suggest suggested texts but, you know, want to group them into one email that's fine.

But (Marika's) going to have to make essentially a choseable item out of each one. I should make that clear.

Man: The reason I ask is originally I think the thought process had been that each proposed text would experience discussion on the list. And I haven't seen that really occur on a thread by thread basis in the way that I think was originally anticipated.

I think what I have seen is a number of people sort of batch their comments and that would, you know, or suggested changes. And that would probably be easier from my point of view.

(Mike): I think that's okay if it's okay with (Marika). I really wanted to defer it to (Marika).

(Marika): I'm not really clear on what the proposal is. Basically you're asking for this specific section whether this whole part can be put in here like

this? Or whether for every point mentioned you need to make a separate proposal. Is that the question?

Man: I guess the question really was is if I go ahead and look at the changes that begin on page 14 do I need to go ahead and break those out into individual email messages or can I go ahead and break them out into a series of items but batch those items within a single, larger message?

(Marika): Yeah, no you can put them together in a single message as long as you clearly indicate where in the document you would like to see that inserted. So it can even make a clear reference but it doesn't, you know, from my point of view it doesn't need to be in separate email messages.

Man: Super. Thank you.

(Mike): All right. I'm on to page 23. I think that this one sort of falls in the same category (Joe).

(Joe): I understand.

(Mike): We'll defer this one and wait for your re-write. And now I'm on to page 29 where item 20 is just another (stub). We're now onto a new section of the report -- section 5.3. And again this is just my (stub) reply. It's one alternate view and number 21 -- which starts on page 30 -- is adjusted alternate text. I think we probably need to defer both of those till next week's call.

Then what you see on - in 22, 23, 24 is that same (stub). You know, again I asked (Marika) just to stick it in so that there's at least one version of a text for each of those report sections.

And if you get to number 25 is an alternate text for section 5.6. So it's the same sort of thing. I think that all of these sort of have to get deferred. So I'm on to 26 on page 31.

And accept that as a friendly amendment. This is (Greg's) suggestion that we change affiliated to contracted and affiliates to contracted parties. Is anybody opposed to that? Okay hearing none, 26 is accepted.

(Twenty seven) probably needs to be deferred. Does anybody (disagree)? Like it's got (content). Does 28 (unintelligible).

Man: I'm going to have to drop off at this point. This is (Greg). Good talking with you. Take care.

(Mike): Twenty nine. Dang he dropped off right when I could have (unintelligible). I (don't) remember working on 29. Anybody want to help educate me on the difference?

Man: Between 28 and 29? Or (who-is) versus (DNS) or?

(Mike): The current draft is over on the left. I'm on page 33 at the top of the page. And (Greg) is suggesting a different (text) there.

Man: Could someone tell me what page footnote five is on?

(Mike): In original report?

Man: Correct.

(Mike): Does anybody have the original report open? I don't.

(Marika): On page 18.

Man: Thank you.

(Mike): Oh I think what (Greg) is trying to do is clarify that.

Man: I think simply just trying to get the technical correct answer there.

Man: Twenty eight and 29 really get at the same thing -- which is that, you know, the footnote was wrong.

(Mike): So I'm willing to put this one up for tentative approval today. Is there anybody opposed to accepting (Greg's) change on that?

(Marika): (Mike) could you just clarify if we're talking about 28 or 29?

(Mike): I'm talking about 29 on page 33.

(Marika): Okay because 28 also concerns footnote five.

(Mike): Oh correct. Sorry.

(Paul): If I can (Mike) -- it's (Paul). I think what (Greg's) doing in 29, you know, it's actually straight forward. It's just saying it's not manual. What's

wrong in 28 is the idea that - or wrong - is incorrect. What needs to be addressed or tightened up in 28 is the idea of having these automated queries. Very, very high volume query already takes place on (port 43). But it's (port 43) that many registrars limit the number of hits you can have to prevent data mining.

So, you know, the idea that you could use the (DNS) for high volume things and (DNS) to access (who-is) data is all possible the challenge is going to be getting access to it - the high enough volumes to do the kind of work we're interested in here and not get tripped up by the rate limits that most every registrar puts in place to prevent data mining.

(Mike): Oh.

Man: Excellent summary.

(Mike): So where does that leave us on accepting or deferring those two (points)? Sounds like 29 is fairly straight forward and could be accepted. Maybe 28 needs more work (a summary of what I just heard)?

Man: I'd be happy (withdraw) of 28 if 29 goes. I mean they both address the same issue and it's just a freaking footnote so.

(Mike): How about that? Anybody opposed to that approach? Done. So we'll delete - we'll actually reject our friendly amendment. (The author) will remove 28 and we'll accept 29. Okay. Thirty is clarifying that the group didn't reach consensus.

I think that's content. We'll defer that. Same with 31 that's one we probably want everybody to (look). Just the (stub).

Man: Is it possible to put all the (stubs) kind of into a single package that was sort of essentially an up or down vote? I can't really see people voting on some of those and not others (in a consistent way). Or do you envision that occurring?

(Mike): Well what was going on there was I just wanted something for people. And where you're seeing them in a row like that is just that there's no alternative. And so I'm open to any and all suggestions. I just asked (Marika) to put them in because there - basically there was nothing in those sections of the report.

I - when I did the drafting of that part I just took all the sections and listed them as bullets under a statement like that. So it's really just a mechanical thing. And I'm open to any and all ideas.

(Marika): And just to clarify there are some sections where there is an alternative proposed for (unintelligible). So I'm not sure whether it's possible for voting on them all together or maybe only for those where there's no alternative provided.

Man: I defer them.

(Mike): Yeah we'll - it's a good point though. We'll take a look at that and maybe (Marika) hit it right at the very end -- where there's no alternative provided. Maybe we could put all those up at once.

Man: It may be best to actually create a section kind of going into depth with the difficulties that we have with these questions. And the - both the (unintelligible) definition of (fast flux) but also maybe some of the flawed assumptions behind the question.

(Mike): That's a hard one to write. Anyone want to take a crack at that?

Man: I could take a stab at it this weekend.

(Mike): I think that would be very helpful. Maybe what we could do is (pull) those ones where there's no alternative text underneath all of that, essentially expanding the (stub) that you're going to write. And then delineate the questions that we had a lot of trouble with.

Let's do that. Who was it that volunteered?

Man: That was (Christian).

(Mike): Yeah if you take a stab at that over the weekend that would be sort of how we (wind up on). And then submit it to (Marika) just like all the other ones with the instructions (unintelligible) questions or just (pull) them into...

Okay so I'm screaming along here. And now I'm on to 34. Just another - same thing. And then on to 35 -- easy to accept. That's a numbering change. (Internal) edit. Anybody opposed to renumbering to make it work right? Thirty five on page 34. Accept that one.

On to 36. I think that's a content one. We'll defer.

Thirty seven on page 35 is (I view) as a friendly amendment.
(Unintelligible) that one and perhaps accept it. Want to discuss that at all or shall we just go ahead and...

(It's essentially) clarifying.

Man: I think it's pretty non-controversial.

(Mike): Yeah I do too. Anybody opposed to accepting number 37? Okay we'll accept that one. Struggling trying to (route) what - what's number 38 about? (Joe) do you want to...

(Joe): Yeah essentially 38 kind of raised the question of whether or not there should be a section summarizing the constituency statements or whether those should be allowed to stand on their own. And if they stand on their own as an annex I'm fine with that (and would) have no proposal in any respect.

However if it goes ahead and becomes incorporated as a summary as part of the body of the report then at that point I think those text become subject to discussion simply because at that point the summary is, you know, work group product rather than a statement of the constituency.

(Mike): Ah. Okay I get that. Let's have a conversation about that. I'm on sort of the fence on that one. One approach would be to just delete that whole section of the report and let -- and as (Joe) was saying -- just let the constituency statements stand on their own without summarization. How do people feel about that?

(Paul): This is (Paul). I for one like the summary but do appreciate (Joe's) point. And would suggest splitting the difference instead of identifying the source (unintelligible) something like some members point out (blah, blah, blah). If we're going to adopted the approach (Ron Mohan) used in the past that sort of identifying, you know, if there was almost rough consensus that there was positive and then alternate views, use that as a guide to how we identify.

So if we can say some members, fine. That falls in the kind of middle category. It's not rough consensus. It's more than a minority of one.

Man: I can live with that.

(Paul): I think it's just that if we cut out the summary this report's going to be long to begin with. And anywhere where we're kind of synthesizing the thoughts I think it's going to be much appreciated by (counsel) and anybody else who reads it.

So, you know, I would rather not lose stuff like this that, you know, helps get you to, okay here's some group's thinking. We just - I think (Joe) makes a good point. You know, rather than identifying who they are and creating problems about what if you disagree with what they say, say something like some members.

Man: I'd be fine with that.

(Mike): Okay let's take that as a friendly amendment. (Joe) what if we withdrew these and asked (Marika) to go through that summary with the approach that (Paul) just laid out? Essentially try a re-write of the whole section.

(Joe): (As long as there's) an opportunity for comment on the re-write I'd be fine with that.

(Mike): (Marika) how are you feeling about that as an approach? Could you take on re-writing the summary where we essentially lose the attribution to the specific?

(Marika): Okay. I'm then taking basically the different amendment as (Joe) made as (the some others). Does that reflect - (I haven't had a chance) to look at the other proposals. But does it reflect what should be integrated in there?

(Mike): I would think that the first thing to do would be to go through essentially the process of summarizing the constituency statement and (pull) the major points that were made out of them all -- much the way you did, but not attribute them. And then see if any of (Joe's) points are missed. And if they are, if there's a way to work those points in.

(Marika): Okay.

Man: (Unintelligible) kind of comes back also to the issue that was raised earlier in the call about whether or not these are indeed constituency statements or just statements of individuals who may happen to have an affiliation with the constituency.

(Mike): Well I think in the case of the two -- where's the (registrars) one at (Paul)? Do you know? Did that one go through the...

(Paul): No and as we said in our thing this is - we very explicitly said this is not a constituency view. It's the views of the members signed below. And we listed those who contributed or signed off.

(Mike): The only one that actually went through the formal constituency process was really the registries.

(Paul): I can't speak to the (NCUC) though because that was presented as a constituency position.

Man: That was a constituency position.

(Paul): There you go.

(Mike): Okay so it went through the formal (stuff for constituency).

Man: Our process is actually more (informal) but it did (bed it).

(Mike): Okay. Well now we've got two things in front of us. One is, what do we do about the registrars one?

(Paul): All you have to do is say - add the word some for (RC) members and then add of the working group so it reads the registry constituency, (NCUC), and some members - some (RC) members of the working group all point to -- and then it's accurate.

(Mike): Got it. (Marika) do you track that? Are you comfortable that you know what to do?

(Marika): Yes.

(Mike): Okay. All right so we will - where does that get us in terms of - (Joe) is the last one there 41? No, wait a minute. So 40 would - so 38 through 40 are the ones that (Marika) should take a look at?

Man: That was my thought, sure.

(Mike): Yeah, okay. And incorporate into the draft along with the changes that (Paul) has suggested. All right. So we're on to 41. We have two minutes to go. Well, you know, we did a darn fine job but I don't think we're going to make it today.

So we'll leave the rest for next time. Any sort of parting thoughts that people have that we should fold into the process of getting ready for next week's call?

Man: I think some sort of mechanism to allow like an up or down vote would be nice, if that could be incorporated into the collaboration tool. I don't know what its capabilities are.

(Mike): Well it's got the capability of two kinds of votes. So we can either do attributed voting -- look over on the left side, the list of names. If you look at the bottom -- turn my up. People can give things a thumbs up or a thumbs down.

I can agree or I can disagree. That's the way it shows up. So that's one way. You know, that would be essentially a roll call voting mechanism.

The other is this polling is (more over) in the upper right corner. And the tricky bit will be if people are not on (it'll be connect). If they're just

calling in. I think what we'll have to do is have a mechanism or Glen to take a roll call of people who aren't (adobe) connect so (they) aren't shut out of participation (unintelligible) over that a little bit.

Man: I think afterwards (you can) folks that are - missed the call - an opportunity (unintelligible) by email.

Man: Absentee ballot as it were.

(Mike): After next week's call (Mike)?

Man: Well, you know, basically yes. After next week's call.

(Mike): Yeah. Not this week's call though right?

Man: No because we still don't have all the proposed changes.

(Mike): Right. No I just wanted to clarify that you didn't mean after today's call.

Woman: I can propose (unintelligible) when I send out the revised proposal list that I indicate as well that on those proposals where we reached agreement there are some possibilities to come back when those are - (we raised) them.

(Mike): Yeah that's a great idea. So the people who aren't on today's call can bring them back to the table.

Man: On mechanical issues you're probably looking at about 1 to 2 minutes per vote (unintelligible) have votes on like everything.

(Mike): Yeah and I doubt that we'll get through them all next week. I've sort of revised the schedule to try and get through this in two or three weeks. I don't think there's any way that we can get through them all. Too much to discuss.

Okay folks. Thanks a million. It's 10:30 my time. I'll let you all go.

Man: Have a good one.

Man: Take care.

Man: Thanks (Mike). Bye now.

END