

**Fast Flux PDP WG Teleconference
TRANSCRIPTION
Friday 15 August 2008 15:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Fast Flux PDP WG teleconference on Friday 15 August 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-20080815.mp3>
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#aug>

Present:

CBUC

Mike O'Connor - WG Chair CBUC

Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC - Council liaison George Kirikos - CBUC

Zbynek Loebel - ISPCPC

Registry Constituency

Adam Palmer - PIR (registry constituency lead)

Greg Aaron - Afiliias

Rodney Joffe - NeuStar

NCUC

Christian Curtis - NCUC

Registrar constituency

James Bladel - Godaddy

Paul Diaz - Networksolutions

Observers - (no constituency affiliation)

Dave Piscitello - SSAC Fellow

Marc Perkel

Rod Rasmussen - Internet Identity APWG

Randy Vaughn

Staff:

Liz Gasster

Glen de Saint Gery

Absent - apologies:

Wendy Seltzer

Kal Feher - MelbourneIT

Beau Brendler - ALAC

Marika Konings

(Mike): ...the next few weeks and then all of us can run off and celebrate the rest of August.

Coordinator: Excuse me. The recording has now begun.

(Mike): Thanks very much. Welcome all. Glen, why don't you start us off with a roll call?

Glen DeSaintgery: With pleasure (Mike). We have (Michael O'Connor, Christian Curtis, (George Kirikos Paul Diaz, (James Bladel, Greg Aaron, (Liz Gasster from staff, Mike Rodenbach, Rodney Joffe, Adam Palmer, (Marc Perkel) and Dave Piscitello. Have I missed anyone?

(Mike): Sounds good. Thanks Glen. There are a whole bunch of things that I was going to do but since I don't have Internet access here in addition to access to Adobe Connect, I'm going to skip some of them.

The agenda today I think unless anybody protests, what I'd like to do is just spend about 15 or 20 minutes sort of talking about...

((Crosstalk))

Coordinator: Randall Vaughn now joins.

(Mike): ...talking about where we're at and where we're going for the next month and not do any substantive work. Just do process work today. Try and wrap this call up really quick so that Dave can go off and take

care of lad who I hope has a successful surgery and the rest of us can get on with August.

I'm not going to do the status report because I can't see it. But there's been a lot of process work this week in response to the fairly grouchy status report that I wrote last week. And for those of you that have Internet access, if you go to our Wiki page and look at the status report for the 8th, you'll see that after the call I raised a lot of flags because I felt like from a project standpoint we were sort of stuck.

That resulted in some fairly frantic position changing by me during the course of the week. I apologize for being all over the map but I got a little spooked and threw a lot of stuff at you. And I've had a chance to talk to wiser and calmer heads. I've talked to (Chuck) and (Avri) and some of the rest of you about sort of where we're at and what we're doing.

And so I have a proposal for us that I want to put on the table and if we're all agreed, I think then we'll just wrap this call up and carry on. Especially the conversations with (Chuck) and (Avri) led to this where while we certainly have some trouble with the charter and that's caused us to get stuck. On the other hand, we have done an awful lot of really good work, which is embodied in that archive of email.

And so the thought is that we'll set a staff effort underway to go through that email and summarize it. I will sit in on that effort. Anybody else who wants to join me in that is more than welcome.

But the goal would be that by the first week in September we would have rough draft answers to the questions that we were chartered to

answer highlighting perhaps some of the differences of opinion and perhaps highlighting some of the reasons why we had such a hard time answering some of those questions.

But summarizing the work that's embodied in the email archive. The goal there would be to produce a first draft of the answers which we could come together around in early September and see if we can arrive at rough consensus around one answer and then see if there are any minority views that need to get included.

And also for early September along with answers to the questions, summaries of some of the other threads because there were some threads that don't really fit neatly into the questions but which are I think really useful work that need to get pulled out into a final report.

We would also describe why we got stuck and offer as the last part of this draft several options for the council to consider going forward, one being to re-charter fast flux with a somewhat narrower charter. Sort of along the lines of the early stages of the list that Dave produced or the early phases of the project proposal that I made, you know, deeper research, more definitions, et cetera, et cetera.

Another might be to throw out the option that perhaps the GNSO isn't known in this -- somebody's got a dog barking in the background -- and could, you know, maybe what we ought to do is raise the issue of whether GNSO should reach out some of the other (SOs) for a broader effort either aimed at fast flux or at even a broader issue like the fraud and Internet issue or fraud and abuse.

But anyway come together early September around a draft built on the work that we've done so far. Try and tie that off in an initial report and then launch the one-month constituency statement cycle and still have something ready for the ICANN meetings in November. Shoot for mid October to have all that done.

So that's the proposal that I was planning to put on the table in front of you through the Adobe Connect, but I'm doubly handicapped on that.

I've talked to some of you about this and it seems to be agreeable to most. But I don't want to - don't want to proceed along those lines without putting it in front of everybody and having a little discussion around it. So with that, I'll stop and discussion can commence. And we'll see if we can arrive at a plan and then get on with the rest of August.

Paul Diaz: (Mike), it's Paul Diaz.

(Mike): Hi Paul, go ahead.

Paul Diaz: We have been struggling in the registrar constituency to get sort of group inputs. It might be easier if we have individual; but if I'm understanding what you're saying, are you going to ask staff to just summarize all the inputs on the list to date or are you still looking for say the individual participants on the working group to submit their comments and that would be like sort of the initial focus for staff summary efforts?

(Mike): I would throw that one out to the gang for discussion. Either of those is fine with me. I panicked on Wednesday and launched that initial effort

thread and then somewhere Wednesday is where I realized that I was just completely thrashing and needed to step back and take a deep breath and calm down a little bit.

What do people want to do? Either way is fine with me.

Man: What were the two options?

(Mike): One option would be to summarize the email and one way to finesse (Paul's) point would be that we could leave the email list open and people could continue to submit material to the list and the staff summarizer would simply include those late additions.

Liz Gasster: (Mike), this is (Liz). I just have one thought about that. One thing that has been hard in the past is when submissions just keep coming in up until, you know, someone's trying to write and summarize and more profound stuff comes in. I mean I've had that experience in other groups.

So I think we do need to set a cutoff particularly for the constituency statements because those are so key to - if you consider for example how useful and detailed the registry statement is...

(Mike): Right.

Liz Gasster: ...if that came in the night, you know, in the hours before we were trying to conclude, that would present a real problem. So I would prefer to have - not try to have a rolling input here and try to get people to - that whatever appropriate date they need to cut off the time.

(Mike): What if we did it like this? What if we said individual responses are fine and set some time next week, pick a date, whatever works, for the cut off because it's going to take (Liz) a while probably to spin up this staff review effort anyway.

So (Liz) what do you think a reasonable expectation would be for when the staff summarizer person would actually be in the saddle?

Liz Gasster: Oh, I think early next week. And I don't want to be too arbitrary. Like I think getting more constituency statements is exceedingly important. So for example for Paul and for others who know that, you know, serious efforts are under way, I think we should ask them what they really need and, you know, try to accommodate. Because I do think it's exceedingly important to try to tee up the views of constituencies and want to allow time for that if that's really in the works.

At the same time, this person, you know, these people actually will start, you know, early next week so why doesn't the team help us with that. And also, what do you think is the final deadline that - what are we working back from?

(Mike): The final deadline I'd like to shoot for is the first Friday in September, which I propose as sort of our next meeting date. So it would be the Friday after Labor Day in the U.S. And Paul, how long do you think would be comfortable interval to get individual statements done from the registrar community? Next week? End of next week work for you guys?

Paul Diaz: Speaking for myself, I think end of next week is fine for individual. I just don't have much confidence in getting a broader coordinated -

something as excellent as what the registry did. We're just not getting people together. It's been very, very hard.

(Mike): Yeah. Well, I think that maybe - I agree. So why don't we - why don't we say tentatively the end of next week, a week from today, is the cut off for submissions of any sort to the email list, preferably structured around the questions.

But for example, (Randy) I think was working on a case study that I read an early draft of that doesn't really fit into any of the questions but would make an absolutely fabulous appendix. And so if people have research that they're doing, data that they're munging, data that they're collecting, whatever, lets shoot for the end of next week to get those things in.

That'll give the staff folks a couple of weeks to include that stuff in their summarizing) and then we'll shoot for the first Friday in September for us getting together around a tentative draft that hopefully we can get out to the list before the meeting so that people can look at that and think about it and talk to their colleagues and so on. Does that seem like a reasonable schedule with folks?

Liz Gasster: This is (Liz). It sounds good to me and we will try to get it done, you know, a couple days before the 5th.

(Mike): (Terrific). Others? Anybody feeling a pinch in that kind of a schedule? This would be the time to say so.

(Rod): (Mike), this is (Rod). We're going to have data coming in for the next two months on this stuff so we'll get what we can between now and the

end of next week. But there will be more and more and it will help shape the picture a lot better over that time period.

Liz Gasster: Yeah. And I don't think we should discourage that at all (Rod). I mean we have the option of the appendices as (Mike) says. We also can put placeholders in the report noting that more research - because I think it's pretty clear more research is needed. So don't want to discourage any of that at least from a staff perspective.

(Mike): Well and one of the things we should probably do is figure out a way that that data rolling in and research effort can continue even as the formal working group process wraps up. We could do some brainstorming around that on the list. But I certainly wouldn't want to arbitrarily cut off what is the beginnings of an incredibly important and useful exercise just because we need to get a report out the door.

Christian Curtis: This is Christian. What do you see our final work product looking like?

(Mike): I'm envisioning that we will - we will (hue) to our charter, which is to answer those questions. And we're very likely to have several answers. If I were instructing the staff and those staff worked for me at the consulting firms that I used to work for, I would say go through all that material and see if you can find clumps in the opinions that are expressed about each question. And then write a summary of each clump.

Then my hope is that when we come back in early September, we'll see question followed by one or more answers reflecting the various points of view. And at that point when we read it, hopefully for each question we as individuals will be able to look at one of those answers

and say yeah, that's the clump I belong to. I'm in that group of opinions.

Then we'll go through the exercise of sort of determining whether we've got consensus around one of the clumped proposal and if we do, that would be fabulous.

If we have rough consensus which means a pretty substantial majority around one clump but some strongly held and important minority views, we'll indicate that in the draft and say we have rough consensus around this one but we have minority views that are very important and here they are. So that's the bulk of the report in my opinion.

I think that then another piece of the report will say why we had trouble arriving at consensus in those places that we couldn't because I have a feeling some of these questions we are going to - we are not going to be able to arrive at consensus on, even rough consensus. And it think that's the place that we can talk about the process trouble that I was ranting about all week.

And then the final part of the report I'm envisioning is some suggestions for the future. So that's sort of what I'm seeing. Does that make sense to you Christian?

Christian Curtis: Yeah. I just - a couple of comments I'd like to make on that. One of which is that we've (talked) quite a bit about problems with the charter and how we might want to refine the questions that we are asked and how they might be problematic assumptions behind the question.

(Mike): Yeah.

Christian Curtis: And I think it would be very worthwhile to have this staff try and summarize those as well as trying to summarize answers to the questions.

(Mike): Absolutely right. I'm hoping that all of the threads on the email will be summarized, not just the ones that pertain to the question because I think that that sort of charters structure difficulties discussion that you just talked about. It's really important and we, you know, that's a substantive finding of our effort and so I'm expecting that to be summarized as well and included in the report.

Christian Curtis: And I'd also like to make sure that we leave ourselves enough time to refine the clumps that we get back before we try and find consensus on them.

(Mike): Right.

Christian Curtis: Because, you know, it's always possible that the summaries that this staff is able to distill from the thread will not quite express the viewpoints of, you know, specific members.

(Mike): Right. Right. Yeah. I'm anticipating a week or so of clump refinement after the draft comes back.

Liz Gasster: And this is (Liz). You know, that is an important concern for us at staff as well. It's not an easy challenge but it's one that we really want to reflect where we can. So because of the kind of tornado of activity, the way I view it is we're going to do the best we can and then we're going

to be very solicitous of input from this group because - for precisely the reasons you're saying Christian.

And what's important is that it expresses how people feel and not the letter of the thread. So we'll be very open to that and we'll try to get something out as early as possible to give you a chance to comment.

There's something I'd like to throw out because I'd like to address it in the response. And, you know, I guess it has a somewhat controversial element perhaps to it.

But I just want to throw it out for discussion which is that when the issues report was written before the PDP was kicked off, staff strongly recommended that more research be done before a PDP was initiated and efforts to answer these questions occurred. Many of these questions derived from questions that were asked in the issues report and perhaps some questions that were even asked in the (asset) report if I recall correctly.

So one thing about the next step that I really, you know, I candidly regret the fact that the council voted for a PDP because I do think that launching a PDP on this is premature.

And I also think that questions of scope are important in terms of what the - not just the issue that (Mike) correctly raises about the fact that this is broader than just the GNSO. That actually worries me less. The fact - because I think you can analogize to a large degree to the CCNSO and it's less of a sort of stopping point for good work.

But I'm more concerned about the issue of scope with regard to all the other players that besides contracted parties to ICANN that might also play in the role in remedies and in detection and in all kinds of things that you all know better than I.

So I just would like to throw out the possibility that comments might also address that question and provide further guidance to the council as (Mike) kind of very wisely tried to articulate about.

You know, is the next step the project? What are the scope issues? Is it appropriate to launch a PDP on such a broad topic when traditionally, and I think the PDP model was more focused on, you know, narrow questions about almost yes or no. Or when you get down to a very refined list of possible options and are weighing the pros and cons of this possible option.

So that's something, you know, I'd love to see some discussion on and willingness of this group to comment on assuming that there's, you know, agreement about that.

(Mike): I think that that goes into options for the future portion of the summary.

Liz Gasster: Right. Right.

(Mike): I was cautioned by wiser heads than mine not to get too enamored with solutions but to stick with identifying the puzzle and let the GNSO take the lead on defining what the solutions might look like. But I think what we do is we summarize that along with all the other stuff and then include it in the go forward portion of the report.

Now I'm going to do a quick point of order for Dave because it's coming up on the bottom of the hour and I know you have to leave pretty soon Dave. Are you okay with this approach in general? Anything you want to chime in with before you have to scoot? Maybe he's already scooted.

Woman: Yes he has.

(Mike): Okay. Other thoughts?

Man: Hello.

(Mike): Christian, I guess I (unintelligible). I don't want to move away from you if there's (unintelligible) that you wanted to add for what's going on. Does that address the issues that you wanted to raise?

Christian Curtis: Yeah. Just one more quick point. I'd like to make that the draft in the conference calls get included in the materials that get summarized as well as the email thread.

(Mike): Oh, that's a very good point. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Good catch. I completely forgot about that.

Glen DeSaintgery: Dave's on mute I see.

Liz Gasster: Christian, we'll do our best. Absolutely.

Christian Curtis: Great.

(Mike): Other thoughts from folks.

Mike Rodenbach: Just a quick though - it's Mike Rodenbach. You know, you mentioned that yes this problem is bigger than the GNSO. Well that's true with every problem that the GNSO tackles. The CCNSO has I think literally never had a PDP error. It's had like one or two in their history. It's not - just you can't wait for some sort of global ICANN group to convene to deal with problems. They typically have historically have always started in the NSO or with staff initiatives, SSAC or otherwise.

Liz Gasster: I agree (Mike). I wasn't...

((Crosstalk))

(Mike): Yeah and duly noted.

Liz Gasster: ...belaboring that.

(Mike): And again, I don't really want to - we're starting to get into defining solutions at this point and I'd just as soon save that until we've got the summary draft in front of us. No, it's noted that we shouldn't wait.

At the same time, I have concerns about buy in and validity if we don't figure out a mechanism for folks outside of the GNSO participate. And, you know, so that I think is a puzzle that we can work on as we define the proposed solution.

Other thoughts from folks?

Marc Perkel: This is (Mark). I'm new to this whole process and there's a lot of this stuff that you're talking about, you know, that I don't really have a very good understanding of because I don't know the structure of ICANN. But I'm more of an engineer, you know, type person, you know, and I'm kind of, you know, you know, someone who would like to jump in the solution end of it.

(Mike): Okay. Can you like - can you come to the point that you're trying to make?

Marc Perkel: Well the point is that I sort of feel like this whole process is skipping the solutions phase and I don't think that's the right thing to do. I think that, you know, the...

((Crosstalk))

(Mike): (Mark). (Mark), I'm going cut you off because we've been down this road before. For sure look for that point to be made in the summary. But I don't want to rehash that right now on the call. I mean we've had this discussion several times before. And I'm really just focused on process right now, not content. Sorry to cut you off like that.

Marc Perkel: Okay, but sometime it makes me wonder if you don't get (unintelligible), what's the point in doing all this in the first place?

(Mike): Lets take that offline.

Marc Perkel: Okay.

(Lis Gasta): Hey (Mike). I just wanted to tell you, it's (Liz), that Dave tried to un-mute and was having some difficulty.

(Mike): All right. Other thoughts from people? And remember I'm really zeroed in on what are we going to do for the next month and not - I really don't want to spend much time on the content today. I feel like I wrapped you all pretty thoroughly around the axle this week.

I really am trying hard to unwrap us from the axle and lay out a pretty short action plan on how we're going to proceed. And if people are comfortable with that, I think we're good. If we're needing to refine that, that's the topic I want to zero in on right now.

Zbynek Loebel: This would be Zbynek Loebel speaking. I tell you I think that what you proposed is a very good plan how to proceed. I'm on - I'm participating on behalf of the IPC and for us it's more, so far it has been more a learning exercise. But basically we are learning and I look forward to receiving the summary to comment and so on and we can move from there.

(Mike): Terrific. We're glad to have you. Others?

Rodney Joffe: This is Rodney Joffe. That Rodney.

(Mike): That Rodney.

Rodney Joffe: (My name's Rod). The process that you're suggesting seems sane to me in the absence of anything better.

(Mike): Cool. I love that actually given that I've run you through some insanity in the last few weeks. Other thoughts? Sounds like we're pretty much all in agreement on that. I'm going to take that as - I'll take this as your last chance to deflect this. And hearing no squawk, I think then what I'd like to do for this call is just wrap the call up.

(Liz), if you could maybe hang on the call, maybe you and I can do some logistical stuff and folks are more than welcome to stay on for that logistical conversation if you want. But I sort of want to draw the formal part of the call to a close, maybe stop the recording and call it a day.

Zbynek Loebel: Okay. Perfect. Thank you. Bye.

(Mike): All right folks.

Man: Thanks a lot.

Glen DeSaintgery: (Mike).

(Mike): Glen. So Glen you can drop off too and go play in France.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes. Thank you very much indeed.

Liz Gasster: Hey Glen. Play in France for us too. Would you?

Glen DeSaintgery: Hey (Liz).

Liz Gasster: That sounds delightful.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes. Okay. So I'll get doodling on it as soon as I can.

(Mike): Okay.

Glen DeSaintgery: And we'll care about calls for September.

(Mike): Terrific. Now (Liz) or Glen, when you drop off the call, will that end the conference call? So (Liz), should you and I just try and call each other...

Liz Gasster: Yeah. That'd be fine. I'm on, you know, I'm at my desk.

(Mike): Okay. Before we drop the call, let me write down the number because I don't know...

Liz Gasster: Okay. Is the recording off?

(Mike): Yeah.

Liz Gasster: Okay.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yeah, just let...

(Mike): The operator...

Glen DeSaintgery: Let me just get...

END