

**Fast Flux PDP WG Teleconference
TRANSCRIPTION
Friday 11 July 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 11 July 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/fast-flux-pdp-20080711.mp3>
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jul>

Present for the teleconference:

CBUC

Mike O'Connor - WG Chair CBUC

Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC - Council liaison

Registry Constituency

Adam Palmer - PIR (registry constituency lead) Greg Aaron - Afilias Mat Larson - Verisign

NCUC

Christian Curtis - NCUC

Registrar constituency

Kalman Feher - Melbourne IT

Paul Diaz - Networksolutions

Eric Brunner - Williams - CORE

Margie Milam - Markmonitor

Ihab Shraim - Markmonitor

James Bladel - Godaddy

Wendy Seltzer - ALAC liaison ICANN Board

Observers - (no constituency affiliation) Steve Crocker - SSAC Dave Piscitello - SSAC Fellow Randy Vaughn - Marc Perkel - Rod Rasmussen - Internet Identity APWG Joe St. Sauver - Oregon University

Staff:

Liz Gasster

Marika Konings

Glen de Saint Gery

Absent:

Rodney Joffe - Neustar - apologies, excused Zbynek Loebel ISPCPC - apologies, excused

Glen DeSaintgery: Let's start again (Mike). Michael O'Connor, Randy Vaughn, Rod Rasmussen, Phil Lodico, Mike Rodenbaugh, James Bladel, Greg Aaron, Christian Curtis, Matt Larson, Kalman Feher, Marc Perkel, Paul Diaz, Eric Brunner-Williams, Margie Milam, Adam Palmer, and apologies from Zbynek Loebel and Rodney Joffe who are not able to be on the call today.

(Unintelligible) we have Dave Piscitello - Steve Cocker, Wendy Seltzer. And for staff we have Liz Gasster and our new staff member Marc Perkel Marika Konings

Coordinator: Excuse me, Mr. Ihab Shraim now joins.

(Mike): Welcome aboard. Does that conclude the roll call?

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes it does.

(Mike): Hopefully you can all see essentially our agenda in front of you. Again if you're not on the Adobe Connect call feel free to join.

And I think we should probably get in the habit of muting our lines. Again, some people have a fair amount of background noise.

What I thought we would do today is a little more process than subsequent calls. But because we're getting started I sort of thought it would be good for us to get a little bit grounded in how things will work.

And then my goal is to get us into a brainstorming session and get to the real work by about 40 minutes from now and spend an hour or so, actually starting to brainstorm some of the answers to the questions.

But what I wanted to do first was just spend a few minutes familiarizing folks with this Adobe workspace. And to that end, I'm going to change it right before your very eyes.

And I'm going to stop sharing my screen. And I'm going to move this into a different set of panel.

What you should be seeing now is five or six panels on the screen instead of the one big slide show. And the thought is that we've got sort of two ways to communicate amongst ourselves. We've got the phone call. But because we've got so many people on the call it's going to be hard without some sort of roll call mechanism.

So if you look over on this side of the screen, hopefully you can see my cursor. One of the things that you each have as an option is the ability to change your status.

So let's say that I wanted to raise my hand. I think I can raise my hand by highlighting my name and going down to the bottom and clicking the little button that says raise hand.

And Wendy is smiling. So that's what I want you all to do. I want you all to do something like that, just like Wendy did. That was excellent. And Rod's given a little applause and falls in there. And Margie's in there. Cool, this is great.

So everybody try that a little bit just because, you know, I want us all to kind of get comfortable with this gizmo.

As we're going through the call I'll be able to see those even though I'm going to be sharing my screen again in a minute.

And if you want to get in the queue, go ahead and raise your hand. If you want to have me speed up or slow down, feel free to use all those buttons and so on and so forth.

And we'll sort of use this to manage the conversational queue. My goal is to make sure that everybody who wants to speak about anything gets a chance to do that. And so feel free to slap me around if I ignore you. But I'll keep a close eye on that.

Now over on the other side of the screen is a little poll in which right now the question is do we agree on this? And we're going to change this. And I'm going to say do we like anchovy pizza? And open the poll. And I'm going to vote yes because I love anchovy pizza.

And I encourage all of you to chime in. I have a statistical norm that I'm trying to prove or disprove here. And I'm actually - it's actually being disproven.

My thought is that anchovy lovers only constitute about 5% of the population of the world. And we either have a skewed group of anchovy lovers or we - I have a statistic that's inaccurate. Because we have a fairly large proportion of anchovy lovers in the group.

This I'm thinking that I may use when we want to test the degree of

consensus around the topics. My hope is that we can stay pretty much around consensus viewpoint. And we'll just see how that goes as the conversation continues.

But during consensus it's also very helpful to sort of get an interim view of what the opinions are. And if for example we were working on something for real, what we would do next is say okay, we have pretty substantial lack of consensus. What can we do to modify this proposal so that we get 100% consensus?

And so I'm going to do that. I'm going to say what if we buy anchovy and other kinds of pizza? Are we (unintelligible) that?

And I'll open the poll again. Vote yes to the proposal. And one person is saying no. We have a...

Woman: That's your cheese hater. You haven't gotten to the cheese problem yet and I know you're in Wisconsin.

(Mike): And see, this is hard for a Wisconsin person to handle. And so...

Woman: I know it is. And I thought I should break it to you right now because I'm your staff support. So there you go.

(Mike): Okay, so we're edging towards consensus but we haven't quite made it. And this is the sort of thing that I'm hoping we can use when we get down to the substantive stuff.

I'm not planning to use the note section. And I'm not going to watch the chat because my brain just can't handle that much input at once. But I

am right now.

But the poll does support...and it also supports non...but also checkbox kind of things.

Woman: So (Mike), are you seeing the chat?

(Mike): Yes I am.

Woman: Okay.

(Mike): And I'm not sure the hum. I'm not understanding the hum, humming for consensus.

Woman: So none of the rest of us can see the poll results.

(Mike): Oh, what happens if I close the poll? Now can you see it?

Woman: No.

(Mike): Oh, well that's (unintelligible). So what do people see on their screen at this point?

Woman: We just see our own book. We don't see the conclusions, the total results of the poll.

(Mike): Ah, here's a button to click. Hold on. Now...

Woman: Ah yes.

(Mike): Broadcast results.

Woman: Much better.

(Mike): That's the missing link.

Man: Are you able to choose the different option which shows the result of each person's vote?

(Mike): No I'm not. I think this is - let me just drive over there and look. But I believe no. What I can do is what you see with me having checked that box.

So if we want to see the results of each person's vote, one way we could do that is back over in the attendee list.

What we could do, let's try this. Let's change our status to agreed or disagree. And so I'm going to change my status to agree. And a little checkmark appears over there. Panel is agreeing. Steve is agreeing. (Mark) - or Liz is disagreeing.

And so on the pizza discussion, now we would know who the people who disagreed with the pizza discussion were. And that would probably be pretty helpful as we're trying to elicit the clarifying issues like the fact that some people hate cheese - and just that's probably a useful refinement to use the - when we want to know who's voting, they use the attendee list capability rather than the voting thing.

I'm going to clear my agree off. Wendy's raised her hand so I'm going to approve that. I don't know what that does. Oh that gives you a

microphone, but that presumes there's audio on this call. So Wendy, just go ahead.

Wendy Seltzer: I was just trying to clear my status -- didn't mean to do that.

(Mike): Okay well let's see what happens if I - yes, I can click it and make it go away. Let's see, what happens if I - well my status is still with raised hand. I'm going to clear my status too. There, okay.

Anyway, that's the little tour of the workspace that I wanted to take us through. And for the most part...

Michael Rodenbaugh: It's...

(Mike): Go ahead.

Michael Rodenbaugh: (Mike), it's Mike Rodenbaugh. It's the (wrong) process. It's asks for clarifying. And obviously some people aren't on the call and some people like me today aren't able to access the ability. So...

(Mike): Yes.

Michael Rodenbaugh: ...presumably everything that he decides on calls will then be confirmed on (unintelligible) as everyone will have a chance to object or comment that way right?

(Mike): Oh sure, and especially in these early calls. What will happen is that I'll take notes as we're speaking. And then those notes will go up on the wiki just as a starting point for editing and commentary.

And if - I'm going to actually use this as a springboard to sort of leap out of the Adobe lesson and go back into sharing my screen. Because what I want to do now is take us through sort of the work plan. And that's a pretty good segue into that.

So at this point in a second, your screen should have reverted back and you should be able to see our little agenda at this point. Is that what everybody sees?

(Mike), are you still unmuted because you're getting - I think you're the one that's generating a fair amount of background noise at this point?

Michael Rodenbaugh: Hey yes I'll stay on mute. Thanks.

(Mike): No problem. Okay so let me take us through the work plan just a little bit to give folks a chance to comment about this.

This is a little picture that I drew. And basically where we are right now is in this - we have to approve this template which we'll do in a second.

But then can people see my cursor as I move it around the screen? If not maybe I can do something about - I'll just have to be very clear.

What I'm thinking is that we will essentially go out for constituency statements twice. The first time very informal much like these calls and much like a lot of editing just to essentially brainstorm ideas, develop ideas, broaden our menu of possible solutions and then prepare an initial report based on both constituents, the informal constituency statements and the results of these calls and take that document out to a more formal round of constituency statements and public comments,

factor those in to a final working group revision that see where we get to really refine our results and decide whether we have consensus or not.

And if we do that's great. And if we don't, we'll publish reports with multiple opinion and send that on to the GNSO council.

In order to do that I've put together a little work plan for us. And if you look at the dates, it's a little bit longer than our 90 day charter. And I'm getting the sense from (Aubrey) and (Chuck) that this will not be a problem.

But before I go to them with these formal dates, I just want to check with you all and make sure that this feels realistic to you.

Under each one of the milestone...there's a little list of tasks. I'll just click on the first one because this is the one we're working on right now.

What I did is I laid out to get to a given milestone, the stuff that needs to happen. And in this one, this is a little bit weird because much of the stuff that led up to this milestone had happened before I became the chair.

But if you look down at the bottom of this list we're kind of at the end of the process of developing detailed work plans, establishing email lists, share workspaces and teleconferences and getting the statements and interest from members of the workgroup.

For those of you who haven't submitted the statement of interest yet,

please do. We need them from everybody unless you already have one on file because of some other ITN related duty that you have. And if you're running into trouble with that, let me know and I'll help out.

Anyway, that's sort of the forming the working group task. That's nearly done and we're going to finish that up today.

We're also going to finish up the templates I hope, because it'd be nice to get that template out to the constituencies soon, like tomorrow so that they could spend a couple of weeks filling them in.

And so that's sort of the way this work plan is laid out. This first round of constituency statements is pretty short. It's really basically from tomorrow until the 25th which is really only a couple of weeks.

And again my thought here is that this is an informal round. Essentially an option expanding round rather than a decision making round.

The second round is the full 30 day cycle to give people time to go ahead and go through a more formal process with their constituencies.

But this one's pretty short. The hope would be that you people who are representing constituencies would get your comments from your constituency back in late July and have about a week to prepare or refine that statement and get it on to the wiki.

I also gave you a chance to go back to your constituency in early August and get their approval.

And then once those are in and once our - meanwhile we'll keep

floating along in parallel with that doing these conference calls.

My thought was that we would spend essentially this call and the next two calls trying to brainstorm our way through the list of eight or nine questions that we've been asked to answer.

And then we'll fold in the constituency statement in sort of the early part of August and see if we can identify especially during that editing cycle, see if we can find the areas of non-consensus and then spend the call on August 8th either arriving at consensus or concluding that there needs to be several positions published.

And then primarily Liz and I will buckle down pretty in that last four days and, you know, (unintelligible) the initial that will go out to the - for the wiki.

Somebody's moving a microphone around or moving their phone around without being on mute and it's pretty loud.

Okay, from there I think the initial report complete. Yes, after the draft is done, after Liz and I have finished the draft, then we get to go through that draft again on the teleconference and give it its final scrub before we release it for comment in the public comment period.

So that's sort of the first half of our work. That takes of sort of from here where we are today through these two parallel processes. Then we as a group prepare an initial report.

And I think that's all I'll go through for right now. I think, you know, the process - and I sort of want to stop at this point and go out to the group

and just see if there are issues, concerns.

This is pretty much my work on my own. I have no editorial pride whatsoever. So if there's something that we need to modify in this or if this is unreasonable, this would be a good time to let me know and we'll fix it.

People okay with this in approach?

One of the habits that I will show you is that I'll let those little pauses go for a while again to encourage people to speak. But if I don't hear anything then I'll take that as agreement and we'll carry on from there.

So I'm going to take that as a yes, this is okay let's keep going vote on the work plan. And I think that's going to get us done with the process part with the exception of this template.

And I just want to take you all through it real quick. And you're welcome to follow along with you want.

But this is the template that's out there for you that you can use to go back to your constituencies on this first round.

And so what I tried to capture in this is basically this. There are two chunks. This chunk here is quite lazy on my part. It was just a recasting of the very questions that we're going to work our way through.

And again, the thought is that we might as well spread the net, throw the net as broadly as we can and encourage others in the

constituencies to chime in.

And then Liz pointed out that it would be a really good idea to have a sense of how (that) constituency process went.

So the first two questions really are more process questions, you know, how many people participated? How did you arrive at your conclusions?

I think this can be quite informal in this round. And I wouldn't stress myself out over answering these first two questions. For example, I think in the business constituency we'll probably send this out via email to the list, get comments back, select them in a shared document, send that shared document out to the list, get final comments and that will be that.

And I think that for this round, that's probably sufficient. Wendy?

Wendy Seltzer: I'm sorry to be jumping in late with a question about the process. But I wonder, I know the PDP puts these constituency statements first. But it seems to be strange for us to be making statements of possession before doing the investigation and consideration of the facts that might lead us to our positions.

(Mike): Yes, and I almost renamed this. And - because I thought that might be confusing in that in a way this is really more constituency input than it is a statement of position.

Wendy Seltzer: Right. And I fear but that by calling it position we're causing people to become more wedded to them than they might...

(Mike): Yes, that's a good idea. In fact I think what I'm going to do is I'm going to bother your eyes for a minute. I'm going to start recording action items here.

Liz Gasster: Yes, this is Liz. I think we could edit that pretty easily and say instead of position, it's input or, you know, perspective or, you know, some appropriate other word that isn't as narrow.

(Mike): Good call. Good catch. Anybody disagree with this?

Man: Yes...

(Mike): I think that's a good refinement. We'll make it - I agree with you Wendy. I really don't want people to get terribly wedded to these positions. This is really more one of - so somebody's talking on another line and we can hear you. Sorry about that.

Liz Gasster: Wendy, it's Liz. If I can just jump in quickly. Wendy if you have a spot if perspective sounds okay or viewpoint or, you know, whatever word you think feel free to email it to me or post it. But I can, you know, edit that to take that as an action item.

Wendy Seltzer: Thanks.

(Mike): Okay, I'm going to jump back to - whoops, wherever I was. Hang on a minute. I'm lost. I'm lost in my own computer. Help me.

Liz Gasster: You're doing a fine job so far.

(Mike): I know but...

Liz Gasster: We're all impressed so...

(Mike): ...I just got totally - okay, here we go. So that's the first good refinement. I'm not going to edit these on here. That's - gets a little complicated. But we've got an action item to fix that.

Other thoughts on that? That was exactly what I want us to do is as I'm blathering along, raise your hand, interrupt me. Any kind of correction is great. That's just what I'm after.

I'm hearing nothing. And so I'm going to say that I'm going to put it to you and I'm going to do my little pause. This is your chance to sort of speak now or forever hold your peace on this first round template.

And then on the second round one I think we're probably going to have to put a little bit more work into that because that's going to be a more formal process then because people are going to be coming up with positions that we're going to need to work through.

But for this one are we okay?

Cool. All right, well we are chugging right along here folks. And one of the problems with a group this large is that you do get to listen to...

Eric Brunner-Williams: (Mike), this is Eric.

(Mike): ...your chair a lot more. Eric, go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes, it takes about 5 seconds which is about the time that you pause to go from mute to non-mute mode.

(Mike): Ah, sorry about that.

Eric Brunner-Williams: So you need to increase the length of your pauses if you're looking for response.

Have you written any of this up or are we just catching this in our ears - in one ear and out the other?

(Mike): Oh no, this is all coming off of the wiki that we've got for our workgroups.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Okay. But I don't...

(Mike): So...

Eric Brunner-Williams: ...seeing them even as agenda for the meeting. So...

(Mike): Yes, the agenda is not on the work...

Eric Brunner-Williams: Kind of spontaneous.

(Mike): No, the agenda got published in email a while ago. And are you on the Adobe Connect gizmo?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes.

(Mike): That agenda is sort of this thing. That's the agenda that we're working

through. And so we're here on...

Eric Brunner-Williams: Now what part of this can be saved locally to each participant's machine?

(Mike): I don't believe that any of this can go locally. It will - the notes from this will go out to the wiki. I suppose you could do screenshots. That would probably be about it. But I don't think that Adobe Connect lets you capture text when I'm sharing the screen like this. This is just a screen saver thing.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thanks very much.

(Mike): Any other - somebody just tried to mute. Somebody remind me of what the number to dial is to mute. Because that pair of tones went into my ear -- it's pretty high volume.

Does anybody remember...

Glen DeSaintgery:

(Mike): Star 6, is that what mutes? Thanks Glen.

Glen DeSaintgery: And we've just had (Joseph) - (Joe Sensivo) who has joined.

(Mike): Oh great. Hi (Joe).

(Joseph Sensivo): Sorry about running late.

(Mike): That's okay. These things happen.

I'm going to leave you to your own devices rather than catch you up. But if you go ten minutes and are still befuddled, feel free to ping me and I'll double back.

(Joseph Sensivo): Not a problem. I'm on the Adobe thing too so not a problem there.

(Mike): Cool. Thanks a lot (Joe). Okay so we are now actually out of the process. You can just - and so the rest of the meeting as far as I'm concerned, can be diving right into the ten questions. And we'll just - my thought is to start at the first one and go through the last one and it goes fast or slow as we need to and see what we wind up with.

With the only other agenda item really being, I'll take about 5 minutes at the end of the meeting to stop and get your reactions as to how the meeting went and I can do better in the future -- stuff like that.

So without further ado, let me expand this to show you the ten questions. And what I'm going to basically do is try to be your note taker on the screen.

So for those of you who like Michael Rodenbaugh, let's try and be clear in the phone part as well, but I'll try and capture all of this in notes. And that set of notes will pretty much get transcribed straight out to the wiki.

So starting right off, who benefits from Fast Flux and who's harmed? Don't be shy. I'm ready for someone who benefits from Fast Flux. Don't all talk at once.

(Joseph Sensivo): This is (Joe). The folks who benefit the most I think are those who can't otherwise obtain stable hosting because of the nature of what's being hosted. So examples of that include things like intellectual property infringing content, child pornography, malware, et cetera.

Wendy Seltzer: And Wendy. I'll just add to the list but it might also include those seeking to avoid censorship in their local network or country.

Ihab Shraim: I can't see anything on this screen now. It's for everyone or just me. This is Ihab Shraim. I'm sorry.

(Mike): I can't tell. Can others see?

Ihab Shraim: I raised my hand by the way just - but I didn't get any response. Now I see it.

(Mike): Oh good. I'm not sure what happened there. Sorry about that.

Ihab Shraim: Can I speak since I raised my...

(Mike): Sure. Go ahead.

Ihab Shraim: ...hand or should I wait till...

(Mike): No, no, go ahead. As long as you're on the air.

Ihab Shraim: Yes. Well some of what we are seeing here is that, you know, this Fast Flux networking is heavily used in the (Frog) arena/(unintelligible) world.

And practically we have major influx of such attacks happening against our customers.

So one of the things that we are seeing is that these Fast Flux for rent networks are heavily utilized. And they're - and as everyone knows, the (Frog) world is benefiting from Fast Flux networking.

(Mike): And conversely who is harmed? You started to talk about your customers. Let's start adding on to that list of...

Ihab Shraim: That - the entities which are harmed are plenty. Let's begin with financial institutions, government agencies, online auctions, payment services, the influx of pay per click, illegitimate pay per clicks added, the gambling world. And the list goes on and on and on. These are the verticals that are majorly harmed by the Fast Flux networks out there.

(Mike): Okay, I've got a bunch of people with their hands up. And I don't know how to determine order. That's something I'm going to have to learn.

So somebody with your hand up, just chime right in.

(Dave): (Dave).

(Mike): Go ahead (Dave).

(Dave): (Unintelligible)?

(Mike): (Dave)? Oh (Dave)'s...

(Dave): Yes?

(Mike): Go ahead.

(Dave): I actually put a fairly long list together as one of the first emails. And I'm (going) to try to read that. Maybe what you can do is transcribe it, you know, out of at the end.

And it was yes, I went through a lot of, you know, a lot of the things that (Joe)'s already mentioned. You know, there's some overlap with what's been said. But there are some others.

(Mike): That's a good idea. Let me push that down into the action items and we'll...

(Dave): I think posing looks like that, you know, using email and then being able to discuss whether or not we want to add or prune is a little bit more efficient than trying to do that in real-time and where we connect system observation.

(Mike): That's a good idea. So maybe one little - I want to do this first. Maybe one of the sort of meeting preparation topics is develop a draft of each section are to the call.

As you can tell by now, I can't spell or type my way out of a wet paper bag. Sorry about that. So that we're in editing mode rather than creating mode.

Does that make sense to folks? Because so what we might try to do, scan down this list and see if - so are there others like (Dave) who have either a lot of ideas or have already written some stuff that we

could move on the wiki?

Man: There was a whole thread on this. So if...

(Mike): Yes.

Man: ...as we're threading off the email archives.

(Mike): Right. And I think what I want to do now is now that I've sort of got the bucket set up on the wiki I don't feel any compelling need to be the only editor of the wiki.

And so if somebody wanted to go through those email threads and sort of pound into the wiki, transcribe into the wiki, those lists, that would be terrific.

Does that work? (Dave), would you be willing for example, to go in and pound your list into the bucket on the wiki for this first chunk?

(Dave): I can - sure. I think that doing it in two places is very frustrating. So I'm not objecting to the wiki. It's just that, you know, we have other conventions and other, you know, other committees. And it's, you know, it's a duplication of work.

(Mike): Well I think that what I'd encourage us to do is now that the wiki is structured a bit, don't use the email list for the conversations. Try to use the wiki's instead.

Man: Negative.

Man: wiki is pull and email is pushed up. And I think that there are a lot of people in the committee who are, you know, accustomed to push because in fact it is more proactive, you know.

You know, and I don't know. Maybe I'm just speaking out of turn.

(Mike): That's all right. Say, somebody just chimed in and I didn't hear you.

Eric Brunner-Williams: This is Eric Brunner-Williams. Like (Dave), I also wrote significantly prior to this call.

(Mike): Yes.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Like (Dave), I also think that we're replicating media with - to little effect. And I concur with (Dave) on everything that he said and I'll go back to mute.

(Mike): Okay. Ow, oh ow. Boy I'll tell you, however you do that, that really hurts.

Well okay, so what we could do is we could appoint - eventually I don't want to leave behind this series of email threads. I want to leave behind structured documents that we can push on, you know. Because my goal for all of this is ultimately is a report.

And my thought was that the wiki is sort of an interim step, practically the final destination step to the report. So one of the ways we could do this is anoint a few people who would extract stuff from the email threads and periodically post it to the wiki. If that's sort of a reasonable middle ground. How does that suit people?

Man: Yes (Mike), do you want to (unintelligible) that again? I was just getting off the (mute).

(Mike): Say again?

Man: You asked us what was the solution?

(Mike): We're not quite there yet. We're sort of teetering on the notion that most of the conversation will tend to happen via email...

Man: Right.

(Mike): ...but that - but that there's been a step of extracting from the email...

Man: Right.

(Mike): ...posting that to the wiki and maybe using those posted commentary as...

Liz Gasster: (Mike), this is Liz. I have a suggestion.

(Mike): Okay.

Liz Gasster: I think one thing that would be helpful is for those who are - for the wiki, I mean for those who are sharing an email, you know, having a real dialogue about content to as much as possible.

Focus the content on how would you phrase an answer to a question or be responsive to a specific topic rather than - and if you need

footnotes or substantiating examples or anecdotes that, you know, follow some threads, handle that another way so that it - you're not doing a lot of editing or crunching of random emails to try to incorporate them into the wiki but that everyone participate in the group discussion and the thread in such a way that it is targeted at a joint statement or a - you know, an end result itself to try to combine the methodology into - even what works for folks to try to get it as much as possible crystallized in the email text.

That's the - so that you're not trying to go back afterwards and recreate what eight people said.

(Mike): Yes, I think that's a good idea. To rephrase that, one of the things that I ran into when I looked at that email thread was it was awfully hard to pull an answer to our question out of that.

And so if the email threads could be structured in such a way that, you know, maybe the subject of the email is that question, who benefits from Fast Flux, who's harmed, that would be good.

And then if through email spread people were essentially editing statements that could be just stapled in underneath that, that would also help a lot.

Does that work as sort of a middle ground between email folks and the wiki folks?

Liz Gasster: And by the way, then as staff, I mean I'm willing to then extract, you know, the upshots of these threads and get them into the wiki on some regular appropriate basis and it would keep the wiki in line. I mean that

- you know, I'm willing to support that.

(Mike): You know, I think another neat thing about that is that then what we can do if the threads produce a disagreement, then we can start to work on resolving those on these calls which is a good use of our time I think.

Okay, that being the case, perhaps we don't continue this call right now, but rather give ourselves a homework assignment to, I don't know, maybe answer - maybe we have email threads around the first four questions and try to converse about that via email over the next week and get a summary of that up to the wiki by no later than Thursday next week so that people can read it prior to the call. And...

Liz Gasster: (Mike), it's Liz. I just have a expanding thought about that. I think that's a great idea, people are willing to do that. And one way to kick it off is if someone were willing to hold the pin on each question just to start with ideas, just a starting place for how they would answer the question even in bullets.

Even if you could take volunteers for the four questions now it might be easier to have people commenting, reacting and augmenting something that someone throws out there rather than, you know, or going looking virtually at everyone else wondering who's going to start. So it's just a way to take that one step further if people want to go that route.

(Mike): I think that fits right into our action item. What if we, volunteers to craft a first round email about each of the first four questions? So can we get some volunteers? That would be neat. (Dave), you want to

volunteer for one or more than one of those?

(Dave): When do you want it by?

(Mike): I think it'd be good to get the first crack out of the gates within the next day or two so that then the email conversation over the next four or five days can refine that.

(Dave): You know, as far as I'm concerned, I'll put a subject line on what I already sent.

(Mike): Yes.

(Dave): Don't have anything new to say. So it's just a, you know, a resend of something I sent two weeks ago.

(Mike): That's fine.

(Dave): Okay.

(Mike): You know, but you might want to go through it with an eye to the conversation we just had about directly answering the question.

(Dave): That's what I did. Yes.

(Mike): Yes okay. And I just can't quite recall your...

(Dave): Right. And that's okay. I mean you were on vacation. I don't expect you to remember, you know, what I sent while you were on vacation so...

- (Mike): Okay, so (Dave), you want to do question - you want to do all four questions or you want to do the first one?
- (Dave): The one I was going to do was through benefits and through forms. And I started - I kicked that off so I'll kick it off again.
- (Mike): Okay.
- (Dave): And I - you know, I think that there are some things that Wendy had mentioned that Eric had mentioned and (Joe) had mentioned that are all complementary with a little bit of overlap.
- (Mike): Yes.
- (Dave): Yes. And forgive me if I've forgotten anyone else. But, you know, like you I don't remember, you know, every email from two weeks ago so...
- (Mike): Okay. So we need volunteers for the next three. Does somebody want to kick us off on who benefits from cessation?
- Man: Before we commit to this plan, could we just quickly address how it's going to impact our schedule?
- (Mike): I don't think it's going to hurt our schedule much. Basically part of the reason I'm so cheerful about this idea is that I don't think it'll impact the schedule. Basically what we will wind up with is arriving at the same milestone date via a different path.
- Man: So we're just going to break up the questions and handle so many each week. And then by August 5th we'll have already answered all of

them.

(Mike): Yes.

Man: Is that what you have planned?

(Mike): Yes. And actually my goal is to have the answers done by July 25th so then we can hammer on our - though I don't want to confuse your screens with dates. But in terms of the way this is laying out, I think it's going to fit in the same schedule without a change.

Man: So does that mean you need to address all of them within the next two weeks?

(Mike): Yes, yes. First draft, first try not striving necessarily entirely for consensus at that point, but get all the ideas out on the table within the next couple weeks.

And so what - one way to do this would be to try and launch even more threads. But rather than just the first four, maybe go through the first half. And in that case we could go down a little bit deeper and pick up the registrants and users and stuff.

And then what that would do is - the first half of these questions are really who's affected. And the second half of the question really focus on what are we going to do about it.

And so maybe the thing to do is break this into two chunks like that and spend the next week via email crafting those who's effected statements. And then the subsequent week we could focus on those

last four, what are we going to do about it from a technical standpoint, from a policy standpoint. How does that sit with people?

Because I think these first six are all sort of in a way the same question with different facets that need to be expanded. And then the last four are also sort of the same question with different facets.

But what if we took volunteers for the first six questions for email this week? We'll have sort of this frenzy of email who's affected. And the goal would be to get a set of statements out on the wiki about this Aaron, go ahead. I think it was Aaron.

Greg Aaron: Are you speaking to Greg Aaron?

(Mike): Yes, yes, sorry.

Greg Aaron: Okay. I'll take the registry operator question.

(Mike): Okay.

Greg Aaron: And then I have another comment. I raised a question on the public board. A lot of these six questions are basically asking us to quantify the problem that we're being asked to solve, for instance, who's harmed, who's taking advantage of Fast Flux hosting and so on.

I think one of our duties is to get some good data to quantify the problem or to explain its scope. I don't think we can come to any conclusions of possibly policy unless we understand the problem fully.

So I think it's incumbent upon us to do some outreach to get some

data or some research. Now we might be able to accomplish some of that by going to our constituencies and asking the members what they can tell us if they have any information on hand.

Dave Piscatello and Rod Rasmussen and I also have an opportunity to go to the anti-phishing working group and solicit information from that membership because we have a lot of security companies and banks and so on in that group.

For instance, I have never seen a basic accounting of how many Fast Flux the (mains) might be out there or how long they live or whether a lot of them are all run by the same party or parties. And that's information I would like to see. But - and I open that up for comment.

(Mike): I love it. Others?

Ihab Shraim: This is Ihab Shraim. I can comment on some of this. I can probably divide some staff on the anti-phishing side of the world which is involved with the Fast Flux network. And normally they last for a certain period of time. But you have to take certain measures to diffuse that particular attack or fraud campaign against a certain financial institution per se or a government agency.

So we do have some of that statistics that we - that probably I can share with you.

As for the numbers of Fast Flux networks and how they formulate on the Internet, we do know that there is no one collection point to by which it can reflect exactly what transpires out there and have a full detail.

And that was one of the things that a lot of people proposed to this team if we were to figure out a way to gather as much information as possible to reflect what exactly is taking place on the Internet.

Our company for example divides solutions geared toward a certain segment involved with Fast Flux network.

And I do see the other verticals being effected drastically. But I don't see any takers in the world to go handle these problems.

(Mike): So to put words in your mouth, are you saying that in addition to Greg's notion that we go out and collect existing data? Are you suggesting that we may also need to charter some new kinds of data gathering activity?

Ihab Shraim: Yes. I think what's happening up there where when people build their honey pots and how they gather such information, some of these honey pots are geared toward just detecting malware. Others are geared toward detecting one other form where you will see lots of research being conducted.

A lot of companies do claim that they have this presence on the Internet. However, not even one single company can come and say or one single entity or agency can come and say here is exactly what's happening on the Internet which for example involved with Fast Flux.

And they can segment that by saying this is the effect of Spam on the Internet as it relates to Fast Flux network. This is the effect of pay per click as a result of Fast Flux networks or utilizing Fast Flux networks

and of course on the gambling side and the financial side.

So these verticals are all affected by one way or one form of Fast Flux networking out there. And their challenge is to gather all that information using a lot of PowerPoint's reflecting oh this is happening, but there is no one single entity collecting such data.

We're collecting a lot of data ourselves in our company. However, our products are geared towards one vertical and that's what we - this is how we make our money.

But I don't see any initiative out there to go and say here's what's happening and I am the source or the authoritative source on what is happening on the Internet. And if you would like to get data from us, share this with us.

As I just heard one last comment, the anti-phishing working group got formulated that way by having all the reported phish to go to one entity. And then someone or some company had to go through that inbox to sift through it, is it official or not.

By the way, I can go on and on on this topic. I don't want to take...

(Mike): That's okay. I think we've all got...

Ihab Shraim: This is what I do for a living so it's...

(Mike): Right. It's not a problem. But you raised an interesting question. And it's one that I think came up in some of the email.

Some of this gets a bit out of scope for the working group. But this would be I think a good forum or platform to have that discussion perhaps in the best practices part of our work where we don't necessarily suggest policy but we point to good suggestions for the industry.

Liz Gasster: (Mike) it's Liz if I could just jump in with some further thought here. It is appropriate for the group, you know, the experts to conclude that gee, more data gathering is needed, more data analysis is needed and/or more specific research, you know, and information is needed in order to formulate to answer certain questions or to formulate certain positions.

In other words, you know, to the degree this is a complex area where there are still gaps in information or understanding it is quite appropriate for this group to make recommendations to the council that steps be taken in research.

There's, you know, potentially could be some funding available or staff ability to support research in certain areas that's targeted and within scope or that would, you know, inform the debate in some way.

And I just want to give the group the opportunity to feel like it has some latitude in pursuing where there are clearly information gaps that are, you know, needed before drawing conclusions about anything. But that's a very reasonable thing but to the degree that we could be as targeted about what those gaps are and how they might be filled we could then - the group is free to make recommendations to the council during this process or at the end of the process in the context of, you know, any step in the process.

That is quite appropriate and I would say more than appropriate because you are the experts on the ground to begin with. And to the degree that you see information gaps or analysis gaps or research gaps, you know, we have to be informed by that and use that information and advice wisely.

(Mike): How's about this? What if we take Greg's suggestion as an immediate action item which is let's go out to our respective constituencies and folks like the anti-phishing working group and so on and gather up as much of the existing data as we can quickly?

Liz Gasster: And I could jump in again, perhaps the more precise question is if we could ask and even add it to our charter to be bold, something along the lines of what are the data gaps that exist and how from the viewpoint of these experts and how might they be filled with either other research that's out there and available or other research that needs to be done so that we really try to nail down the precision what - I'm working on the who is or study group or we're looking at what studies need to be done.

So precision with studies and hypotheses that make sense, they're very much on my mind. And using the talent of this group if that's what's called for to tee that up is another real added value you can bring. So taking Greg's idea, you know, to the next step and developing that if that's a right answer or a right interim step is encouraged.

(Mike): Cool. Somebody just took a breath to speak. Go ahead.

Ihab Shraim: Yes, this is Ihab Shraim again. I go agree that we need to speak with groups such as the anti-phishing working group.

But just keep in mind they're looking at a slice of the problem, not the entire problem. While this is a very good approach, we have to look at the other segments by which Fast Flux networks are being utilized. And I - and this is what I was referring to breadth of how Fast Flux networks are being used. Everyone talks about it at big conferences, but no one is really gathering all that data in one location by which there are be -- the entity by which they are authoritative entity which shared data and described data to save the masses. And while you see a lot of vertical, but you don't see collectors of such information.

(Mike): See if this is a friendly amendment for what I think you're saying, Ihab. What if we went out to the -- and got the existing data as quickly as we can from whoever? I just put in the Anti-Phishing Working Group because that rolled of Greg's tongue.

But if there are other places, let's go there as well. And one of the goals of that outreach effort would be to identify what those gaps that you're talking about are. It may be that they're gaps. It may be that they're overlaps. It may be that there are different definitions.

Sometimes people are counting apples and oranges and can't really put those numbers together. But to get a sense of the quality of the data that's available now along with obtaining it, because I think it is, you know, Greg raises a really good point which is good to have facts when we're having these conversations.

But let's gather the facts with -- and eye the gathering facts but also in

determining what other facts aren't available. And then fold that part of the effort into essentially a recommendation like Liz was saying. And, you know, I don't think that we're going to have time to actually go out and conduct that research. But I think from what I'm hearing from Liz and others we certainly could encourage that that happened in the future.

Now somebody's hand went up. And then it went away so fast and I missed it. But whoever stuck your hand up, go ahead - (Mark), I guess. Yes. Go ahead.

(Mark): Yes. I have a question. I'm more leaning towards hearing out solutions to the problem, you know, and of course after the problem is defined. And I would sort of like to know, you know, what the things are that are possible for us to do, what the current thinking is on how to solve those problems, and how to, you know, come up with, you know, workable suggestions on, you know, other solutions that might be possible.

I'm still trying to grasp the whole thing. And this is very new to me. So if you could tap the solution in it then I would appreciate it.

(Mike): I think that the one answer to that question is maybe stay tuned until next week, you know. And clearly by the time we get to the second half of this list of questions, that's where best practices, new ideas, best approach, you know.

There's the whole discussion they have about -- that I think (David) raised which is let's be careful that we don't propose something that just (unintelligible) people off what they do now, into something that's even harder to intervene against later.

And what I'm trying to do on this call is steer us a little bit away from that part of the conversation just to keep our conversation focused. But clearly that's where a lot of the interest is going to lie. So if we can hang onto that one until next week, I think then that's when that one really gets rolling. That okay?

(Mark): Okay. That's part of what I want to understand is where that is. So I can wait (unintelligible).

(Mike): Yes. Well and I think it's certainly not for lack of interest. It's just a matter of trying to keep some sort of conversational thread going. And that's where I like this notion of sort of (unintelligible) in half. Again I'm back to sort of the first six seem to be (unintelligible) affected and how. And then the last four seem to be what are we going to do about it.

And if I can sort of drag us -- are we sort of done with the data research thing? And if so, can we get some volunteers? I heard some people sort of self volunteer to especially do this outreach thing. Can we put some names behind that one so that folks feel like they owe the group a little something?

Rod Rasmussen: (Mike), it's Rod Rasmussen.

(Mike): Rod. How are you?

Rod Rasmussen: One of the -- well I've already volunteered myself on the data gathering. But I wanted to add to this conversation. I think it's exactly what we need to be talking about is the scope on this. I don't think we need to understand it entirely 100%.

But we do to (unintelligible) and, you know, the level of harm that we are seeing. I think that beside the APWG we have groups like (Moss). We have the botnet coalition folks. I think there are a lot of overlaps. And many of us are involved in those various organizations. And a lot of those gaps as it were will be filled in by looking at the, you know, the piece of the elephant as it were that we all have a view of.

And one of the things that I don't think we're hearing covered which is also important is the legitimate uses of Fast Flux, and who might be able to gather that information because that is something that, you know, if we're, you know, I mean at that fraud world we're not so, you know, and we're not going out and checking to find out where those things are.

But we certainly know that there are some uses for that. And it would be good to gather some real data about that rather than having just the anecdotes that we have heard up at the university clinic. So I would put that out to somebody who might be in that part of the space to take a look at that side of things as well.

But we certainly have I think on the fraud side between the university researchers which are several -- (Joe) has got some excellent data for that matter and who's already on the group. But there are several other folks out there.

They're gathering this kind of information and looking at it for more of a holistic view between those folks and then the various verticals. I think we can get a good picture on the fraud side. So I think that that outreach is going to be happening. I'm going to be working with (Dave)

and Greg on the outreach and anything else again. Love to help.

(Mike): Cool. Let me tie off the volunteers on that. And then maybe we can get some volunteers for -- I agree the -- I was thinking about the legitimate users. And the kind of people that we need to talk to about that are probably the data center managers, for places like Google and Yahoo and stuff like that.

And we need to figure out how to get a hold of those people and get their opinions. If we've got anybody in this group that can reach those folks, that would be a fantastic addition. Greg has got his hand up. Go ahead, Greg.

Greg Aaron: Rod and my (unintelligible) and Dave Piscatello are active in APWG. So I think the three of us be probably happy to go to APWG specifically.

(Mike): Okay.

Greg Aaron: So we'll volunteer for that -- APWG. These legitimate uses are interesting. Wendy earlier in the call mentioned I think users who are using the method to circumvent censorship for example. Wondered if she knew some ways to get the information about that.

Wendy Seltzer: Well sure. It's Wendy Seltzer. Well by definition the people trying to circumvent censorship are reluctant to talk about all the ways that they're trying to do it. I will see what information I can gather.

(Mike): That would be great, you know. I'll put you down as the volunteer, Wendy, and with the understanding that it may be hard to get much in

the way of limited information.

Eric Brunner-Williams: I'll be happy to help, Wendy, on this also.

(Mike): Okay.

Wendy Seltzer: Who is this? Who just spoke?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Eric Brunner-Williams.

Wendy Seltzer: Eric. Okay.

(Mike): How about a big data center?

Michael Rodenbaugh: I'd do that -- get to Yahoo, (Mike).

(Mike): Okay. Rodenbaugh.

Man: And probably by extension to Akamai.

(Mike): And I can get to (Thompson) and (Royer). They're here in (Clint City).
That's probably a good enough list.

Man: Question?

(Mike): Go ahead.

Man: Do you want to go ahead and clarify actually what we're talking in terms of Fast Flux via just things that have short TTLs? Because I think there may be some confusion there.

(Mike): That's a good question. And they knew we need that definition before we go out for data, hey?

Man: And, you know, part of it is is, you know, for me at least I think a Fast Flux as being things hosted on, you know, compromised machines.

Man: I don't necessarily think of them just that way. But send me a big part. But there are other, you know, hosting companies that you're -- that are customers. (Unintelligible) hosting.

(Mike): Okay. So let me -- let's just rattle off a few. Is there a definition existing out there and materials as in prepared prior to this?

Man: Yes.

(Mike): And if so, can somebody very quickly find it and rattle that definition off for us?

Woman: There's more than one I think, maybe at least two. Because there's one in the effect report and there's one in the issues paper.

Man: Yes.

(Mike): Do they largely...

Man: They are pretty consistent.

Woman: They are very consistent. They are very consistent.

(Mike): Okay. Can we essentially adopt that as our definition for when we go out to gather data?

Woman: Why don't we -- I'll take the action item of excerpting both and posting them.

(Dave): Well you're one -- this is (Dave). And one of the...

(Mike): Hi, (Dave).

(Dave): ...threads that have been, you know, continuing since we started the e-mail is the stuff is whether continuing to focus primarily on what is called Fast Flux, may actually result in a policy that won't be very useful in, you know, by the time we even respond to the, you know, to the GNSO in Paris -- I'm sorry, in Cairo.

And so one thing I would lo try to do is, you know, make certain that we're in agreement on that. We're only going to look at Fast Flux or that we're going to look at evasion techniques and policies that help a broad range of these techniques, among which Fast Flux is one.

(Mike): Yes. I commented on that part of the thread. Let me throw that comment out again. I'm a little nervous about expanding our scope a whole lot. I'm very aware of the issues that you're raising, (David), and don't want to make that mistake. But at the same time I don't want to get this so broad that we basically her suddenly trying to boil the whole ocean here. Is there some way that we can thread the needle on this, so that we can deliver something to the GNSO perhaps with a recommendation...

(Hayes): If I could make a suggestion on that, (Mike). It's (Hayes).

(Mike): Yes.

(Hayes): I mean let's give it what we got right now, right? And we just hope the work gets a very clear charter. But that take notes -- and that other issues are outside of this charter that might, you know, be the apprentice as far as getting another charter for our next working group. But I don't think, you know, me having a charter to more -- let's set out on our charter, right? Let's not get it out of control.

(Mike): Well I'm going to put this in an action item right now. But I really think that this becomes part of our recommendations. I think one of the recommendations is the very point that you raised, (David), which is -- be very, very careful developing this policy in such a way that neither A -- it's too narrow to be really useful, or B -- actually causes harm.

And then as a result of that conversation, perhaps suggest subsequent forces of study either for this working group or another one. But I'm really edgy about expanding the scope of this one, partly because I think we would run out of time pretty quickly. Is it all right to not grid, but to include it as part of our recommendations instead?

Man: Well I mean I'm not trying to be oppositional here. I just think that we are really answering the wrong question. And, you know, if we want to focus on this question, I will do my best to answer this question well. But I think in the long run this is not as productive as looking at the problem in a broader context. And that's all I'll say on it.

(Mike): Well I think it's a very good point. But I think that the time to have this

conversation is when the work groups are being chartered. And what we need to do is speak to subsequent work groups and say, "We executed the charter you gave us. But we have these concerns about that charter..."

(Dave): At that point...

(Mike): ...etc., etc. Because, you know, I don't want to lose those thoughts. At the same time, I don't want to broaden this one a lot because we really don't have authority to do that. And so the compromise that I sort of worked out in my own hand was let's make sure that we've got a really compelling chunk of the recommendations that talks to that issue, so that subsequent work groups really do answer the right question.

And to that end, I'm not going to be terribly upset if we're not super aggressive in the policies that we recommend for that very reason. I would rather come up with good recommendations that guide future work than unnecessarily or perhaps even harmful policy at this stage of the game. I think that's the way to navigate that particular problem, is to build that into our recommendations rather than trying to modify our charter on the fly.

Eric Brunner-Williams: This is Eric Brunner-Williams. I concur with David that the question is not necessarily well posed. Having a starting point is not necessarily the correct starting point. That said burying the issue until the next working group -- whenever that may be -- start optimistic that there will be a next working group.

Finally, speaking as the registrar, the registrar constituency was opposed to a PDP in the first place. They preferred best practices

document. So the idea of starting from a less incorrect starting point and arriving at a policy by whatever means. It's not that attractive to the registrar constituency. And this is a still a bottoms up consensus based process.

(Mike) So does my notion of making sure that we get it right for the -- I mean I think one way to finesse that is to run pretty hard in the question. We do have a best practices question to answer right here. And it seems to me that what we could do is write a lot in that area and not embed them as policy, but simply document them as great best practices that would move the ball forward in the way you're describing.

Liz Gasster: But also -- it's Liz. If there's some fundamental flaw in the charter guides, you know, let's tee that up. The council needs guidance. And if you're the expert, this was a -- it rather got technical area. You know, the charter was based on the issues report that I wrote. But it was based on the SSAC report.

There's a lot of need here. I can tell you because it's a staff position to begin with, so to more informed dialog, more discussion, get some experts in a room, that this is the first cut at that. If, you know, to (Dave)'s point and Eric's point, if you feel strongly that there's something misphrased in that, please let's just tee that up and, you know, bring it to the council earlier.

We don't have an artificial wall here that prevents us from doing that. And I take responsibility for, you know, and by the way what I recall in the discussion about creating the charter in the registrar's view was their biggest concern was not launching into a PDP prematurely, which I totally from a staff perspective supported.

And I thought it was really important once again, to get it right in the data gathering, to get it right in the finding of the issues, to get it right in the scope questions about, you know, ICANN consensus part policies being focused, you know, especially in reaching and so on, you know. GTLD service providers and on, contracted parties that we have relationships with.

The evolution of best practices is an important alternative. I mean the whole point was really to be smart here, not to be misguided in how we're gathering. So I just want to give -- again, I don't want to start at Square 1. (Mike) is, you know, marching to a important direction. But if there is a fundamental flaw, let's tee it up and move on.

Michael Rodenbaugh: Yes. That's fine. Let's do that. But it's not -- you don't want to delay the work we have on the floor now. You know, Eric, the registrars certainly have ample opportunity to comment on the draft charter and everything else to get further (unintelligible) time to bring that up.

(Unintelligible), let's hear it. No problem. But I don't want to delay. We've got a group formed here to answer some important questions that can go beyond this issue in the future. But let's focus on this issue now.

Man: And the voice quality on that portion of the call wasn't very good. At least at my end it was pretty choppy.

(Mike): Yes. I think Mike Rodenbaugh is coming in by cell phone.

Michael Rodenbaugh: I am. So I'm sorry if I wasn't clear. And I'll save my

comments for the e-mail list in the Wiki.

(Mike): That's okay. I can kind of understand you, Mike.

Michael Rodenbaugh: All right.

(Mike): I think that the issues sort of boil into one momentum. I think if we stop now and reframe our charter, we probably lose a fair amount of time getting that new charter approved. And I guess at this point I'd just like people to get on the agree-disagree thing on your respective names on the Adobe gizmo. This leaves out folks like Rodenbaugh who's not on Adobe.

But I'd just like to get a sense of are people more interested in carrying on and meeting this schedule, with all the caveats that I described about making recommendations for the subsequent one. Or are people more inclined to reframe the charter, set the timetable back?

So to make this a yes no question, how many people want to reframe the charter? If you want to reframe the charter, hit agree on your little name gizmo on the Adobe Connect thing. If you want to carry on, don't do anything.

Randy Vaughn: Randy Vaughn here. I tend to agree with (Joe) and look at the issues report. And then the -- which basically points out the Fast Flux is an issue with botnets and compromised machines.

And then when I look at the working group charter, there's basically just an excerpt of that which omits the very important flavor of the use of maliciousness, or compromised machines or botnets or that type of

thing. So whereas we see some disagreement on things like censorship, I believe what we're looking at basically is just a little bit clearer definition of what's going on there. So I'm going to put agree.

Christian Curtis: This is Christian. I think that part of the reason that that definition is so broad though is a recognition that any action that we take is not just going to impact the use - these uses with compromised machines, but may well impact other legitimate uses. And we want to have the information on what that impact will be before making any decision.

Randy Vaughn: Okay. That makes sense.

(Mike): Others? This is a good conversation, a useful thing I think. We're sort of split at this point. We sort of got about a 50-50 divide between clarify -- now if we clarified the way you just described, would that meet the needs that (Dave) originally raise, which is if we slightly expanded the definition of Fast Flux to include the piece of the -- I think it was the SSAC definition that got left out.

Would that address the issue that you're raising, (Dave)? Because that I think we could do really quick. I think we could just, you know, amongst ourselves define Fast Flux any way we wanted to and carry on from there. Then I don't think we would slow down at all. Could we wiggle through it that way?

Ihab Shraim: This is Ihab Shraim. Can I make a comment.

(Mike): Sure. Go ahead. Go ahead. Go ahead, Ihab.

Ihab Shraim: Hello?

(Mike): There we go.

Ihab Shraim: Oh great. Okay. I think what we probably can define it -- and I'm trying to simplify that so that we can proceed with our charter. In terms of the legitimate Fast Flux networks, these are controlled environments by which Web hosting providers and other ISPs do use these tactics in a legitimate way to conduct their day to day business.

However, the other side of the coin which is the illegitimate Fast Flux network usage, which would be hacking say the masses. And these hack servers or illegitimate networks -- I'm sorry, illegitimate servers -- they're all over the map.

They're residing on multiple subnets within ISPs. They cross boundaries and so forth. So we can create a distinction between the two by saying controlled environment and uncontrolled environment. And we can - you can this way devise your recommendations accordingly without confusing the two.

Because it's very clear that Fast Flux networking does affect the wall from a fraud-centric point of view, by having all these hack machines out there on the masses. And the machines could reside on any network within any ISP within any country as you know.

(Mike): Thanks.

Ihab Shraim: Sure.

(Mike): How's this notion of expanding -- not changing our charter per se, but

changing the Fast Flux definition to be the broader one that was in the SSAC report, go to addressing the issue that you raised? (Dave), I'm going to kind of put this one back in your lap just to see if this is feasible.

(Dave): I can't tell whether I'm on mute or off at this point.

(Mike): You're okay. I can hear you.

(Dave): Yes. It's not the definition in the SSAC report that I'm concerned about. It's that the SSAC report is, you know, almost a year old. And criminals are much more flexible and adaptive than policy. And, you know, many user things that we describe in the Fast Flux, you know, advisory and yes are still being used.

But there are also other techniques that have emerged that don't exhibit the same characteristics. What I want to make certain is that we don't simply create policy that solves something that is not the -- that these anticipated most common attack method a year from now, because the policy is going to always move more slowly than the attackers.

What I want to do is certain that we provide enough information to allow policymakers to understand that there is a broad set of issues here and that, you know, perhaps as an example a registrar should be granted more latitude in being able to take corrective actions on their own.

I'm not necessarily that is exactly what we want to say. But I wanted to leave that opportunity open as opposed to going in and saying, "Well

registrars should never allow CTLs less than 30 minutes.” I don’t think that’s a very useful conclusion for this kind of group to come up with.

So we don’t want to just look at CTLs. And I’ve seen too many of these e-mails looking at monitoring CTLs and monitoring, you know, setting limits and rate limiting. Those are things that SSAC recommended a year ago based on the best available knowledge a year ago, you know.

We have to, you know, recognize that those things change. And what we want to do is learn from the facts change, and make a concerted effort to provide a policy framework where registrars can be proactive in, you know, in eliminating DNSs (unintelligible).

(Mike): Okay. I’m getting more and more enamored with the idea of loosely interpreting our charter so that we can carry on. Because we have such a great group and we have all this good stuff going on. And I hate to lose all that momentum while we go back and...

Woman: And I don’t want to.

Michael Rodenbaugh: I agree with that.

(Dave): (Unintelligible) stated here. What I want to do is make certain that, you know, and I’m comfortable with saying that, you know, we think that we can answer these questions to the best of our knowledge. But have a conclusion that says this is only one aspect of what, you know, of what policy might emerge to combat, you know, the broader set of abuses, and capture some of what we’ve just talked about here because I don’t think it’s generally known.

(Mike): Right.

Michael Rodenbaugh: Hey honestly, (David) and everybody, I'd like those other issues put on the table ASAP, even if we need to start another policy and open process. Maybe we need to change the charter to get this through to focus on multiple issues if they're willing. You know, let's get it out there. That's fine.

But I also don't want to lose sight of the questions that are before us. I want sort of time (unintelligible) come from. The way I look at it -- I think the way a lot of the (unintelligible) looked at it. You got to just keep taking all these tools of the bad guys.

You got to knock down one registry after registry after registry to build it in, get them to change the policy. You know, you just got to keep pushing them into a corner. You can't just give up and say we can't solve the whole problem. So let's just (unintelligible). That's my point.

(Mike): Yes. That cell phone connection of yours is pretty rugged, (Mike). I think I got that. Let me offer the following. Let's keep going with the framework that we've got in front of us. All this work plan stuff and all the questions, etc., etc.

Let's take in any opportunities that we have to write something, let's take the broader view of the Fast Flux rather than the narrower view in what we write and what we talk about. And we'll essentially -- I'm becoming persuaded that a slight broadening of the scope probably isn't going to make a whole lot of difference to our schedule.

And I agree with (Dave) that it would be a lot more useful if we solved

today's problems in such a way that registrars, registries and so on can also solve tomorrow's problems without having to have policy online. So what if we essentially left the infrastructure of this working group untouched, but selectively took a broad view of the flux problem rather than a narrow one?

Does that work for folks? So we would not go back to the GNSO council because, you know, that cycle loses us a lot of time and loses us at least a month. We'll just carry on but with a broad definition of what our charter is rather than a narrow one. Is that okay?

Christian Curtis: Could you explain roughly what that broad definition would be?

(Mike): I'm going to defer to smarter people than me on that one, you know. And maybe what we ought to do is have an e-mail thread about that rather than trying to do it on this call. We could try it on this call. Now I was starting to write some points here as we went. (Dave) and others - Rod, are there definitions that are already written that are out there that are broad enough that we could use them? Or do we need to write our own?

Randy Vaughn: Excuse, this is Randy again. I'm looking at the first two questions here, and which is basically who benefits from Fast Flux and who is harmed, and who would benefit from the cessation of the practice.

I believe we ought to pay very careful attention to those because I think once we get those two questions solidly answered, or at least satisfactorily answered I think we might have a better idea of how we're proceeding. So those two questions seem very critical to me.

(Mike): Oh. So maybe what we do is we let the definition emerge from this first round of conversation? How about that?

Randy Vaughn: Yes.

(Dave): I think that that's not -- yes, that's a reasonable way to go because I think that one thing we can point out is that a number of the people who are harmed by Fast Flux, are also harmed by other evasion techniques that exploit the DNS and registration processes. And we can enumerate those and say for example you don't have to Fast Flux the network. You can be adaptive to detection.

(Mike): Right.

(Dave): And there are ways that, you know, other ways that criminals will, you know, will seek to evade detection. And what policy emerges ought to be sufficiently flexible to empower registries and registrars to take appropriate action when, you know, when they have compelling evidence that, you know, their resources are being abused.

(Mike): Right. I wish you had a mental tape recorder and could have typed that, because I thought that was a...

(Dave): I thought we had a transcription service.

(Mike): Oh that's right. We do. God, I've never done this with transcription before. That's right. Cool. Okay. So I can go look at the transcript from this stuff. That's...

Eric Brunner-Williams: This is Eric again.

(Mike): Go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Sorry to interrupt, (David). The one thing that we lose by not communicating back to the GNSO that they didn't quite get it right at the beginning, is that we're not giving them immediate feedback that they didn't quite get it right at the beginning.

(Mike): What if we advised them of this, but we didn't ask that, you know, I'm a big fan of begging forgiveness rather than asking permission just to keep things rolling. What if in the course of our initial report development we transmitted that back to the GNSO that we corrected their charter just a little bit by broadening the definition, to include some of these other issues but didn't ask them permission? Just beg forgiveness?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well I wouldn't beg for forgiveness. But I would inform them.

(Mike): Yes. I think that's right. I think we should inform them. I agree.

Christian Curtis: This is Christian. One danger of having an open definition about flux that didn't include validation techniques, because it makes it very hard to answer that question, "Who will be harmed by the cessation of Fast Flux," because we don't know why exactly it is we're talking about stopping.

(Dave): I think we just break it down into Fast Flux and then, you know, other techniques that, you know, that have similar hostile effects so we can,, you know, we can say, "In the case Fast Flux in particular, here are some, you know, here are some possible remedies and here are the

people affected.”

In other cases, you know, we can just call that out. It requires us to do a second order analysis, not just assume that this is a one attack model that we have to piece.

(Mike): Does that work for folks?

Eric Brunner-Williams: This is Eric. I concur.

(Mike): Cool. Greg, you're still out there disagreeing. I don't know if it's just because my conversation has been so scintillating. Do you still have concerns of where we're at at this point? Give him a couple minutes to get off mute. Thank you.

Greg Aaron: I'm fine. I'm fine where we are.

(Mike): Cool. All right. So let me summarize with this sort of action items. What we're going to do is we're going to clarify the definition of Fast Flux. During the process of answering the first several questions -- God, I can't type for beans. Liz, you're going to lose the responsibility for this one.

Liz Gasster: I'm good with that.

(Mike): I figured you might. And put these in hints. And I'm going to say we'll notify new definition as it emerges. No later (unintelligible) the initial report, will broaden definition to include other attack vectors in Fast Flux. What are some of the other highlights of this conversation we just had? That cover it? Did we broaden the definition to -- and we'll let the

council know and we'll clarify and broaden. That work?

(Dave): Works for me.

(Mike): Cool. I think this was good work, people. This last little bit of the conversation -- this is the kind of thing I'm hoping we'll do a lot because I think that we can get a heck of a lot of stuff done if we can work this well consistently.

Now I'm still working on volunteers to write some of those first round answers. I don't want to let that go. (Dave) is signed up for question Number 1. Greg is up for the registry operator ones. But let me give you your menu again. This one's the one I think (David) is signed up for. And this one's covered. How about some of these other ones? Do people want to take the lead on driving first draft with any of these?

(Joe Sensivo): This is (Joe). I'm willing to go ahead and look at the "Internet users are affected by Fast Flux hosting."

(Mike): Okay. Thank you, sir. (Gerald), are you on the Adobe thing, (Gerald)? So this was (Gerald). (Gerald), correct?

(Joe Sensivo): That was (Joe).

(Mike): (Joe). I'm sorry. Now it's all coming together. We got three to go -- cessation, registry -- no, registrars and registrants. Anybody want to volunteer for -- this isn't like a massive job. This is just kicking off the e-mail thread. Not getting an overwhelming...

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes. This is Eric. I'll take the e-mail threading for registrar

(unintelligible).

(Mike): Eric is going to do -- which one do you want to take?

Eric Brunner-Williams: The registrar.

(Mike): Registrar. Hey Rodenbaugh, can I sign you up for registrants? Wonder if he's still there. He's probably being a good scout and is all muted on his cell phone. We'll put Mike in it. It'll either be Mike Rodenbaugh or it'll be Michael Connor will do registrants.

That leaves only one left. Registry, registrar, users -- oh, who is benefiting and harmed from the cessation. (Dave), is yours both cessation and the activity itself? Can you kick both of those off? Or is it - is the cessation one different enough that you don't want to take on that burden?

(Dave): I mean I can kick them off because, you know, I've had some conversations with Wendy. And I can do some other than conversations with some of the other folks who can more clearly represent how Akamai and others use it in a positive way.

(Mike): Cool. Okay. I'm going to sign you up for that one. Who benefits -- right now I'm just going to call it cessation for now. Okay. I think we have just arrived at a pretty good stopping point for the call. It's ten minutes before the hour. And I don't feel like we want to tackle anything else real substantial, except for the feedback on the call as it's gone so far.

Maybe just take a quick stop before I do that. The folks that have been on the call for quite a while and have not spoken either much or at all --

this is sort of a time for you to jump in with your thoughts about what's been going on so far and if we've missed anything, or if there's anything that you'd like to add at this point. (Unintelligible) in there. Go ahead (unintelligible).

(Cal): Hi. This is (Cal).

(Mike): Go ahead, (Cal).

(Cal): Okay. I just wanted to ask how much motivation are we going to ascribe to the first question. We seem to have a previous position that some people might have nefarious intentions to use Fast Flux, some altruistic.

But that doesn't necessarily marry up with legal or illegal, because some people with altruistic intentions might have to use illegal methods to obtain the Fast Flux capability. Is that important in forming our policy? Do we really need to know whether the people that we're forming this policy for are in fact bad guys or good guys?

(Dave): Well bad guys and good guys are going to have very different interpretations, depending on whom you ask, right?

(Cal): Yes. Exactly.

(Dave): Yes, so correct. I think you're getting to the point of, you know, if people are using Fast Flux to, you know, to enable a free speech channel or in a country that's attempting to block it, are they good guys or bad guys?

(Cal): Well I don't want to decide actually.

(Dave): No. I agree with you. But I'm just -- I'm saying that you and I may not want to decide. But certainly other people will. And, you know, how are responses used by certain CCTLDs as an example may, you know, may well, you know, well influence, you know, what we say.

(Cal): Okay. So the -- I guess my question is that we have -- do we have any interpretation that merely describes the activity, or an interpretation that describes the motivation, because the activity is simply to hide. The motivation might be cruel. And I'm not sure if listing motivations as a big long list is necessarily going to get us -- because some overweigh others.

Free speech might be more important than (unintelligible). So I'm not sure if the end goal should be listing all the different motivations we can think of, which is how I feel that a lot of the discussion has traveled so far. There's discussions about we use it for this and they use it for that. And I wondered if that actually matter.

(Mike): That's a profound question I don't have a glib answer to.

Christian Curtis: This is Christian. It seems to me that we're being asked to catalog those by the charter where we could, you know, put some gloss and say that, you know, we're not sure if it matters. But it just seems that that's what the -- we're being asked to do here.

(Mike): Yes. I think that's right. I think the point that (Cal) raises though is a really good one. And I think this is another one that I'd like to make sure we don't forget. And when we get into writing some of the

recommendation portions of this that we acknowledge that, because landing on one side or the other of this dilemma -- in either case you wind up with sort of some peculiar outcomes.

You know, if you only do it by limiting activity and leave out motivation entirely, you wind up with the possibility of throwing the baby out with the bath water. So I don't really know how to resolve that.

(Dave): I think that you can put in the motivation without drawing a conclusion whether or not it's a, you know, it is an appropriate or inappropriate, you know, motive. I mean I don't think it's, you know...

(Cal): That's not my point that you don't necessarily know the motive. These people are hiding -- kind of the point. And we will guess at some motives. We may be wrong. We may be right. We will not anywhere close to, you know, full coverage. So the question is knowing that, does motive matter at all?

(Dave): Well I guess in some cases it probably does account on, you know, for example, you know, fraud, identity theft. You know, it's more reasonably universally considered a, you know, a criminal activity. So that's an easy one. I think, you know, there are others that are nowhere near as clear cut.

Liz Gasster: Hi. This is Liz. Wasn't the genesis of the question essentially because we wanted to determine whether there were legitimate uses of Fast Flux, so that we wouldn't -- if there were legitimate uses -- whatever that means, however you define it, whatever the scope is -- that we wouldn't implement policies to prohibit it or prevent it when it's serving legitimate purposes, or that at least we'd be mindful of what the

legitimate purposes were, you know, and not pose a baby out with the bathwater.

I mean I think that was the rationale behind the formulation of that, not -- and (Cal)'s point that, you know, how valid is the statistical, you know, smokestack chart at how everybody's, you know, much is being used for this or that. I think it was really trying to just answer that threshold question, so that subsequent questions about what should be done about it could factor that reality in.

(Dave): Well I am just going to -- I was making the point that you can take something like, you know, an underground network that, you know, perpetuates free speech. It runs on a Fast Flux environment.

It's, you know, many, many people would think that that's, you know, that's a good thing. The regime that's being subverted doesn't. So saying it's a legitimate use is absolutely incorrect because from the perspective of the regime or the sovereign nation, you know, it's a criminal activity.

(Cal): I agree with that actually. That's exactly the problem that we face I think, that the motivation might align with our ideas of legitimacy. But it might contradict entirely legitimacy in other locations.

(Dave): Well so what we end up with -- and let's say I mean if you speculate. And let's say we come with a set of measures. And we come up with a set of, you know, set of motivations. There are some motivations where the, you know, the measures that we identify to prevent Fast Flux would be used to, you know, to essentially eliminate the activity that many of us might find, you know, might find appropriate.

Because ultimately we don't have control over what a sovereign nation does or what a, you know, what a regime chooses to do. And this is no different in the virtual world than it is in the brick and mortar world. And, you know, in countries where they can't, you know, conduct a, you know, a fair and legitimate, you know, election.

So, you know, I think that that political reality is with us. And I don't think that we can, you know, we can stop the process that we're going through now because that political reality lies out in front of us.

(Mike): Oh, I didn't hear (Cal) suggesting that we would stop.

(Dave): No, no. I didn't either. I'm just, you know, I'm just sort of amplifying.

(Mike): Yes. I think that what I've gotten out of this conversation is that this another important dimension of what we include in our conclusions, and that there is sort of this issue where A -- we can't probably ascribe motivations to people who are hiding, and B -- the point that you made which is it's in the eye of the beholder, the definition of legal and illegal.

Gang, it's exactly top of the hour for me. And I want to adhere to our timing. So I'm going to draw the meeting to a close. I want to take a few seconds (unintelligible) how the meeting went. Is this okay as a format? Did people feel like they were heard? Just was there things that drove you crazy? Are there things I can do better? If this is all right, we'll keep doing the same. Wendy, go ahead.

Wendy Seltzer: Just could we keep it to an hour and a half at maximum? Two hours feels like a very long time.

(Mike): Yes. We all get a little tired. I would take that as a friendly amendment.

Wendy Seltzer: Thanks.

(Mike): Christian?

Christian Curtis: It seems to me that it might be beneficial to use this hand raising function, and to establish the order of speakers so that we can today more or less organize.

(Mike): Yes. I agree. And question to those in the group. Can those of you who are looking at my screen -- can you now see the two raised hands, one from Christian and one from Eric on your screens?

Man: Yes.

(Mike): Okay. Then why don't we use that as the order thing, because I think those come in in order.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Actually it doesn't come up as raised hand on my screen.

(Mike): It wouldn't be as a raised hand. It's in the screen of the little outlining tool that I'm using. I have two little green boxes in the lower right corner of my screen that shows...

Eric Brunner-Williams: Okay.

(Mike): ...two raised hands. Do you see those? Because if you do...

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes.

(Mike): ...those do come in order.

Man: Look at the attendee list.

(Mike): Now the attendee list doesn't show people in order. It just shows people with raised hands.

Eric Brunner-Williams: I suggest we keep the chat box larger.

(Mike): Which one is that? The chat box?

Eric Brunner-Williams: On my screen it's a miniscule box in the lower left hand corner.

(Mike): Oh. Well let me see what happens if I do this. Hold on a minute.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Also...

(Mike): Sure.

Eric Brunner-Williams: ...while you're mousing, how can we get a copy of the image on the larger screen, which presumably is larger than the actual screen shown?

(Mike): The stuff that I've been typing into you mean? The little outlining tool?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes. And underwatch - I wouldn't want to miss it now.

(Mike): I thought what I would do is I would turn these into two kinds of documents. One would be an outlined word type document, text type document. And then the other is a PDF. I can push these out of this PDF. And I would just put them out on the site as notes.

Eric Brunner-Williams: That would be fine. Thank you.

(Mike): Okay. Did the chat thing getting bigger work? I tried to.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes. I agree with you, Wendy, that we should avoid the word legitimacy and illegitimacy and (unintelligible), etc. We just stick to trying to be technical about this.

(Mike): Cool. Okay. I think Eric is next. Christian has finished, right? I'm just trying to get this straight. So if I make that go away -- so Eric, are you next?

Eric Brunner-Williams: I guess so, although I've just been talking for over the past...

(Mike): This is a user error. This is not a technology problem. This is...

Eric Brunner-Williams: The use of the (unintelligible) that was suboptimal. So I recommend people who can use Skype rather than an actual handset that goes through a five second or so pause, which in turn (unintelligible). I forgot when that was just an artifact in my handset. That's it.

(Mike): Oh. Okay. So use mute on your phone rather than mute on the conferencing system?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well use Skype or something like that rather than a cell phone or a landline.

(Mike): I think the reason we need the landline connection is because of their transcription and translation all happens on that landline.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Actually I'm using Skype to you now.

(Mike): Oh. Oh I see -- on your end?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes. To avoid the handset delay when switching from mute to un-mute.

(Mike): Yes. And I think that, you know, when I've been doing this I've been muting the actual phone handset rather than trying to do the star 6 business. So, you know, and I'm using a landline. So I agree. Okay. Other ideas? Thoughts? It's pretty late. I apologize for running a couple minutes over here.

And with that I think we'll call it a day. And we'll see you in a week.
Thanks, gang.

Man: Thank you.

(Dave): Bye now.

(Mike): Right.

Man: See you.

END