

**Fast Flux PDP WG Teleconference  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Friday 19 December 2008 16:00 UTC**

**Note:** The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Fast Flux PDP WG teleconference on Friday 19 December 2008, at 16:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ff-20081219.mp3>

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

Please note, the next call will be on 16 January 2009 at 16:00 UTC.

Present for the teleconference:

Avri Doria - NCA, GNSO Council chair, Interim chair

Greg Aaron - Afiliis Ry c.

Paul Diaz - Networksolutions RRc

James Bladel - GodaddyRRc

Adam Palmer - PIR Ry c.

Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC

Observers - (no constituency affiliation)

Joe St. Sauver

Martin Hall

Dave Piscitello

Rod Rasmussen

Staff:

Marika Konings

Glen de Saint Gery

Liz Gasster - absent - apologies

Man: A bunch of editorial comments that are enabling...

Avri Doria: You raised this one some time ago, no? Or did you send something else?

Man: Yeah, but they're all in this draft now.

Avri Doria: Okay, okay, okay.

Man: So I think there are one or two small comments that I have and then I think that Martin's annex of data merits maybe some comment or at least some approval.

But I think it looks pretty clean right now.

Avri Doria: Okay. Because I believe we have to be at a point where sort of everyone has read through it and we deal with everyone's issues so then we can call it done and ready to send on. And I just don't know if we're at that point.

Man: I think we're very close to that point. I for one haven't had a chance to really read the details of redraft from Marika just so the focus doesn't reach the LD stuff.

Avri Doria: Yeah. And that's kind of what I meant, I think everyone believes that the document is fairly close from everything that I've seen and listening to the last meeting I wasn't on.

It's just that I don't know if we're quite ready to do it. And then of course there's the new annex that might be a good thing to people, talk through, walk through.

Glen DeSaintgery: Avri, would you like me to do the roll call, I believe the recording has started.

Avri Doria: Yeah, we don't - okay certainly do it, yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: Operator?

Coordinator: Yes, you are recording.

Glen DeSaintgery: The recording is started?

Coordinator: Yes, we're recording, yeah.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you. So we have Joe St. Sauver, Martin Hall, David Piscitello, Rod Rasmussen, Greg Aaron, Adam Palmer, Mike Rodenbaugh, James Bladel and Avri Doria on the call.

And for staff Marika Konings and myself Glen and Liz Gasster is - cannot be with us, she's got a conflict today.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you Glen. So yeah, I mean at the moment I see that that's pretty much where we're at, it's just basically doing a last walk through to make sure that that document is - it's fine.

But I don't see how we could do that until everyone has had the chance to sort of read through it and make sure that they're comfortable with it.

Man: I have one question.

Avri Doria: Sure.

Man: How about the executive summary, is that something that staff will put together or is that something we also need to produce?

Avri Doria: I think that that's something that would be best done by staff and then reviewed by us.

Marika Konings: Yes, my idea would be indeed, I was waiting to see if there were further comments on you know the different parts in the report before writing that. But I think we're indeed at the stage where we probably can put that together and put it as well out for review.

Avri Doria: Yeah, my feeling is that if we have comments now they're going to be more of the smaller specific type and not of - there would be a comment that would be so large that it would reflect in something so small as the executive summary would actually surprise me at this point.

I don't know how others feel about that statement.

Marika Konings: I did notice that Mike just sent out a new proposed chapter six section, so that - I don't know, I noted there's no tracked changes, so I'm not really sure how much has changed in that.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah, I have it with the changes tracked in the report, I can try to send that around that shows that, sorry it got lost in copying it over. But basically I just kind of deleted some - shortened it up a little bit but kept the gist of it in tact.

Avri Doria: Okay, so it was really just a wordsmithing as opposed to a content change?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well there was some - some sentences were deleted. I'm sorry, I meant to include both versions and let's see if I can do that here.

Marika Konings: Mike, I have another question for you. In an earlier email you mentioned something as well about issues you had with section 5.10 and that you would circle it, some language. But I don't know if that has been resolved by the current draft, or...

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think that was - really was section 6. I think it became renumbered at some point. My understanding, let me - is that totally wrong Marika?

Marika Konings: I think - it didn't get renumbered but maybe there was confusion over the numbers, that's possible.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah, I think I was confused with the numbers.

Marika Konings: No, I just want to make sure that you know you're happy with as it stands now and we won't have any big changes again that are coming up.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well thanks. No it's the challenges section six that I had the problem with for a while. I know you've been reminding me to do this, I'm sorry just got it done this morning.

I can't figure out how to copy and paste just the text but actually showing the changes I made. I guess I have to send the whole report.

Marika Konings: No, you delete all the rest. You basically delete all the rest of the report and leave the marked changes section. That should do the trick.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Thank you.

Avri Doria: So yeah, because what I would propose doing is once we have - we seem like we're really close to having a final pass, what could be called a final draft of the document, then we can just basically walk through each and every person's issues that are still there and work them out at that time.

I just don't think we're there yet and I don't know if we have any other contents that needs to be discussed, perhaps if Mike you were sending out your changes now people could look at that and see how they felt about the deleted lines.

But even that's difficult at this point.

Marika Konings: In the meantime Avri, there's two sections on page 19 and one on page 37 that are also untracked changes that were basically added between the last conference call and this one that I think both of them are more - are rewording and not real substantial changes.

But as we're on the call now people might want to have a look at those and make sure that they are fine with those.

Avri Doria: Okay, let me get to that.

Marika Konings: First one's page 19.

Avri Doria: I've been having network problems all day. Network problems, new computer problems. So which version of the document is this one? Is it the one the 8th of September or is there a later version?

I don't see anything later than the 8th of December, is that correct?  
Multiple versions, I just want to make sure I've got the right one. Is it 8  
December or is there a later one?

Marika Konings: Eight December is the last one.

Avri Doria: Okay great, thanks. And it was page 19?

Marika Konings: Nineteen.

Avri Doria: Nineteen, thank you. Sorry to be so unprepared. Okay, so basically  
this is in the section 5.2, who would benefit from cessation of the  
practice and who would be harmed?

I think the text under who is harmed by Fast Flux techniques when  
used in support of a tech networks. And these are additional lines, and  
support the benefit from the cessation of the practice of Fast Flux text,  
other (unintelligible) parties who are harmed with Fast Flux infusions  
for the tech network.

The working group that's focused its attention on identifying the harm  
as follows. I don't assume there's any issue with that, is there? Okay,  
then that could probably be made final.

Where's the next one?

Marika Konings: Page 37.

Avri Doria: Thirty seven, thank you. Okay, here we have a deletion and some  
other text. The working group would like to point out that a number of

registries including generic sponsored and country code TLDs currently have policy that might serve as examples of how TLDs can take individual action in areas of domain abuse.

STLDs are differently situated and have different needs and approaches in this area. And this is replacing text about affiliates, etcetera. Is that an acceptable change to everyone?

So you guys went through this one last time, right? And this is just now confirming it?

Marika Konings: No (unintelligible) in the meantime.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. So is there any issue with that substitution?

Man: I sort of hate to see the loss of the pointer to the specific affiliate's policy, I think it really is worth calling out specifically even if only as a footnote.

Avri Doria: And in fact at one point I think we had talked about that one and I don't think we'd want to have that whole deleted section as a footnote. I think that that would be too much.

You know are people - do people find having a footnote acceptable?

Greg Aaron: This is Greg, I think on our last call we talked about it a little bit and I'll reiterate what I said then which is that there are a lot of registries out there that have various kinds of language that address this kind of issue.



And then the most if not all registrars in their agreement also have language that addresses these kinds of abuse problems.

So I wasn't comfortable having one company pulled out, although I think Joe meant it certainly as a compliment for a registry that was thinking hard about the issue.

Joe St. Sauver: I think it's exemplary in fact. Thank you.

Greg Aaron: So that's much appreciated but actually a lot of these perhaps applicable policies have been listed in a recent GNSO issues report about use issues actually and there's quite a lot.

So I think it's more of a general issue and I don't want to give the impression that just one company seems to be praised when there might be others who are also doing something worthwhile.

And I don't want to give the impression that there's only one registry out there or you know only one registrar out there that have applicable language.

Avri Doria: Okay, but certainly it really depends on how strong - the feeling is it certainly would be possible to you know to phrase a footnote that says while there are many registries and registrars who have you know taken individual action in the areas of abuse.

One example among many is and so would that kind of phrasing make a difference to you or still you'd be uncomfortable with it?

Greg Aaron: I mean I'd be happy to work with somebody on some language like that, sure. I'd be glad to.

Avri Doria: Okay, would that work for you who would like to see it in a footnote? And something similar to what I just said, would that be an acceptable way of approaching it?

Man: It would be at least for me and I can also say that if need be we could also probably find some of those other examples that would be worth mentioning to go ahead and kind of make it be less Afiliias focused if that would help.

Avri Doria: It could be a few examples are and then maybe two or three if people have them handy. Is that an acceptable solution to everybody, is that unacceptable to anyone? Okay great.

So then we can sort of take the wording that I had and maybe people could find another example or two and put it in there. Is that okay with you...

Marika Konings: This is Marika, can we even make it shorter and have a footnote at the end of the first sentence, the working group would like to point out that a number of registries and then a footnote saying example given, the abuse policy of Afiliias and then some other example.

Avri Doria: I think it would have to say one example among many or some examples among many. And that way the - we have avoided making the singular reference even in the footnote.

Yeah, we don't need all my wording perhaps. But as long as we repeat the one among many or several among many or a few among many are, you know?

Some examples among many can be found or something like that just so that we're dealing with the issue of singular mention.

Okay and we'll be able to look at that again when we have the whole final draft to look at. Any other particular issues on this particular spot?

Okay, the next one would be at...

Marika Konings: No, these are the only two.

Avri Doria: Okay those are the only two, then we have basically Mike's additions. Mike have you succeeded in sending around your - or were you going to do that at another time?

Mike Rodenbaugh: No, it's gone from outbox but I...

Avri Doria: Okay it's gone from your outbox, let's see if it's submitted to my inbox - oh I see it made it to my inbox. It made it to other people's inboxes.

Marika Konings: I received it as well.

Avri Doria: If enough people received it we could go through it now so we can have some discussion before the hopefully final draft comes out.

Man: I have it.

Avri Doria: I'm opening it up at the moment, so if everybody takes a chance to look at it.

Man: There's not a track changes or anything for it is there?

Mike Rodenbaugh: There is a second version with the track changes.

Avri Doria: Yeah, that's the one that was just sent out. It arrived marked 17:17 on mine so at the hour dot seventeen for wherever a person is. Okay. And where do we look Mike? What page are we at in terms of your changes?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well it's section six.

Avri Doria: Oh I see, you basically crossed out everything, it's all deleted except for - yeah, I see. Section six, now I've got to page - or a line number.

Man: Oh I see, God, it did get the whole report.

Avri Doria: Yeah, it got the whole report so just if someone - but if we could put - okay, I'm looking for...

Mike Rodenbaugh: It's on page 38.

Avri Doria: Okay great, that helps bunches.

Marika Konings: I only got four pages.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I know, it depends on how you look at it, what view you're looking at in Word, I think that's causing some confusion.

Man: If you're looking at track changes you get three - you get four pages and Mike's comments start at page 3, at least that's in Word for the Mac.

Avri Doria: Okay yeah, I live in Open Office so I got a whole lot more.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I did too if I look at it in a certain view in Word I get the whole thing.

Avri Doria: Yeah, that's what I've got.

Mike Rodenbaugh: That did - I only have the part I wanted.

Avri Doria: Okay well that's okay, I can get to the right page and then it won't matter.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Is it page - I can't even tell what page it is, it just says page 2.

Avri Doria: Okay, it's section which number?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Six.

Avri Doria: Section six, okay five nine, five ten.

Man: Hey Mike?

Avri Doria: Those are the same and looking at it totally it's on page 41, so if you happen to be in open office that shows all of it.

Man: Mike is this sort of summarize your changes as sort of removing the kind of chronology of events in the working group and focusing on you know on the document at hand?

Mike Rodenbaugh: That....

Avri Doria: Yeah, that's what it looks like.

Mike Rodenbaugh: That's definitely part of it, I really just wanted to take out some of the stuff, I didn't think there was actually broad agreement on in the group.

I think that there were - there was a big argument about some of this stuff early on and that's how this text resulted, from a former chair.

And obviously have passed that by I think in a lot of ways so I just tried to take out some of the language that I thought was very critical of the working group.

Avri Doria: In the folks that have the doc from Word, do you still have the same line numbers, does it still start at 1176?

Mike Rodenbaugh: My line numbers have disappeared altogether from this document.

Man: I have line numbers but they're just 1 to 53.

Avri Doria: Okay so that won't help. Okay then we probably should just walk through it change by change. The first change I have is a deletion of the working group quickly concluded that to it was argued by some member of the working groups that.

Greg Aaron: This is Greg, this was kind of before your time Avri, but there's a lot of background on this threads. Yeah, we - I don't know if it quickly concluded, but I think that there was a lot of work on the definitions.

And I think that there was a broad realization that needed a lot of work.

Mike Rodenbaugh: That's still there in the next sentence.

Avri Doria: So do you object to that change then?

Greg Aaron: I thought there were any members of the working group who found the original charter definitions to be adequate though, which is what this revised language implies.

Avri Doria: I see. Well one could make the ambiguity a little less apparent if need be by just saying it was argued in the working group that this definition, and that could still allow for there to have been someone who thought it was a fine definition and yet not bring it out quite as boldly as this is.

Does that make a difference to anyone? It was just argued in the working group that this definition lacked the details, would that be okay?

Greg Aaron: Seems reasonable I think.

Avri Doria: Is that okay with you Mike?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes, thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay. Then moving down to the next change I see, it was a way for an attacker and then this is an insertion to avoid the tension and then frustrate the response to the attack.

Perhaps I need to read the whole sentence, that is Fast Flux servers do prolong the period of time during which the attack continues to be effective before the domain is taken down by the in quotes good guy.

Mike Rodenbaugh: You missed a typo there, servers should be serves.

Avri Doria: Oh okay, thank you. I read the servers. Okay, it is not an attack itself, it is a way for the attacker to avoid detection and that frustrates the response to the attack. Is that an acceptable change? Okay.

Then in the next paragraph the (legal has) as two sentences are removed. However the members do not agree as to whether ICANN is the best source of (unintelligible) to conduct this activity.

This point is expanded on in the next section of the report. And those two sentences were deleted.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah, because it was talking about it in the next section which I did change pretty dramatically, but...

Avri Doria: Okay, does anybody object to removing those sentences and with it what comes? Okay well then let's keep looking down and maybe we'll come back to these if we need to.

And the next paragraph is left alone, then the following paragraph is removed. The question was asked whether PDP was started



prematurely, this is the historical sentence, on March 2008 issues report had already recommended that further fact finding and research would be helpful in order to inform the community deliberations. Yes?

Greg Aaron: I would like that remain in the document somewhere because it's a...

Mike Rodenbaugh: Which point?

Greg Aaron: That paragraph about whether it was started prematurely. Because the question was asked whether it goes, where it is or where it goes, if it goes in section B, you know it's up for discussion .

But that is a point that a number of constituencies raised during the process.

Avri Doria: Yeah, and it's certainly one that has affected behavior in the council since then in terms of looking at how we start things, but - excuse me. But does it necessarily sit in this section?

I guess, I mean in some ways it is appropriate, it is talking about the challenges of the group itself, challenges faced by the group.

Greg Aaron: It might make sense to stay there because the next section is about the charter itself.

Mike Rodenbaugh: That's fine, leave it there. If you're comfortable with the changes in the next section then I'm fine with leaving that there, above that.

Avri Doria: Okay well let's look at the next section then. So okay, then we have - we change or the suggested change, misconception about the scope

of the PDP and remit of ICANN to issues with the charter which is basically a more neutral statement. Is that a fine change?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Actually I really tried to delete stuff in here about what's within or without of ICANN remit because it's just not within this working group's remit to be talking about that.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Greg Aaron: Well is it or is it not?

Avri Doria: I tend to say that that - that those determinations tend to get made by legal counsel, so the working group can certainly ask the question of the GNSO council but ask the question of legal counsel.

But certainly the working group doesn't decide what's within the remit and what's not. It can raise a question about.

Greg Aaron: We raise the question as we learn more about the issue, and then the determination is made later by another body, so.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Bad precedent for working groups to be challenging - to have members of working group I should say disrupting the working group by challenging the working group's remit and charter, you know once the council decides the formal working group, that should not be subject to further challenge from within the working group.

Greg Aaron: That's not what we're saying though, is it?

Avri Doria: Yeah, and actually I'm not sure that I would necessarily, I mean in almost all of the charters and certainly there's the notion that once the working group starts working with a charter and starts looking at it practically, it can certainly have questions as to the charter.

And can even make recommendations, it's the council that then needs to answer these things and the working group can't on its own change its charter certainly.

But certainly to send a question to the council on a particular issue would not seem to me to be inappropriate.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I agree, but at least it would be inappropriate if it's addressing what's within, without of ICANN's GNSO scope. That should not be fought at a working group level every single time.

Avri Doria: I definitely agree with the phrase every single time, but if someone does bring up such an issue and it's not clear to the other members or even if it does seem clear to the other members, it does seem a way to get rid of such an argument as to you know basically send it on so that legal council can look at it and say what's the problem?

Yeah, it's within scope, go do your work. And certainly we've encountered this in previous task groups and others where one constituency or another would say this work is out of scope.

It's sort of an in my almost five years, or I guess four and a half now, it's a question that's come up periodically and almost the only way we've ever had of resolving it is sending it to the council, the council

confers with legal counsel, the council comes back and says nope, was in scope, question's over.

And at that point then it's easy for the chair of the group to say hey, we checked with counsel, they checked with counsel and it's been defined as in scope, out of issue.

So when there's ambiguities with that I think they have to be handled with that sort of - that way of checking.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well the entire group has been delayed to basically reanswer a question that was already answered in the issues report.

Greg Aaron: Well let me put it this way. What happened in this working group was that there was an issues report that's put together in a very short time period by staff, so there are time pressures.

And then there was a decisions to go into the PDP, there is a question of whether further fact finding and research was - should happen before that or not.

What happened is we went into a PDP and...

Mike Rodenbaugh: That's what the council decided....

Greg Aaron: That's what the council decided to do, but during the course of a working group like this, what you do is you find out what you're talking about and understand the issue.

And it's very natural perhaps in those cases to find out that the issue is a little different or a little more complicated than originally anticipated and that may naturally bring up questions about what's in scope or out for example.

And so it's natural for folks to raise those in the group as a legitimate question and send it back to council and folks will figure out whether it's in or not.

But I mean this - what we're talking about here is partly about an ICANN process where you learn and things always might not be the way you thought when you - before you started your learning process. Is that fair to say?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes.

Greg Aaron: So it's okay for people to raise the question, this might be a little different than it was originally thought. It's okay to raise the question, is this in scope or out?

It's not denying the charter, but it's saying you know we've got some things we have to figure out here.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well that's what happened in this situation is the charter itself was totally within scope. All we were asking for was information. But it turned out that in trying to answer those questions, there got to be all sorts of extraneous argument that was going on about you know what would happen if we answer it this way or that way.

Where really all that council wanted was the fundamental answers and then we were going to suggest what the next steps were. Unfortunately the working group just got outside of its charter early on I think.

So we ended up bringing it back and we ended up answering all the questions. So you know I really don't think it's appropriate to be stating in here that you know the PDP was premature.

Because that was asked and answered by the council itself when we....

Greg Aaron: Well I mean Chuck said straight out he thought that the PDP was premature.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Who said that?

Greg Aaron: I think Chuck did, didn't he?

Avri Doria: It was - I mean certainly any issue in the council there is a divided opinion, but the PDP was approved by the council by the required votes.

So yeah, you're going to find different people and that's kind of the whole problem we're having with PDPs at the moment in terms of how do we define them so that - I mean so that's the whole GNSO improvement cycle.

Not the whole, but a large part of it is looking at PDPs and looking at the sort of more complex and more you know time issues that how do we really do a PDP these days and such.

So yeah, there were certainly people that thought it was too early, but there was a sufficient number of people who thought it was the right decision and so the decision of the council to start a PDP was the decision.

And you know in a sense with the varying opinions matters less than that. All it says is one could consider and I mean you know I think it's there to say that some at the beginning of this PDP some considered that it was perhaps premature.

That is the truth. It doesn't really matter because the working group was decided but it is part of historical fact.

David Piscitello: Avri? This is Dave. It seems that there's two issues here, one is I think the council's obligation to you know to ask people who expressed a willingness to participate to respect the fact that you know that the council has decided to move forward on a PDP.

And participation means that you accept the fact that the PDP process has been put in motion. And I think that the - at least my perspective is that an initial problem with this working group was that people took the campaign about whether or not the PDP should have been issued into the working group.

And that proved disruptive and so from my perspective, once the PDPs launched and you express a willingness to participate, you're sort of honor bound to you know to do the work.

And I think that that's one of the things that Mike is very sensitive to, I don't want to you know and I'm wondering if that has to be made

clearer at the council level for future, just future working group composition.

Avri Doria: No, I definitely do agree with that point.

Greg Aaron: Yeah, I do too and I didn't know whether it's - should we mention those kinds of things here because it would help the council?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Greg, I guess I've got a suggestion here. Why don't you and I spend a little time on the phone and hash out some text on this?

Greg Aaron: Happy to.

Avri Doria: Yeah, because I mean finding a balanced way, I mean you're giving some of the challenges that happened in the group and the history of that is worth having, especially in this time of trying to understand how is it that we do working groups and how it is that we do PDPs.

So capturing the history in a fair way is a good thing I think.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think Greg and I can do that if we can just spend a little time together.

Avri Doria: Okay.

James Bladel: This is James, I'd volunteer to help if you think I can make a difference there.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Sure.



Avri Doria: And this was, yeah.

Mike Rodenbaugh: All right, and I apologize to Marika especially, unless she's been asking me about this particular section for several weeks now, but you know I'd like to get it so it's acceptable to everybody.

So I don't know if Greg and James and I can take it away and come back to the group and come back with some text within the next week or two, then that would be good.

I think we can finalize it.

Marika Konings: Works for me if it's okay with everyone else.

Avri Doria: Okay and I have a feeling there's probably not going to be all that hard for you guys to do that. Okay, the only other thing we've got is the annex.

And when was that sent out? There was a draft five sent out yesterday which I guess is the current place on it now?

Martin Hall: Yes Avri, this is Martin, that is the current place.

Avri Doria: Okay. So I don't know where we're at on that and what we need to discuss on that.

Martin Hall: Let me kind of summarize the progress that we've made since the last meeting. So first of all I've taken input from a number of people and I'd like to thank Dave in particular for helping me kind of get this thing going and on track.

I've had input from a number of people including Joe and Greg, most of which I've tried to fold into this current draft. I have had to balance some of the input with the amount of time that it takes and some of the (wrestling) but I hope this is in better shape.

At some point clearly if we're okay with it, we'd like to start folding this into the master document, but for now I'd like to see if anybody's got further input or direction they'd like to give me as I kind of wrap this up.

The one note I will make is that I have not heard back from Jose at Arbor, so I was hoping to potentially elaborate one of the graphs based on data we had (commerce) had and include some Arbor comparison.

I don't think it's the end of the world if that's not in there, but I haven't heard from Jose so I don't know where things stand with him.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. How many people have had a chance to work their way through this? Because they'd be the ones most reasonable to comment at this point.

Joe St. Sauver: This is Joe, I have.

Avri Doria: Okay. So where are you at on it?

Joe St. Sauver: I think it's in pretty good shape, the things that are kind of left are little nit picky things that just may not be possible depending upon what the graphic tool does.

For example on the log graphs, I really appreciate putting them in log format, the only thing I would love to see would be to have the legends, have sort of more same values go on the side.

It kind of fix weird random sort of values like 1191 and 203 or 208, whatever. I don't know if you can force that to like 1000, 10,000, that kind of thing.

Martin Hall: Joe, I'm sort of chuckling, I was muted. I'm chuckling because I was ready to throw Excel out of the window and then I thought I'll try numbers, so I tried numbers and I've gained some things and lost others which included control over those values that you're referring to.

Joe St. Sauver: Okay. Well it really has come a tremendous way, you've done a nice job, so.

Avri Doria: Yes, it does look like a formidable piece of work that will be quite useful. Anyone else, and I've only done looking at it, I haven't read it and applied any intelligence to try and understand it.

Have others read and had comments on it?

Greg Aaron: This is Greg, I've read it. A tremendous amount of work went into it so thanks to Martin and to Jose. Thought it looked pretty good, I understand the time constraints you're under, so I don't have...

Avri Doria: Okay great. So I guess...

Mike Rodenbaugh: I had a chance to read it to, and you know to the extent I understand it it's great work. I did hone in on Joe's question about it

though, on the discrepancies in the data and I figured that plenty of other folks would hone in on that as well.

So it might warrant a little bit of an explanation.

Joe St. Sauver: In terms of the numbers of domains detected, that sort of thing?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes.

Man: I think this was the question of how the two entities do their detection, because it leads to different - like one found more in .CN for example than the other.

I guess it has to do with how your systems are set up or what you're looking for.

Martin Hall: Sorry, I was just going to make a couple of observations. One is that we don't always understand where spikes come from until we see them and we look into them. And it's not always clear to us sort of why a spike's occurring.

I imagine the work Arbor do similar to Karmasphere is you know you basically are utilizing various data input sources and those input sources are causing you to sort of trigger sort of examination heuristics to go look at domains and associated identities, especially the IP addresses.

So we don't always have definitive answers on sort of why a spike occurs, that's the first point I would make. And that's true for the China domains for example, we've looked into that.

We're not quite sure yet why that's occurred and if we did know then we'd certainly look to elaborate.

The second thing I will say is I think the heuristics at Arbor utilize and that we use a different - I'm not at liberty yet to really get into detail on those heuristics and talk about it probably for a whole number of reasons.

So I would resist any request to start explaining that within this document.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks.

Man: I mean I have a sympathy for Mike's you know concern. And I think it - would it be sufficient to simply say that the differences, you know relate to the - to exactly what Martin has said that heuristics and the techniques used to track and monitor?

Avri Doria: I mean if I understood what Mike was asking, he was just asking that there be some note there on telling people why it was the way it was and not necessarily, I don't know that it needs to get into detail.

Would that be okay Mike?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah, absolutely, it can be quite vague, just something like you know discrepancies in the number of domains detected by the two sources can generally be explained by their different detection methods.

You know, something like that.

Martin Hall: I'm sorry, Mike I'm happy to make that change. I'd sort of I guess implied that earlier on by talking about different techniques but maybe it needs to be called out closer to where the data is not so similar that it causes people to scratch their heads.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah, exactly.

Avri Doria: Could even be on a footnote or something like that, yeah.

Martin Hall: Yeah, okay, so I'm happy to take that and sort of make that more explicit, closer to where the data, well doesn't necessarily contradict, but is different.

Avri Doria: So how soon do you think this would be ready to hook into that final draft I'm hoping we have soon?

Martin Hall: Well unless there's any input missing here, it sounds like there's only one minor change that I would make.

Avri Doria: Okay great.

Martin Hall: Then I'm assuming what I would do is send this that I've been working on in Word format based on the template of the master document to Marika to incorporate.

Avri Doria: Is that okay with you Marika?

Marika Konings: Yep, that works for me.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Martin Hall: So let me turn this around quickly Marika and I'll get it to you.

Marika Konings: Perfect.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you.

Marika Konings: And I can work as well on executive summary.

Avri Doria: Okay, executive summary, and then you're getting a revised section six within I guess another week or two so that hopefully we can have a meeting coming up beginning of January where hopefully we have a assembled final draft that we can then just - well I guess people will need at least a week to read a final draft before we meet to discuss it and make sure that there's nothing in there that anyone is violently against.

So that then we can take the next steps.

Man: I had one very small, I think its' very small, question. On line 1197, which is on page 41.

Avri Doria: Okay, let's go to - 1197 you said?

David Piscitello: Yeah. One of the things that this sort of I think Martin's annex provides in my mind, you know sufficient and compelling data that's saying that we have a lack of data overtaken by events.

You know I'm willing to concede that maybe we still have a lack of you know uniform understanding, but I honestly think that you know it would be very hard for us to provide that much more data that would illustrate you know the scale and scope of the problem beyond what Martin has done.

And I think that we would simply have you know multiple views of relatively the same you know same kinds of data.

And we would still see you know approximately the same spikes and the same trends because these are being collected by a lot of different organizations beyond Arbor and beyond Martin's group.

And you know we're all seeing the member first you know spikes drops as a you know as a consequence of suspending (macolos.com) and things like that.

So I hope that you know we have enough data to not be questioning our own results at this point.

Avri Doria: Yeah, well I think that's the section that a few people are going to work together on that section, because that's in that section six. So I guess it's good that you pointed out that line and perhaps they can look at that and come in with something that sort of expresses what you just said if others agree with it.

Does that make sense that you guys that are working on rewriting this? Or rewordsmithing it I should say, Mike and all?

Mike Rodenbaugh: I'm sorry Avri, I was just distracted by my child.



Avri Doria: Okay, the point that was just being made, it was Dave right? Basically is one of that line, the lack of data and lack of understanding of the full scope of Fast Flux also made discussions difficult.

Is basically is the in the few pages that you guys are going to be wordsmithing.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes.

Avri Doria: And so basically sort of to mitigate that and say well it's - you know perhaps it's not common understanding but there is data and it is being worked on.

And it's almost like it's a work in motion and things are moving from that point. So was looking for you to sort of consider something in the writing of that sentence.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Got it.

Avri Doria: Okay. Anything else at this point? So when do we think it's reasonable for a - and this is really Marika and others contributing pieces, to try and have a assembled draft for review by this group together with people taking adequate time off for holidays and things like that?

Mike Rodenbaugh: So when would our next meeting be, the 9th?

Avri Doria: I suppose that would be yes, that would be the Friday after. And if we're going to have anything to talk about though, people have to have had time to read.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Right. Well I mean based on - Greg, you're still on the call, I think from what James emailed just now to me and you, sounds like we could do our part of this early next week if you're available Greg.

Greg Aaron: I'm available on Monday only, then I'm on vacation.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Perfect. So I think we could do it on Monday and get it at least you know then we can swap drafts ourselves and get it to the group I'm sure by January 5th anyway, yeah?

Avri Doria: But that's just your section, correct?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Correct. Well there's just our section and then the change to the data annex, right?

Avri Doria: Right. Well I'm hoping as I said though if you're going to be sending that out and then we're going to go through it, it won't actually be included in sort of a final draft for review in that week.

It wouldn't be reviewed then until the following week.

Mike Rodenbaugh: How about why don't we do this? Why don't we say that everyone who wants text has to have it in, changes, just call a deadline. Suggested changes have to be in by the 12th and we'll go through them on the 16th and finalize this thing.

Avri Doria: I don't know if that gives Marika enough time to assemble and people to read.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay then...

Marika Konings: From my point of view it would give enough time to assemble, the people get - you know if we made the deadline maybe then the 9th to get (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Deadline the 9th, right.

Marika Konings: And I can get you know depending on how many edits there are I should be able to get it out either the 9th or otherwise the 12th.

Avri Doria: The 12th and then if we meet the 16th then people have had four days to read.

Marika Konings: Is that enough?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Seems like we're not going to have that many changes you know. We're pretty much down to just clarifying changes other than the section six.

Avri Doria: Right, right, yeah. But then still I think people are going to want to do a read through and also Marika is talking about creating the executive summary.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah.

Marika Konings: And one thing I would like to ask as well, I think Martin made that point as well is that you know now we have the data it might be worth as well like when reading through the document if people want to point to you

know different sections or chapters or annexes that clarify some of the points, that would be really helpful I think as well.

Just wanted to point as well that people might want to think about when reading through the documents.

Avri Doria: Yep, sounds good. So that means we don't have a meeting on the 9th correct? And we plan the next meeting for the 16th? But that everybody's working on the interim on getting bits and pieces done?

And Marika I can work with you if you want or if you need someone on the executive summary to just pass things back and forth, no need, but if you want to I can help.

Marika Konings: I can make a first draft and then you can have a look to make sure I didn't leave anything out. And then as well I'm happy as well to circulate that first - on the mailing list so you know people can make comments like that as well (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: That's a good idea.

Marika Konings: So I should be able to do it you know the week of the 5th without any problems.

Avri Doria: Okay, fantastic.

Martin Hall: So we won't have a meeting on the 9th but we will have an almost final document to review by the 9th?

Avri Doria: Well almost final but actually it could - it will all come together on the 12th.

Marika Konings: At the latest on the 12th, it depends a bit on how late people are with submitting their final changes and how many changes there are.

Avri Doria: The deadline for submitting any changes is the 9th. And then they'll have staff going - ongoing on the list during that week, people will have sent in their stuff so it can be discussed.

But the deadline for submitting changes for the final hopefully, I know I keep saying final and the first final and then there's the final final. But anyway, the final draft is the 9th.

Martin Hall: Okay, I get it, thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay. Anything else for today? Okay well again apologies for being late, thank you all and have a really good holiday and get some rest and whatever else, some cheer.

And talk to you all next year.

Marika Konings: Thank you, you too.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Bye bye.

END