

Fast Flux PDP WG Face to Face meeting in Cairo

TRANSCRIPTION

Wednesday 5 November 2008 15:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Fast Flux PDP WG face to face meeting on Wednesday 5 November 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/gns0/20081105-ff.mp3>

<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#nov>

Present for the teleconference:

Avri Doria - NCA, GNSO Council chair, temporary chair

Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC

Greg Aaron - Afiliias Ry c.

Paul Diaz - Networksolutions RRc

James Bladel - GodaddyRRc

Mike O'Connor - CBUC

Wendy Seltzer - ALAC Liaison

Zbynek Loebl - IPC

Observers - (no constituency affiliation)

Joe St. Sauver - remote participation

Martin Hall - Remote participation

Dave Piscitello

Rod Rasmussen

Bobby Flaim

Staff:

Liz Gasster

Marika Konings

Glen de Saint Gery

Absent Apologies

George Kirikos

Beau Brendler

Randy Vaughn

Martin Hall

Operator: ...appropriate or effective group within GNSO to address this issue. If that is one of or the openness to inclusion of this group, do we still need to go and get a permanent chair or can we...

...continue with you in a temporary capacity to get to that point if that is – or if it's a re-charter - can you get us to the next checkpoint or do we have to have to a new chair prior to that?

Woman: That's an interesting question. I guess if what the group is saying to the council is listen, we think it's time to tie this up in – as a GNSO working group and take it somewhere else. Or, you're saying this is the best GNSO working group and we should....

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...probably two types of next steps, some that are going to be longer than others and some that are going to...

...at this date to necessarily have a continuation of this group in a much longer time. And I see both having, you know, a need for a permanent chair, but some of the other ones might not. They have a shorter timing horizon. I'm just curious if you....

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Right. What sort of time horizon?

Woman: I actually think that yes. I think – I guess I think personally that (Mason) should hangup a snapshot and someone taking over chair and no matter where we're headed with it...

Man: Right.

Woman: ...it's probably a good idea.

Man: Okay. So we're not looking for a chair main stream now and the snapshot.

Woman: Right. No, I'm ...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...basically, it's something I want to start talking about and start thinking about. But, I see myself as finishing the initial snapshot, but then after that, the group has to sort of get into that negotiation mode. And as one of the things that I think we need to be able to do with a charter or with a task is that the working group – finished. Yeah, you wanted to say something - no.

If the working group gets to a certain point on it and then says they are stuck, we need clarification, we want to change, we don't think this belongs here....

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...BPNSO and other organizations.

Woman: Right, is to go back to the council and say that and get some feedback.

Man: Weren't you were saying something about body language earlier or...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Yeah, that...

((Crosstalk))

Man: I picked up on a real....

((Crosstalk))

Woman: I think that's why I asked him if there was something he wanted to say.

Man: So I guess, I – a couple questions. Again, hypothetical, not advocating any (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: No, no. You keep saying snapshot. Do you mean the initial report?

Woman: The initial reports, but the way I've basically been doing the initial report is, as opposed to continuing to work real hard to reach consensus on anything, everything was basically to take a snapshot of where we are now, where there's agreement, where there's support, where there's all kinds of viewpoints, get those set down – that's what I'm calling a snapshot. And others – I know it may be possible for people to talk and get more consensus.

I mean one of the problems with the working group model for ICANN, at the moment is a cultural issue is reaching consensus in a working

group can be a lengthy, painful process sometimes. Sometimes, you know, the consensus building within an ITF working group goes on a year and half longer than we wished it would. You know, sometimes I find myself editing a document three years after I cared about it anymore. So, building complete consensus beyond a snapshot, if that's what we want to do, is a fine goal.

Man: But for that, we would need a new chair.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: And we need to rethink how we're doing this. And I don't personally think that a three-year working group on a three-year project is necessarily about that. And, I'm not saying that this is such a project etc. But, you know, sometimes a project is a long project. Sometimes it's a short project. If we want consensus, then – and since the working group model is driving us towards consensus building, we have to be aware that consensus building always takes longer than anybody wants it to.

Man: Maybe it makes sense to – this is pretty much the core of the working group. Is this (George) on the phone or...

Woman: I believe that's (George) on the phone.

(Joseph): This is (Joseph)

Woman: (Joseph).

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Joseph), I'm sorry, not (George).

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: Oh okay. But I mean, maybe it makes sense just kind of take our temperature. Do we feel like we're getting close to consensus on that initial report, and I do personally, at least on the initial report. And it seems like we're very close actually recommitting to give our opinion on that too. I mean I know it's a long document, but it seems like most of it at least...

Woman: Well, that few – a few sections of (unintelligible) RBs are being worked on so I think – like Avri said, the big questions of course is the next step conclusions part, and maybe it's an option not to fill that in. I mean, I'm just throwing it out, I'm just saying this is what we found and maybe need to go back to the council...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Or to the constituencies, that would be the next step in the initial report, right. So the constituencies who then could suggest next steps and perhaps we have some consensus next steps after that process. But I feel like we have to take this report and go back to the constituencies

((Crosstalk))

Avri: Oh there's no – yes, that wasn't an issue. I don't think that was an issue and actually, I guess there's two ways of looking the word consensus on the report, that there's consensus on yes, this is what we want to send people or...

Man: That's right.

Avri: ... there's consensus on all the thoughts in it. But no, that's why we have agreement support and whatever, so yeah. And I – that's what I was saying earlier. I think what – close to, except for the parts that we haven't looked at yet which was not – next step.

Man: (Unintelligible) it's just that my question was can you get us there?

Avri: Oh, that's my intent. My intent is to get to the point where we've given the report to the council.

Man: All right.

Avri: And it's what happens afterwards. It's basically, if there's a desire of the working group to say, hey, we want to keep working on this, then that working group needs to elect a (unintelligible) chair.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Well, I don't (unintelligible) after we get the constituency statements.

Avri: So basically, that is one of the options that basically the group goes dormant and as once it goes - gets sent off to initial, then the group

goes dormant, doesn't do anything until after constituency statements is an option.

Woman (Unintelligible)

Avri: Yes, so the whole

((Crosstalk))

Avri: Yeah, the whole constituency public, council discussion, figure out what to do next....

((Crosstalk))

Man:have to go completely dormant. We can continue whatever research, data gathering efforts are obviously. I mean, you know done everything.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: There's one part that's still missing and needed in the report is and more data. I think that's, you know, people in the background are working on that because that's a section that, you know, it would be good if you could have...

((Crosstalk))

Man: I was sent data literally hours before I got on the plane to come here, so and I haven't been able to read it all until I got here.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...just maybe more low profiles could be worked on....

((Crosstalk))

Woman: But it still could be good for the group to coordinate itself somehow during that period then.

Man: I have some data from people (unintelligible) too.

((Crosstalk))

Man: I think we have enough to at least get some representatives.

((Crosstalk))

Man: It sounds like we agree.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Is anybody opposed to that?

((Crosstalk))

Man: Has anybody posted that. The constituency report or constituency statements and then talking again?

Woman: Are you proposing to take out the conclusions as next step parts for now or are you...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...hard for us to make any conclusions or next steps right now. I don't know if we're gonna come to a consensus on that. I mean..

((Crosstalk))

Avri: Well at the moment, when you're talking about...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...other than taking constituency input, which I think is a good next step.

Man: I agree with you, but would it be – I mean, we could put some possible next steps and just as long as we qualify them and say...

((Crosstalk))

Avri: Well, you've already got that.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: I mean you've already got pages...

((Crosstalk))

Man: There's no harm in that. Sure, everyone put in whatever they think the potential next steps are.

Woman: Right.

Woman: But actually then the question becomes, but - (Murica) said that the possible next steps that are in here were never really discussed.

Man: Yeah, we won't – let's not even take people's temperature on possible next steps.

((Crosstalk))

Man: But then they think possibly next steps are and look at the constituency's comments, maybe all of us will agree on a few.

Man: I mean, is it too naïve to hope that they come back from all the constituencies and 80% alignment on the....

((Crosstalk))

Avri: The 80/20 rule is always a nice thing to hope for.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Well, even if there's 20% consensus, maybe that's...

((Crosstalk))

Man: At that point, really - at that point it's up to the council to decide anyway after that constituency statement. So, it's out of hands.

Man: Right.

Avri: So really – and there are no conclusions are there?

Man: Not conclusions.

Woman: Well the first – intro-conclusions, that's right.

Woman: Is there extra paper copies floating around?

Avri: There's two papers left.

Man: I'll take one please.

Avri: Normally I don't want paper but my computers not working.

((Crosstalk))

Avri: Right, okay.

Woman: (Unintelligible) is (unintelligible) next steps.

Avri: No.

Woman: (Unintelligible)

Avri: Right.

Woman: I haven't been updated yet the (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Avri: Well the possible next step, if I understood what (Mike) was suggesting, it was just people read through these and if they have one that's not there yet, they write it up and it gets added.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Are these – is this (Mike O'Connor) and (Murica), this is guy's text or?

Woman: This is maybe (Mike's) text.

((Crosstalk))

Avri: The possible next steps, page 43, 44, 45. So then perhaps something to do with that possible next step is for people to read that and if the possible next step that they would prefer isn't here, we append it, write it up and we add that as another possible next step.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible) should also take comments on like text. I mean, if we come to consensus that we don't like it, it can go, right, some of it. Like his notes or that – you know, that time had just passed by some of his – some of his text. I'm not reading this right now.

Avri: Right. No.

Man: I haven't read it in a while.

Man: I'm sure he's a...

...too much pride in it. I mean...

((Crosstalk))

Man: I mean, that's not what I meant.

((Crosstalk))

Avri: ...definitely I don't believe he's requiring keep his text and ...

((Crosstalk))

Man: He's not even in the group.

((Crosstalk))

Avri: Nonetheless, you know, you just get really depressed and we'd worry about your psychological state and...

Man: Yeah, bad karma.

Avri: Yeah.

Man: I think would be a great idea and it would work if we can, I guess – and I'm just trying to think two steps ahead here. If we are in agreement that we can be permissive in what we accept as long as it's reasonable and, you know, fits with the process and (unintelligible) from some of the other ideas. If we get into you know (unintelligible) would work,

slicing and dicing all the individual steps, I think, you know, we're kind of back into the quicksand, so...

Avri: Right, yeah. No, I'd want to avoid that myself. I think if we basically indicated the possible next step was completely alternative viewpoints...

Man: (Unintelligible) them feasible next steps.

Avri: Right. And that basically, it's a collection of viewpoints about what the possible next steps are and then leave it to the constituencies who read it could comment on, you know, their preferences and to the public comment and to the council to figure out what those are.

Now what about the interim conclusions? We went through this once before and we – other than tentatively crossing out 1156 through 1159, that would basically, as I asked (Murica), to strike – to do a strike through on anything we planned to delete and then delete it at the next pass. We didn't have any major changes on it, as interim conclusions. That's something we probably need to read through and make sure that people are in some sense content with.

As I said, we did already talk about it once and all we really did was strike out 1156 and 59, and we haven't (unintelligible) it.

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...this is a small block of text. I don't want to move away if we could –
....

((Crosstalk))

Man: Well, I'm thinking maybe it might help since we're face to face and you've got a little time to throw out. I mean, James threw out one idea about looping in the CCNSO. Maybe we should just throw out some of our ideas about what the next steps would be after we get constituency statements, because we're obviously gonna be meeting constituency statement most likely and just talk about it while we're face-to-face because we never get to see face-to-face.

Avri: That fine with others? I have....

((Crosstalk))

Man: Could we start with the CCNSO issue? I mean...

Man: You know, throwing that out an example of something that could be suggested. Recognizing this issue, I mean, based on...

Man: ...depending on what (unintelligible) I'm sorry. (Unintelligible) probably operating on two hours sleep, but...

((Crosstalk))

Avri: Or less I think.

Man: Or less – more caffeine than water. (Unintelligible) you know, I think (unintelligible) various presentations on (unintelligible) e-crimes, phishing attacks and things of that nature, various constituency statements, workshop, break out meetings, and I think that one thing

that (unintelligible) comment in a lot of those is that they span the (unintelligible) so, throwing that out there is one possible...

Man: (Unintelligible) maybe just trying to get some liaisons from the GNSO?

Woman: Yeah, that's what I thinking as I listened to that.

((Crosstalk))

Man: I mean, you know, we're the GNSO, right, fundamentally. We can't tell them what to do and we can't sit around waiting for them to do something just because the problem cuts across the lame space. Every problem cuts across though, so if that were a rule, we would never do anything.

Avri: But we did talk about on certain things where we shared problems on finding ways – I mean that's sort of a decision we've made as the two

((Crosstalk))

Avri: ...so we do have a liaison. Certainly what this prompts is the idea that when we put out the initial report for review, we send a copy to the (unintelligible) CCNSO with our liaison and, you know, ask them if they're interested, to review this and perhaps we can schedule a joint conversation or collect comments or something from them.

Man: I mean more broadly it would be great if we could get CCNSO participation on several of our working groups.

((Crosstalk))

Avri: Well, that's the whole idea about the working groups is we're (unintelligible) broaden them out to that point, so perhaps that's part of the continuation that after this (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: I agree with you. It completely makes sense for this. You know, we can't sit on our hands (unintelligible). I don't think they've ever passed a policy (unintelligible). So...

Avri: I don't we get into judging what they've done or haven't done, but basically, if they have the same sort of issues, you know, or...

Man: Or just recognizing that there could be valuable (unintelligible) or maybe something that we (unintelligible) and I think that the idea of a liaison is probably (unintelligible).

Woman: We just today created a liaison to the CCNSO thereabouts create one to us so that we have (unintelligible) – I was gonna say a wider communication path, but I think we have – (Chris) and I talk to each other – but a wider communication path than that.

Man: (Unintelligible) certainly a similar solution is that we've looked at as possible solutions to problems have been implemented in the CC's registry so (unintelligible) valuable input in that regard.

Man: (Unintelligible) useful observation.

Man: (Unintelligible) and they can have some experience too.

Woman; Yeah.

Man: (Unintelligible) kind of agreed on that point.

Avri: Right and the first step on that is the liaison and passing that over to them and asking them to...

Man: Well again, I was just throwing that out there (unintelligible).

Avri: No, but it's great one.

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...include is a possible next step and whether we move on that or not, I certainly wasn't trying to...

Avri: Well, getting them to read – asking them to read and review it is sort of a prequel to I think the kind of thing you were talking about, as we certainly couldn't get them involved until we had gotten them to read it and gotten them to decide to be involved. So that's why I, you know, I thought basically as a sort of prequel, as it were, to what you mentioned was just getting them to read it and review it when everyone else is - when the constituencies are.

Man: I think we all agree on that prospect, basically process step as far as I can tell. (Unintelligible) think that we should try to think what are the options for substantive next steps, right. We either – we can disband the working groups if they were done. We can draft another charter

from our work if we think that makes sense if we can all agree on one (unintelligible) council.

Basically, that would be the council who would draft the charter, which we may or may not take a shot at drafting or we could - (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Avri: Well, one of things I was thinking of, if we get that far after the review is to actually not only draft the charter – we had an initial charter – is almost to negotiate a charter and that's often done by a chair so that we can get something that both the people working on it agree as doable and the people on the council agree is within (INSCO) and within policy constraints (unintelligible) it may take a couple back and forth before you actually get somewhere.

Man: Well on the farther end of the spectrum, I mean, you know, clearly where it would be ideal is – I hope in all of our minds is if we could actually agree, after the constituency statements, on some recommendation - policy recommendations. I don't know that we'll get there. But it's possible. I got to believe. Come on, so...

Man: Yes they can.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible) a combination. Maybe there is some very simple recommendations that we do all agree on and we also agree that there should be more work done to look at other possible (unintelligible).

Woman: Maybe could even agree that there should be no policy recommendations coming (unintelligible).

Man: Well, there's a difference between recommendations...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...very doubtful.

Woman: (Unintelligible) between the policy and recommendations (unintelligible).

Man: Well this is the policy (unintelligible) right.

Woman: Yeah, at the moment, we're in a policy development process.

Man: And I think there's a question about whether (unintelligible) appropriate subjects (unintelligible) expressed. Staff has recently said that the manner in which domain names are registered is appropriate and (unintelligible), but the manner in which domain names are used is not, and I think that's what the manner in which domain names are used.

Man: (Unintelligible) out on the list today (unintelligible) find that a little inconsistent with the prior advice (unintelligible) but I'd love to have further interpretation. If you want to do it on the fly, that'd be awesome.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible) probably better do it (unintelligible) rather than later. But I think it's a (unintelligible) and so I think (unintelligible) that's what

(unintelligible) talking about (unintelligible) registration is going to achieve (unintelligible) registration or is that a use. (Unintelligible)

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible) could be something like post the wrong file on my Web site two years after I registered (unintelligible) registration record (unintelligible) registration of use (unintelligible).

Man: I'm gonna need to see that.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Or if there's any other possible next steps (unintelligible). Is that what you want to talk about?

Man: Yeah. One thought would be using the model for IRCP. If we approach this more like, okay, you know, how do we get our arms around this, if one possibility is gonna be broken up into, you know, smaller (unintelligible) working groups.

But you know, if we have a technical challenge (unintelligible) requires a lot of data analysis and then we want to take a look also at the (unintelligible) being the CC space (unintelligible) see if that could mess up some of their policies and (unintelligible) you know, trying to decide this issue between Houston and registration. I mean, if these types of issues can be narrowed in into smaller and smaller working units and then we can take a subset of this working group and (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Avri: ...IRCP (unintelligible) we would taken them sequentially. We would look at the partitions in smaller chunk subjects and then say, okay, this is the one we take first. Or, the way it worked with IRCP is, the working group came up with the chunks and the recommendations of priorities, and then the council sort of went through it and said, well, yeah, okay, let's start working on this one and then later we'll work on that one.

And, it really depends on getting to the point where we've got enough people to work on multiple things before we start working on multiple things. At the moment, we barely have enough people to work on one thing.

Man: Yeah, the and cautionary tale for, I think, everyone has been (unintelligible) do we want that (unintelligible) to turn into a careers and (unintelligible) five or six years, because I mean, you know, it could – it would take – could drag the process down I guess is my concern there.

But one of the successes, I think that I think (unintelligible) from another group that (unintelligible) the IRCP group is that we've had a lot of more streamline in the (unintelligible) set because the, you know, the huge issue was broken into smaller sets of related questions and then they were very narrowly targeted so that we could pull in, you know, various expertise and then just focus on those. And I think that you can see that the headway's being made a lot faster even through that group I think started later than this by a couple months. So...

Avri: But then again, the group that cut it up into the pieces and the prioritizing of those piece...

Man: I'm sure they were pulling their hair out.

((Crosstalk))

Avri: ...took about a year or more to get to that point. So...

Man: Okay.

Avri: Yeah. So, this group is where that group was a year and a half ago in a sense. I hate to say that. Forget I said that. But yeah.

And so yes, the dividing it up into manageable pieces and when you do that, you also get to prioritize those pieces. Because some of them may be interesting problems or interesting things, but are not the key problem area at the moment, or they're not the most acceptable to study or they're not the most acceptable change, and so that can be useful exercise too.

By the way, were any those – there must have been (unintelligible) possible next steps – were any of those included in the next steps?

((Crosstalk))

Avri: Right. Well, we can look at that later – can look at that (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: One of things we could look at as well as possible next steps is trying to find out what (unintelligible) parts of this that could be policy and parts of this could make (unintelligible) be best practices, and parts of it that could be support for the industry. Because right now, the industry is solving this problem, not in the way I think most people in domain community want them to solve the problem, and that is by arbitrarily setting rules and creating system that block a whole bunch of stuff and I don't think that's a world that we really want to have happen.

If we can create a system and policies to let people who have a legitimate use for these techniques etc. use it. So I think just, you know, if we can take a look at what make sense from a policy perspective versus what make sense from now. You know, how do we support ...

((Crosstalk))

Man: I guess (unintelligible) that would probably come after we got constituency statements I think wouldn't count normally...

Woman: Everything comes...

Man: (Unintelligible) view at that point or (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: Would it be after final report, then you would insert something about scope or what?

Woman: No. That's in the (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible) then you're done basically unless you get a special request that you choose to answer it.

Avri: So first of all, I think all of these things come either parallel to the constituency report or after it, but, you know, certainly not before we've sent it on.

By the way, before we go with more ideas, I just want to check. Three ideas were given, talked about getting people to write up small paragraphs that we can put in this section, so I'm wondering if before the next time we meet, someone can volunteer to take one to some of these (unintelligible) and write them up so we can get them in. So we had three that (unintelligible) we had the CCNSO cooperation idea, we had the cut it up in the – into smaller chunks ala IRCP.

Man: Those two were due (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: I know.

((Crosstalk))

Avri: You have – okay, so you're happy to write up these ideas and add them. Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Avri: And then you can put them on the list and people can see them. Okay.
And the (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Unintelligible) a little bit like what (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Okay, great.

((Crosstalk))

Avri: (Unintelligible) and then next time, what we can do is – and we see if they're anymore ideas to add to the list, we can go through them plus we can – everyone having read it and being awake, we can go through the – well, I don't know what time the call is (unintelligible) people. But, we can go through the – what's currently in there and see what stays in and what doesn't and what needs changing.

Okay, anymore ideas on things that we should/could add to the possible next steps report?

Man: I think that this very well could dovetail into the issues would be that (unintelligible) but the whole issue that I was trying to bring up with the registration abuse policies. Because, you know, frankly I don't know, it's from what I –where I sit today, I'm think, you know, (unintelligible) over me and (unintelligible) if you think I'm crazy, but I think if we cut...

((Crosstalk))

Man: No don't have to (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: You know, I thought – I think that ultimately what I'm trying to do there, it would be nice (unintelligible) affiliates (unintelligible) request, that sort of policy where kind of uniformly apply to all PLDs so that they're releasing power to investigate and look at this stuff. That would at least be a step forward, but I don't know...

Man: Well, there (unintelligible).

Man: Some say they're not. Some registrars investigate it.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Talk to some (unintelligible), they say they can't even looking at things, so (unintelligible). But, you know, I don't know if affiliates (unintelligible) sites at all. I don't think so, but I mean, having some sort of a policy around this topic area I think every registry probably should just for their own, you know, legal cover if nothing else. Whether the policy – the policy could be if we do nothing, right – a lot of them don't have policy at all.

Man: Exactly.

Man: And so I'm not thinking necessarily (unintelligible).

Man: I'm not necessarily even thinking registries as much as registrars. You know, I'm not thinking about you guys either. I thinking about guys that will never show up at meetings, okay. So I don't know. I mean this could be solved if we have agreement on that, maybe.

Woman: I guess I don't quite understand that yet.

Man: What are you saying, this would be a subset of that, right?

Man: Well mean, would – we would – to polo – we would basically from a GNSO perspective, that policy would simply address the issues in this – in the (unintelligible) group (unintelligible) total solution basically (unintelligible) done, because we've got this policy that all registries have agreed to and acts basically that empowers them to investigate things and take things down.

Man: (Unintelligible)

Man: No, not something you can stop or any (unintelligible) they can do at any time on any kind of a (unintelligible).

Man: Have you seen – do you have any (unintelligible) has that policy been (unintelligible).

Man: Our policy comes into effect (unintelligible) after a 30 day (unintelligible) what I've seen in my research (unintelligible). What I've seen in my research into various abuse issues is that different registries have different issues that they have to address. Different registries have (unintelligible) different registrant bases and different thresholds for getting a domain name. And, someone (unintelligible)

have very different (unintelligible). Some registries address the same problems using different means (unintelligible) different policies.

The same thing is true with registrars. There's a wide variety of solution and capabilities and (unintelligible). Look at GoDaddy for example. They have interests in certain things and that's their choice. I think (unintelligible) good thing that it is their choice. They're interested (unintelligible) illegal drug sales or something because that (unintelligible) impose that on another registrar, you know (unintelligible) gets into a sticky situation. We try to have policies that (unintelligible) what are they and I don't see (unintelligible) solution being (unintelligible) useful – is useful or appropriate.

Man: All registries can (unintelligible) correct?

Man: Not (unintelligible) restricted ones it'd be pretty hard for.

Man: Okay. That's a good basement. That's how I thought some (unintelligible) handle. So all unrestricted registries can't be tied into the (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible)

Man: That's true but also, unrestricted can be as well.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible) there's a matter of likelihood or...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Bottom line is (unintelligible) not – wouldn't be requiring really anything. It would just be empowering. So we have, take the argument away that we can't do anything, which I just think – I hope everyone in this room think that just a ridiculous argument, but – sorry. Maybe perhaps other than (Wendy). But...

Woman: Well, yeah...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: I guess I don't understand the complete permission for registry to necessarily take down anything. I guess I don't quite understand it at the moment and on what basis and how do you regulate that.

Man: Where have you been? I mean, I don't know if you read the issues report (unintelligible). I mean, it's already in a lot of registry agreements, the general power to do something and then affiliates went and speced that out a little bit and people flushed it out.

Woman: This is the point I was at. It doesn't say anything about how they do it or if they do it. I mean – It doesn't need the (unintelligible) to do something or (unintelligible) they don't anything. So, I just want (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible)

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...then look at that so it's very difficult to make a judgment about how effective those provisions are or how non-effective they are. So (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Avri: As one of the possibilities that can be looked at, as we weren't necessarily trying to decide that that was our conclusion at the moment. We were merely stating that that was one of the possibilities that could be looked at. I guess that seems to have asserted itself enough to be on the list.

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Avri: Well, we could put anything on the list, but you have to be able to write it in and explain it and...

Man: I could do that.

Avri: Right. That's kind of what I meant. It sort of needs a clear assertion.

((Crosstalk))

Avri: So do we want to – is there another one that people want to talk about at this point that comes to anybody's minds that haven't been mentioned yet of possible places one could go in this multiple choice?

(Unintelligible) don't need to. It's – and then again, if someone can, they can write it out and send it to the list between now and then.

Man: (Unintelligible) probably gonna be better.

Avri: Yeah.

Man: Because that – I looked at the (unintelligible).

Avri: Right, well, it was possible that somebody was sitting there just waiting for this one to be over because, you know – speak another one that was on their mind.

Man: Not catching us on our best day.

((Crosstalk))

Avri: So, I think that probably covers what we're gonna do about nine called eight, nine numbered eight. So next time, and then I think unless we have something else, we can call ourselves done for today.

Next time, we're going to basically go through all those because we have some new sections, right, that we need to talk through. And then, we have a bunch of edit from last time, things that are struck through or things that were added, confirm that we either are comfortable with the deletion staying deleted it or comfortable with the addition as it's been made. And then we'll talk through the new that will go through eight - and that's already a full meeting - we'll go through eight and delete, change and add if necessary.

And, I may be being optimistic – I'm often optimistic – but I think we could probably get through it in tomorrow phone call. Does that seem like a good goal? Obviously, in this one, they'll be new stuff to – we'll only have seen it on a first pass and therefore, will want to go through it one more time just to make sure that (unintelligible) yeah.

Woman: Because I just (unintelligible) 5.4, the last time – the last thing I saw that it was sent out to a bigger group, but there is - I didn't see any feedback, but (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible)

Woman: Okay, so the last thing Jason that – of what's been sent to you (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) 5.4.

Man: You got three things from me, right? (Unintelligible)

((Crosstalk))

Woman: I think the only other outstanding thing is the (unintelligible) that (George) put in, because there was discussion on his (unintelligible) of some element of that. So...

Man: (Unintelligible) okay with that.

((Crosstalk))

Avri: It could basically – I think anything can go in as an alternative viewpoint and then just if it goes higher than an alternative viewpoint, it needs people to agree to it. I mean, we sort of talked about, at this point, in terms of capturing ideas – if somebody could say it, it was an alternative viewpoint.

Man: That's the section that this was in (unintelligible) 5.

Woman: Well everything...

Woman: I think 5.7...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Are we going back in – okay.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: But it wasn't (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Woman: There's an F55 is an empty one.

Man: Okay.

Woman: If someone can come up with the text for that one.

Man: I think there was one that I took on and I dropped the ball.

((Crosstalk))

Man: I need to be reminded of it.

Woman: It was 5.4 or 5.5. I know 5.4's been talked about, 5.5 is still...

((Crosstalk))

Avri: 5.5 was how a registrant's affected, 5.6 is about content.

((Crosstalk))

Man: I think (Murica) has that.

Avri: Okay.

Man: 5 10. I know that we've passed it back and forth.

((Crosstalk))

Man: If you can just summarize – since we don't see the document that you have, if you could just summarize the sections on the mailing list and I know I can go back and pull out what we've written and make certain that you have a copy of it (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible) but (unintelligible) language for it.

Woman: Yeah. I need to look back in the list. On some of the things (unintelligible) but still had the impression that also...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...are not in here but they are on the list and some of them I might not have received. So, I'll double check and come back to the list (unintelligible). If I have language already copied in the email (unintelligible) on what that (unintelligible) looks like and if that's the latest version.

Man: While we're talking about predictions, I have one question about data. Do you want summaries or raw data? I mean, one of the problems that I have with what I have is that it will be 80 or 90 pages if it were printed and so I'm trying to understand what representation is best.

So, for example, I have lists of domain names and the number of ASMs that were associated with those domains names that were used as a determinant to identifying the domain as a (unintelligible). So how would I represent that in data that would be appropriate for the committee?

Woman: Well what we did with (Randy)'s case study and maybe it should be separate chapter in the report. I mean, the (unintelligible) is we basically asked him to write and attach the summary (unintelligible) on what the main findings are also data.

Man: Okay.

Woman: The best of the data on the separate (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Woman: And then point - and then appoint (unintelligible)

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...delays there so it needs (unintelligible) 90 pages (unintelligible).

Man: Yeah, I guess we have to make certain we have the right to publish the actual data as opposed (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Avri: But you would need to do that if it was (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: Would it be easier if I could break it down into kind of rages – ranges – this level of domains have this range of ASMs and all of them were determined to be (unintelligible). This had that range and (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: Now that I have an idea of what you're looking for, let me write, you know, write one summary of potentially three that I can provide and I can – I might be able to go back to April and get like a more recent monthly survey kind of summary and I can do that as well.

Woman: (Unintelligible) most of the readers wouldn't have the top level (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yeah, right. You don't want to look at 10,000 domain names.

Man: Not unless you really want to.

Man: Yeah. A couple of high-level summary bullets would be good, because (unintelligible) – we have lists – lots of lists of domains now.

Man: Right.

Man: You might want to (unintelligible) and see how many there were (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yeah. Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Man: One more (Murica) and then I wanted to get (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Avri: Right, I wanted to make sure that before we went back I wanted to make sure that we had – we were all set on what we were gonna do.

Man: Yeah, that's fine.

Avri: Okay.

Man: And the reason – the only reason I ask is because earlier in the day when (Rod) was presenting his global phishing survey, several of the CCPLDs, you know, wanted the raw data because they were put off (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...they actually had phishing attacks in there – in their domains.

Avri: Okay. So, that pretty much covers where we're going to and what we're gonna do on our next meeting, which is when?

Man: 14th.

Man: Next Friday.

Avri: Okay. Okay, yeah, okay. So we're cool with that, yeah. (Mike) had one more possible next step.

Man: (Unintelligible) preliminary (unintelligible) but I think one feeble next step is also coming up with a list of potential recommendations that registrars – I know registries could adopt of their choosing, and I know we don't want to call them best practices, but we could call them recommendations or even an information alert or whatever – something like that.

Man: I thought that's what I wrote up.

Man: When? Oh sorry. I didn't know it was on the list. I just wanted to make sure it got there so we could (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Woman: No, I think we need that as a next step and (unintelligible) about the 5.10 (unintelligible)

((Crosstalk))

Woman: No, he had mentioned under policy – is it a policy, is it a best practice...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Is it a best practice. Is it under his bullet point?

Man: Right, yeah. Okay.

Woman: So yeah.

Man: I don't think she has it.

((Crosstalk))

Man: No that was before we were talking about 510.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible) idea is already listed as one possible option (unintelligible).

Avri: So. Well, I think we are done unless there's anything else anyone wants to add at this point. I think it was probably good seeing you all face-to-face.

Man: Is our meeting next Friday a problem for you Avri since you (unintelligible) on the last (unintelligible) that you have more travel coming up.

Avri: I definitely have more travel but actually, I'll be – next Friday, no, isn't a problem. I'm home.

((Crosstalk))

Avri: The following Friday, I'm traveling back from the ITF in Minneapolis that afternoon so I wouldn't be able to do it. But next Friday, I am actually home.

Man: (Unintelligible) the Friday after that, the Friday after Thanksgiving.

Man: Thanksgiving.

Avri: Right. And then I'll be at – the problem is (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Avri: See the problem is after the ITF, I head off to...

Man: Black Friday.

Avri: That's why I'd kind of like to finish it in two meetings and maybe we can do the next one during ITF week, but not Friday, because then after ITF, I go off to (Hydrobacks) for the ITF for two weeks where I'm working as secretary and so I will be totally useless to this effort.

Woman: Well, it make (unintelligible) report and be done.

((Crosstalk))

Avri: Okay, yeah. So I guess at our next meeting, (unintelligible) schedule it for two hours. Is that okay, and see if we can get home on time.

Woman: (Unintelligible)

Avri: Yes, and see how far we can get, then look for something the following week, but before Friday if I'm gonna do it. If someone else is gonna do it, especially the person that, you know, people think might be a continuing a chair if it continues, then, you know, it can be on a Friday. But if I'm doing it, it needs to be done Monday through – not Thursday because I have (unintelligible) research group (unintelligible) Thursday, but earlier in the week. We can find – we can talk about a date.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Avri: That's the other thing I have. That's right. I got that in the afternoon and one in the morning. (Unintelligible).

Man: Thank you for (unintelligible) busy schedule.

((Crosstalk))

Man: I appreciate it.

((Crosstalk))

Avri: And thank you for, you know, putting up with me. Okay, thanks.

Man: All right.

Avri: Are you all going to take naps? Oh no, I got another meeting in half an hour. (Unintelligible) get ready for the (unintelligible) but we have a meeting about tomorrow's meetings.

((Crosstalk))

Avri: Another meeting about tomorrow's 8:30 to 9:30 meeting.

((Crosstalk))

Avri: Okay, thank you (Joe).

Man. Thank you. Have a good one.

END