

## **Fast Flux PDP WG Teleconference**

### **TRANSCRIPTION**

**Wednesday 17 September 2008 15:00 UTC**

**Note:** The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Fast Flux PDP WG teleconference on Wednesday 17 September 2008, at 15:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:  
<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ff-pdp-wg-20080917.mp3>  
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#sep>

Present for the teleconference:

CBUC

Mike O'Connor - WG Chair CBUC

Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC - Council liaison George Kirikos - CBUC

NCUC

Christian Curtis - NCUC

Registry Constituency

Greg Aaron - Afilias

Rodney Joffe - NeuStar

Registrar constituency

Paul Diaz - Networksolutions

James Bladel - Godaddy

Kal Feher - MelbourneIT

Observers - (no constituency affiliation)

Joe St. Sauver

Dave Piscitello - SSAC Fellow

Marc Perkel

Wendy Seltzer - ALAC Liaison Board

Staff:

Liz Gasster

Marika Konings

Glen de Saint Gery

Absent - apologies:

Zbynek Loebel - IPC

Rod Rasmussen - Internet Identity APWG  
Eric Brunner-Williams

Woman: Okay.

Coordinator: And just to let all parties know, this call is now being recorded. Thank you.

Mike O'Connor: Thanks very much. Glen, why don't you call the roll?

Glen DeSaintgery: I will do that. We have on the call Mike O'Connor who is the leader of the group, (Marc Perkel), (Joe St. Sauver), James Bladel Kal Feher, George Kirikos, Paul Diaz, Greg Aaron, Wendy Seltzer, Dave Piscitello, and Mike Rodenbaugh.

And for staff we have Liz Gasster, Marika Konings and myself.

Mike O'Connor: Thanks a lot Glen.

Glen DeSaintgery: And we have apologies from Rod Rasmussen who unfortunately cannot be on the call.

Mike O'Connor: Thanks. We have a somewhat compressed timetable for a pretty important call because today is the day of the Anti-Phishing Working Group's Board and a number of you need to drop off the call at the top of the hour. So we are going to push along pretty hard.

The agenda is up there and essentially what I really want to do is focus us on the review of (Marika)'s second draft of the document. I have put

the link to the draft out on the Adobe Connect chat area for those of you who are on Adobe.

And here is what I would like to do today. I would really like to focus on sort of the hard parts of that document, unquote, and see if we can get through that.

I think what we will try to do is vote in Adobe if you are on Adobe. And then those who are not on Adobe, Glen will call the roll for those folks.

Today I think what we want to do is just (bip) through these as fast as we can and I am sort of getting a little distracted because I got myself out of place. I am trying to find the spot that I wanted to start.

I think what I want to do is start on page 3 of (Marika)'s document. (Marika)'s items 7, 8 - I am going to try and clump some of these.

Man: Talking about her September (unintelligible) document?

Mike O'Connor: Yes. Though this - these are the ones that Dave Piscitello injected at starting at line 58. And what I would like to do is just go through the 4, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 in a group if that is all right.

And maybe let Dave sort of - what I would like to do is spend as short of time as possible on the rationale just because we have so many of these to get through and they are so important.

And then very, you know, as rapidly as we can go through a series of polls to see where our consensus is at on these. And then to the extent that we cannot get through them today, I would like to lobby that we

take this polling to that offline polling, or the asynchronous polling thing that I sent out to the group called Survey Monkey for the rest so that we can kind of keep this polling going.

But I wanted to try to do as much as we could today on the call. Is that all right with folks? This is the time to voice complaints if that is not a good approach.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: I am (unintelligible)...

Man: Okay.

Woman: ...having trouble pulling together all the pieces of documentation...

Man: Yes...

Woman: ...in a readable format.

Mike O'Connor: ...I apologize for that. Do you want us - do - are others having trouble? Should we wait a minute while we kind of collect our respective wits?

Man: We have to download that CDF again.

Mike O'Connor: Yes. And, you know, I am on a very fast connection so it just came right down. So, I tell you what. Let us use the little - we will practice our skills at using the Adobe stuff and when you have got yourself together, just tick off that you have - your agreement button, the little

check mark that is down at - and when I see that we are all in good shape, we will carry on.

And I am on page 3 and the URL is in the chat area. And for those of you who are not on Adobe Connect, it is also posted out on our main Wiki page. Liz go ahead.

Liz Gasster: Oh I pushed my button by mistake.

Mike O'Connor: Aha.

Liz Gasster: I thank you.

Dave Piscitello: Are we connected? This is Dave.

Mike O'Connor: Hi Dave. Yes, we are connected, yes.

Dave Piscitello: Greg Aaron says he cannot do anything. Greg, can you hear now?

Greg Aaron: I can hear you now.

Dave Piscitello: Oh okay. I guess it was just a pregnant pause.

Mike O'Connor: Yes, there was a quite pregnant pause. We are pulling up documents. So when you feel like you have got drafts that we are working on in front of you, tick off your checkmark on there just to let us know you have got the documents in front of you and are ready to carry on. And we got real quiet while everybody was doing that.

Dave Piscitello: Can I ask a quick question?

Mike O'Connor: Sure, go ahead.

Dave Piscitello: Are you - when you said you were on page 3, are you referring to the proposal blitz?

Mike O'Connor: Yes.

Dave Piscitello: Okay, thank you.

Mike O'Connor: I am on proposal number 7 which is one of your inserts on page 3 of the September 16 proposal blitz.

I know it is uncharacteristic of me not to talk. Maybe that is what the problem is. You all are just so used to hearing all this Irish blather.

Greg and Mark and Wendy, how are we doing? Are you running into troubles? Can we help you?

Oh, you are printing them Wendy. Oh, this is going to take you some time. These are pretty long.

Man: The alternative is to have a 32" monitor.

Mike O'Connor: Yes, yes, yes, yes.

Man: I opened one of t-mail attachments and they work perfectly.

Mike O'Connor: I have monitor envy.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: It is the only time I print the dumb kids to review them better.

Woman: Well and then there is the I - the quality of the eyes and age starts to have an impact.

Mike O'Connor: It does.

Okay, it looks like we are set. Wendy, what do you want to do? Do you want to - I am happy to wait if you are close. If you think you are a ways away, I may drag us on ahead. What do you think?

Wendy?

Wendy Seltzer: Sorry. I am not going to be able to stay for much longer, so do not wait for me.

Mike O'Connor: Okay. This is starting to convince me that maybe the asynchronous approach is going to work better anyway because it is going to give people a more flexible way to review the documents. But let us see how this works over the phone and see how far we get.

Dave, why don't you give us, if you can, just a 30 second to one minute summary of 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11.

Dave Piscitello: Great. What I started to do in this section, starting with seven and eight is reword the text that existed to more clearly separate the characteristics that I had originally intended to apply to harmful uses of Fast Flux Network as opposed to those that I labeled self beneficial.

The idea of using what I hoped was less charged terms like self beneficial but publicly detrimental was to get us away from some of the language that trapped us so much in the, yes, early on in the process.

Yes, I am hoping that what I have done is, yes, is represented both facets that we, yes, we wanted to illustrate in describing, yes, Fast Flux Network.

So I think it reflects some of the stuff that George and Wendy and (Christian) had, yes, had expressed, and the things that (Joe) and I and Greg and (lob heads) had expressed.

That was really the goal of the changes in this section.

Mike O'Connor: Okay. I think what I want to do - if, in cases where there are counter proposals, which there are not here, we will have the person whose attached to the counter proposal speak as well.

But on these, what I would like to do is everybody clear your status so that we have nothing but blanks and then once we are all blank, I would like folks to either give it the checkmark, the agree or disagree, the check or the X. See where our level of consensus is on these - I am going to try and do these in clumps like this just so we can get through them all.

So go ahead and agree or disagree that we should insert this into the document.

(Christian): Can I ask a question real quick?



Mike O'Connor: Sure go ahead. This is our first try so I think we need to work on these questions too. Go ahead.

(Christian): Are we talking about all of those changes you just referenced?

Mike O'Connor: Yes, I am going to try and do them in clumps. If it turns out that we need to split them apart, that is fine. But I am hoping that we can take them in groups like that.

(Christian): The drafts I am looking at, seven (sill) inserts Fast Flux Attack Network which I understood to mean that that reference was intended not to be neutral. Is that still part of the proposal?

Mike O'Connor: Ah, Dave would you take that as a friendly amendment to take attack out of that?

Dave Piscitello: I am sorry, I cannot hear - hold on just a sec. Could you repeat the question?

Mike O'Connor: In your number 7, you have added the word attack in the phrase - a Fast Flux Attack Network. (Christian) is raising the point that is not exactly neutral. Would you take the notion of removing attack from that as a friendly amendment to your number 7?

Dave Piscitello: Well...

Mike O'Connor: ...as say a Fast Flux Network?

Dave Piscitello: ...have you read the whole - (Christian) have you been able to see the entirety of the replacement text?

(Christian): I mean I have not looked at it all together, but my understanding was that it did not quite sit with the other statements you were making.

Dave Piscitello: Well, so if you can take a look at the entirety, and unfortunately the way that it is represented here it is sort of challenging. What I have done is I have said here are the things that are characteristics Fast Flux Attack Network, then here are the characteristics of Fast Flux Networks that are used for self beneficial purposes.

So I tried to use Attack Network to be able to include the one very obvious, you know, case where you are using compromised computers without authorization and consent, yes, as one of the characteristics of an attack network.

And then there are a whole bunch of, you know, characteristics that are common or could be common to networks that are used in a self beneficial way but harmful to others, or in a, you know, self beneficial way that is beneficial to others.

And that is the way I wrote this section. So, I mean, the attack - we wanted to try to, you know, identify two cases here I believe. And it probably would be easier for you to understand what I have done if you were able to see the entirety of the section here.

Mike O'Connor: Okay, good clarification. Let us keep on with the voting. I would like to see something beside everybody's name except mine. I am trying (unintelligible)...

Liz Gasster: And mine, Mike it is Liz. I am not going to vote...

Mike O'Connor: Oh yes.

Liz Gasster: ...as staff. And Marika Konings (unintelligible).

Marika Konings: Mine either.

Liz Gasster: Yes.

Mike O'Connor: Yes. Yes, I think Chair and Staff should sit out. And we have lost Wendy, (damn).

Liz Gasster: It is not lack of interest.

Mike O'Connor: No, no.

Man: I am sure you really need to sit out as the Chair, Mike, you are (unintelligible).

Mike O'Connor: Well I thought if it came down to a tie I would jump in, but...

(Rodney): I just have to apologize, I just joined the call and missed what is being voted on so.

Mike O'Connor: Oh, welcome. Who is this?

(Rodney): It is (Rodney). I am sorry.

Mike O'Connor: Oh hi (Rodney). We are on the two documents that we are really working on are - the primary document is the one that is in the middle of the chat called the proposals document. And that long link that is in the middle of the chat.

And we are on page 3, 4 and 5 looking at sections 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 in a group, essentially clarifying the definition of Fast Flux that we had already put into the report.

And then what we are doing is using the little Change My Status thing in the lower left part of the screen either picking the checkmark which is agree or the red X which is disagree. But this - and what we are trying to do is just poll to see the level of consensus around this change.

(Rodney): Okay, so I am just trying to bring it up over here so I apologize. Do not wait for me obviously on this one, but...

Mike O'Connor: Right.

(Rodney): ...I am bringing it up so (unintelligible).

Mike O'Connor: This one looks like we have pretty strong consensus so I am going to declare this one. What are our three terms? We had, I should have written those down. This is the thumbs up one, whatever it is I think. Everybody seems to agree that this is...

Mike Rodenbaugh: We have agreement, support and alternative.

Mike O'Connor: Thanks Mike. So this I would say is agreement.

(Christian): Could I just make one more suggestion here?

Mike O'Connor: Sure.

(Christian): If we are talking just about the characteristics of different networks, could we change the language about definition because I misunderstood the nature of these changes on the whole.

And the way it is presented in the initial document, it sounds like this was a tentative definition, whereas I think it might be better to refer to it as characteristics that we are simply trying to find some characteristics that we associate with these different activities.

Mike O'Connor: I would take that as a friendly amendment.

Dave Piscitello: Oh I think that is fine. Yes, and I just want to tighten it up so that we have both perspectives represented (Christian).

(Christian): Okay.

Dave Piscitello: So, there is no, you know, I think that that is a gray thing because I think when you have definitions people tend to run around with, you know, using them as a hammer.

But, you know, we have all learned that there are just so many different characteristics here, you know, that - and more to come so I think that that is a great idea.

Mike O'Connor: Cool. All right, I am going to push us along because we have miles to cover.

The next one - I am going to skip some of the smaller ones because we have some giant ones that we need to address. So the next...

(Marika): Mike can I just - this is (Marika), can I just clarify so that 7, 8 and 9 are a yes and there is no agreement (moderate). This is agreed by all and will be inserted?

Mike O'Connor: Yes, 7...

(Marika): Okay.

Mike O'Connor: ...through 11...

(Marika): Okay.

Mike O'Connor: ...are a yes.

Dave Piscitello: And we are going to call these characteristics, not definitions.

Mike O'Connor: Right. And we took that characteristics change as a friendly amendment (Marika). So if - when you go through, the section will have to get rewritten.

(Marika): Okay, in the original documents you mean where we mention - because here I see it is already saying characteristics and not definition.

Mike O'Connor: Yes. Wherever it says definition, we want to switch towards characteristics.

(Marika): Okay. It has been noted.

Mike O'Connor: For those of you who were not on the call earlier, (Marika) is much on mute today because she has two kids with her and I was sort of lobbying for leaving it unmuted so that we could sort of join in, but she was not going for that.

I want to go to - there is a whole series - trying to find the question 5.1 start.

Wendy Seltzer: And I am sorry, I have got to drop off but I will try to pick up the discussion online later. Thanks.

Mike O'Connor: Thanks Wendy.

I am looking at number - oh there is 15.1.

Dave has a minor change. I think the next one that I would like to take a look at is number 16. It is on page 8 of the changes document. And it is (Joe)'s comments about the Manheim score. And (Joe) if we could hear from you for just again a very short period of time, sort of fill in the...

(Unintelligible) in a nutshell, remember that folks were interested in having something that we would provide sort of a definitive assessment or scoring tool for whether or not a domain looks like it is a Fast Flux one or not.

The Manheim formula seems to go ahead and do that and do it quite well. And there is also, I think, a need to go ahead and talk about the data sources that we have received as a group and what has been done with them to date and if they are accessible or not.

And those are the two items I attempted to deal with here.

Mike O'Connor: Terrific. Thanks (Joe). I think we are probably going to have to split this one in two. The data one I think we are just suffering from friction. We still have not got those sections done.

I know that Dave and Rod especially have been working on stuff, but the stuff has not come in yet. So I think let us leave that off. Let us have a quick - clear everybody's status and then indicate agreement or not as to the first part - the Manheim score.

Man: No I am just afraid it sounds like a minority opinion. Would consensus at this point insert it as a minority opinion or would it present it - would it remove the some members' language?

Mike O'Connor: Well that is a good question. I think it depends on - let us presume that the some members is gone and see if there is consensus around using this as the formula. And then if there isn't consensus, we will insert it as a minority. How about that?

Dave, you have got your hand up. What?

Dave Piscitello: Well I am just botching the...



Mike O'Connor: Okay. That is the talk button. That is the one next to the raise hand button. So if you toggle it again, that will probably go away.

Okay. I mean you are raising your hand again.

Dave Piscitello: That is all right.

Mike O'Connor: Okay.

Dave Piscitello: I am not talking.

Mike O'Connor: Fair enough.

Waiting on James and Paul.

All right. It looks like we can insert that as just part of the report rather than a minority opinion.

So (Marika) the notes on this would be to remove the clause at the front that says some members and just start it with the working group believes that the Manheim disk or blah, blah, blah, blah, blah.

And then, let us...

George Kirikos: (Unintelligible) saying the minority that, because I guess (Curtis) and I - (Christian Curtis) and I disagree that...

Mike O'Connor: Oh, I am sorry. I missed that. Yes, do you want to put a minority in there?

George Kirikos: Yes. I am - let me explain the reasoning. I am still concerned about the false positives. I am also concerned about any mechanical rule that does not have the human element, you know, overseeing it.

The third concern I have is once you publish a formula that is an invitation for attackers or malevolent people to castigate that formula, just like if you publish a formula for spam or viruses, people will test their spam or viruses against that formula to make sure that it passes and then send it out.

People do that all the time if you look at all the anti-virus software. You know, the bad guys buy it too and...

Mike O'Connor: Right.

George Kirikos: ...and make sure that their signatures do not match. So I am concerned that people will adapt to that formula. But if, you know, we have longer discussions that show that you cannot gain that formula, that Manheim formula, then I might be able to be turned to the other side, but I would still want the human review.

Mike O'Connor: Great I get that. And we have - I am seeing Paul and Greg and James - are you guys changing your status? Are you changing your mind?

Man: No I was just clearing it so that I...

Mike O'Connor: Oh okay.

Man: Same thing, just clearing it.

Mike O'Connor: (Marika), I think you are going to have to listen to the MP3. I subscribe to George's point of view and I think he raises a good minority opinion.

(Marika): This is (Marika). Could I maybe just change into the majority of the working group?

Mike O'Connor: You can certainly do that for the text that is in your document...

(Marika): Yes.

Mike O'Connor: ...but then I think you will also have to go and summarize George's points for a minority position.

(Marika): Okay, or George if you want to put it in a few lines so I am sure I convey the exact message it would be great.

George Kirikos: Sure I will do that.

(Marika): Thanks.

Mike O'Connor: (Christian) does that encompass your point of view as well?

(Christian): Yes, my concerns were more his first two rather than that last one, but I think that what his (traffic) will likely - if you can explain my concerns as well.

Mike O'Connor: Terrific. Okay.

Man: Mike can I ask a question to (Christian) real quickly?

Mike O'Connor: Sure go ahead.

Man: One of the things that has troubled me in the way that we have talked about false positives is that we imply that, you know, there can be no false positives. And I think it would help if what we, you know, discuss or agree to is that in all, you know, studies and analyses, you know, medical scientific data, there is nothing that results in a zero, you know, false positive.

And there - usually we talk about false positives in the sense that an acceptable rate of false positives. Is that something that we can try to introduce in the text here to make people understand that we are going for?

(Christian): You know, we actually have another item that I think we have skipped over that deals specifically with this issue. Do we just want to go back and address that now?

Mike O'Connor: Sure, where is it? Do you remember?

(Christian): One of the earlier ones.

Mike O'Connor: Okay, somebody gets a gold star for finding it first.

George Kirikos: I think that the false positive rate, I think (unintelligible) mentioned to the list several weeks ago is going to be affected by the proportion of use of the technique in general. This goes back to (basien) statistics.

Mike O'Connor: Yes.

George Kirikos: So you may not see the false positive rate high right now, but that could change in the future as more people...

Man: Oh it is actually my comment.

George Kirikos: Oh okay.

Mike O'Connor: Yes, it is on page 7, 15.1.

Man: Right.

Mike O'Connor: (Survival) techniques to detect Fast Flux Networks while maintaining an acceptable rate of false positives.

(Christian): So on this issue, my concern is actually more not so much that it may be impossible for there to be an acceptable rate of false positives, but that it is inappropriate for ICANN or for the Registrars to decide what such a rate is.

So it - in terms of there being a rate of false - an acceptable rate of false positives, the policy concerns that I have turn very much more on how that gets set and what the process is that we use to deal with Fast Flux.

So for example, if, you know, a private security company designs software that will advise users not to use certain Web sites or follow certain links or, you know, block that access, then, you know, if they do not have some sort of choke hold on the - or actually what was the term we used before?

The DNS community being a choke point, you know, if there is not some sort of submission of power like that, then I am far less concerned than if ICANN is making a decision like that.

Mike O'Connor: Dave in terms of the placing of your point, can you give us a quick interpretation as to how that would - how (Christian)'s concern would be addressed?

Dave Piscitello: Honestly, no because I do not know how these would all materialize.

My point was simply to make certain that when we were trying to characterize, you know, Fast Flux, or solutions to mitigate it, that, you know, that if we had agreed to go forward on some, you know, some sort of automated technique similar to what (Joe) has introduced, one of the criteria for approving that technique would be - it demonstrates an acceptable rate of, you know, of false positives, just as you would see in like an intrusion detection system or anti-virus software on a desktop.

You know, and I guess I thought that that was kind of accepted practice in the security industry and maybe I am, you know, I am - it is not in a (broderance) community.

I do not really have a preconception of how ICANN or the DNS community at large would adopt some of these mitigation techniques. And I thought we were presenting them in the spirit of trying to broaden the understanding, not choosing one.

Mike O'Connor: I think that is probably safe to say in this section of the report. I think if we were - I think (Christian) that our - the issue that you raised might

be of much greater concern if we were in the described proposed solutions part of the report.

(Christian): Could, you know, to some degree maybe it is best just to address it by a statement in that section or a personal statement that references that - I just get nervous when there is any talk that assumes unacceptable rates of false positives, because I worry that there is something - because what we are discussing is ICANN action, I do worry that that inherently assumes that it is appropriate for ICANN to take action that would make such a determination. Yes...

Mike O'Connor: Oh you mean decide what is acceptable?

Dave Piscitello: Yes.

(Christian): Right.

Mike O'Connor: Ah, okay. Yes, I mean that would be a valuable clarification and I would support, you know, (Christian) and - I mean why don't you write up a statement and post it because as I said, you know, I am sort of agnostic about, you know, where the definition of acceptable is.

And frankly I think different communities might have different interpretations of that just like we have encountered with legal versus illegal and, you know, harmful versus beneficial.

So, I think that is context. And I think it is valuable to raise that point.

George Kirikos: One other point of data, our concern is the false negative rate. Is there any data about how many malicious Fast Flux networks exist that are not caught Manheim formula?

Man: I do not think anybody has gone ahead and done a study of that. It is kind of one of those questions of how do you know what you do not know, I think, so that is going to be kind of tough.

Mike O'Connor: Well unless you use different, oh gad, I mean now we are into survey design. I am going to stop talking. Sorry. George, you want to carry on?

George Kirikos: Oh no. Well, it is (side) if you, you know, you say that, you know, you built up a data set saying, you know, this is cancer. The thing you come up well then you can so that does not fit that definition, then you are going to have to go back and revisit what the Manheim Flux score formula is.

And if that is going to keep being changed, then, you know, it is going to be a moving target as to what the formula is.

Man: Yes.

Mike O'Connor: Okay. I am going to try - so I am on 15.1, bottom of page 7, clear all your little gismos. With (Christian)'s friendly amendment that (Christian) just walked away with an action item to write clarifying the issue of false positives, how say ye about 15.1 bottom of page 7 and use your little (tick) boxes again.

Man: (Unintelligible).



George Kirikos: What are we voting on again?

Mike O'Connor: Fifteen point one, the...

George Kirikos: What is the change?

Mike O'Connor: It is changing, roll down to the - oh where is my (unintelligible). In the original text it said while avoiding false positive. In this text it says while maintaining an acceptable rate of false positives.

George Kirikos: Okay.

Mike O'Connor: I think it is a clarification. I wrote the original and would view this as a friendly amendment. That is part of the reason that I skipped it. But then I think (Christian)'s point is well added.

(Rodney) is - is (Rodney) still on the call? Did he...

(Rodney): I am. I am still struggling with documents. It is like, you know, I picked up on the last one just based on what was being said, but I cannot find the damn document. (Unintelligible).

Mike O'Connor: Oh they are on the working group site.

(Rodney): But every time I go to the working group site, I get the general working group site and I cannot get at the docu- I cannot see the document.

Mike O'Connor: It is directly below the heading Working Group Deliverables and then Initial Report and then Proposed Additions and Changes. It is the one right above...

(Rodney): And it is the version 2 right?

Mike O'Connor: Yes.

(Rodney): Okay, so, okay so I have that document open.

Mike O'Connor: Yes, that is the one that we are working off of.

(Rodney): Okay, so we are now on page 7 correct?

Mike O'Connor: Yes.

(Rodney): Okay, now I am with you. I was looking at the right thing. I just - I did not realize it was the right thing.

Mike O'Connor: Uh-huh. I am learning a lot about how to run these kind of meetings, believe me. I apologize for not getting that to you.

Okay. We have got pretty good consensus. George, do you want to rattle off a minority opinion on this one?

George Kirikos: No, just the same as before so, I will work on something on the mailing list.

Mike O'Connor: Terrific, thanks. All right. I think we are going to call that one support.

Now I am going to go back to - now I am on 17 and 18. Basically 17 is the stub that I asked (Marika) to put in that is basically the no we could not answer this question answer.

And 18 is Dave's write up of the answer who is - to the question who is harmed. And do Dave, why don't you give us, again, just a minute. We have seen this one before, but just give us a one minute summary of what this one is about.

Dave Piscitello: Well actually this is rewritten from the one that I spoke to earlier to try to align with the prior definitions and to be more consistent with the earliest division I need and with what I had observed was being submitted in the document.

But what I have attempted to do here is enumerate the various end parties that would be, you know, publicly harmed or individually harmed, and I tried to identify the harm.

When a Fast Flux Attack Network, you know, is involved. So again, I am trying to tease out that whole notion that there are people who are attacking and it is an aggressive act versus there are people who are doing something that is both self and publicly beneficial.

Mike O'Connor: All right (Terry), thanks. Since I am the one on the list for the stub, I will just reiterate the stub position which is essentially, I do not know if I even need to reiterate. You can read it. It is at the very bottom of page 9. It is number 17. And this will repeat over and over again.

This is essentially the view that says we really need more research understanding statistics, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera before we pronounce on this stuff.

And I am not necessarily espousing that position, I am essentially capturing a sense of the group.

So those are the two positions. Let us vote Dave's as the one we are voting on. Use your check buttons to agree or disagree with Dave's, and we reach support for that then that will render number 17 mute.

If we do not reach support for it, we will figure out what we are doing from there. So go ahead and vote on Dave's.

Looking pretty good. James are you...

James LaDell: Reading.

Mike O'Connor: Reading, okay. I will not pressure you much, just a little. (Mark) still with us?

Okay, it looks like we have support for Dave's. So number 17 will be removed. Number 18 will be supported.

Somebody wanted to ask a question? I heard a...

Mike Rodenbaugh: So you mean - I am sorry Mike it is Mike Rodenbaugh. There is agreement on these.

Mike O'Connor: Yes, there is agreement on number 18, which is all of those, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, whatever it is, 6, 7, 8, 9, you know.

Dave Piscitello: That is including (Christian)'s addition, right?

Mike O'Connor: Yes.

Dave Piscitello: Okay.

Mike O'Connor: I am assuming by friendly addition that you agreed with it Dave right?

Dave Piscitello: Yes, I, no, I - I think it is a great clarification.

Mike O'Connor: Yes, okay. No that is the way I interpreted it. I just wanted to make sure that was right.

Okay, now onto (Joe)'s number, let us see what number is it? Starting on the bottom of page 12, (Joe) is inserting some who is harmed.

Joe St. Sauver: I can give a brief summary if you like.

Mike O'Connor: That would be lovely. Thank you sir, go ahead.

Joe St. Sauver: Well essentially the issue is, is that while they have captured a lot of the harms that might be inflicted on individual users, there is really a whole bunch of additional ones that he did not capture.

And I think some of them are bad enough or material enough that I think it would be a real mistake not to include them. That is what I have

attempted to do there is go ahead and provide a list of some of the additional ways individual users can be damaged.

Mike O'Connor: Okay, great summary. I think we will clear our little gismos and see if we are in agreement on (Joe)'s - the meat of it is on page 13 and a little bit on 14. So if you disagree use your X and if you agree use your checkmark.

Man: At this point, assuming that we are putting in the preceding section?

Mike O'Connor: Yes.

Man: Okay.

Mike O'Connor: Is there anybody on the call that is not on Adobe Connect that we should be tallying your vote? I forgot all about that. Okay. Good.

I think we have a - oh Paul, no. Now I think we have agreement on that so that is support. So that can go into the re - now I want you to use your little tick marks and tell me who has to leave the call at the top of the hour.

So if you have to leave the call, give me a checkmark. Greg, go ahead.  
Oh.

Greg Aaron: Oh, no just saying I have to leave, sorry.

Mike O'Connor: Yes, it is a false positive on a checkmark I guess.

So we are losing a lot of folks at the top of the hour. Okay. That is what I needed. Thanks (unintelligible).

George Kirikos: We have seven minutes though, I think we can race through another one.

Mike O'Connor: Yes, we can get through a few more of these I think. I am now on page 14, another one from (Joe). (Joe) why don't you give a quick summary of this one.

Joe St. Sauver: So again that one just kind of expands on some of the harms that a business would go ahead and face potentially from Fast Flux. Not meant to be critical of Dave's thing, just kind of providing a little additional discussion in the way of evidence or examples.

Mike O'Connor: Okey dokey. People give that one a read and your voting capability. Tell us how you feel.

Man: And that is the American or the English way of spelling (specter).

Joe St. Sauver: It is probably the (Joe) bad spelling way. I hope we are going to have a spelling check apply to the whole thing because otherwise I am doomed.

Mike O'Connor: Dreaded specter, I kind of like that. (Unintelligible).

Joe St. Sauver: I am also fine on editorial adjustments of minor language of that sort (unintelligible).

Mike O'Connor: Cool. Now (Marika) you may, why don't you take this as a license to sort of sharpen up the language without changing the meaning?

(Marika): Okay.

Mike O'Connor: (Christian)? Michael? Reading?

Man: Are we just going for B1?

Mike O'Connor: This is B2.

Man: B2.

Mike O'Connor: Yes.

Man: I mean, just, but just B2, okay.

Mike O'Connor: (Christian) why don't you give us your concerns.

(Christian): Well I am just worried that we are getting a little bit on the whole long-winded and speculative here. But the breach of personal information - or personally identifiable information seems to fit, but when we start to get things like possible new legislation, I mean, yes, technically that is correct but I mean it seems a little bit speculative and, you know, we are already formulating a rather lengthy answer here.

Mike O'Connor: (Joe) would you take that as a friendly amendment to lose the second to the last paragraph?

Joe St. Sauver: The one that is the GLB or HIPAA-related one?



Mike O'Connor: Yes.

Joe St. Sauver: I can live with that.

Mike O'Connor: That work for you (Christian)?

(Christian): Yes. I do not particularly want to hold this up if everyone else seems to think it is necessary, but...

Mike O'Connor: Oh no, you know, this is part of what this (unintelligible) and tool is about. I think we get improvements when we have these conversations, so.

Joe St. Sauver: I should also mention really it is not talking about speculative legislation there but rather legislation that has already been passed. So maybe a suitable solution would be to change that from additional legislation to additional specific laws. Would that work for you (Christian)?

(Christian): Actually, I do not know that that - I think I would want to tweak the language a little bit more there, but I do not have something immediately jumping to mind.

Mike O'Connor: What if we...

(Christian): It does kind of sound to me like it is talking about new legislation which is what immediately came to mind.

Joe St. Sauver: How about we just change it to additional laws may also apply to specific disciplines?

(Christian): I would actually drop the word additional and just say specific.

Joe St. Sauver: That would be fine by me.

Mike O'Connor: Given that change, are you comfortable then (Christian)?

(Christian): Yes.

Mike O'Connor: All right. I think then we have support for that one. Let us see, Rodenbaugh, have you got anything that you are agitating about on that? Ah.

George Kirikos: I think this Fast Flux is like a kind of an enabling technique to do all kinds of criminal activities so it is kind of hard to just narrow it down, you know...

Mike O'Connor: Right.

George Kirikos: ...all these things. I think actually these things are just color that are not really going to be that important.

Mike O'Connor: Okay.

(Christian): You know, actually, I am sorry that I did not have it ready to be circulated by this conference call, but I did address that in a statement that I was drafting. If we want to add that as some sort of alternate opinion on these topics, we can address that in the future.

Mike O'Connor: Yes. Let us - we have got a couple of essentially individual statements that either did not make the deadline or do not fit well. And the approach that (Marika) suggested this morning which I just tranced with is that we will submit them as individual statements and then members can sign on.

And if we wind up with a lot of members signing on, we will move them up into the body of the report. I think (Christian) has got a wonderful one coming. So, keep our eyes open.

I am going to call this one supported onto B3. That okay? All right.

Man: Top of the hour?

Mike O'Connor: Top of the hour. It is the top of the hour. Thank you sir.

Thanks, wonderful call, got a lot done, see you in a week. I think we will call it quits for today.

Man: Well Michael are we going to continue this...

Mike O'Connor: Yes.

Man: ...in email or...

Mike O'Connor: No, I think we are going to continue it on the call. I think that the back and forth dialogue is very helpful and...

Man: You want to wait till next week to proceed.

Mike O'Connor: Yes.

Man: Okay. I just wanted to make certain.

Mike O'Connor: Good question. Thank you sir.

So we will see you in a week and we will carry on from where we are right now. Thanks again.

Man: Good call.

Mike O'Connor: Yes, great call.

Man: You bet (unintelligible).

Woman: Thanks Mike.

Man: Bye everyone.

Woman: Thanks, bye.

Man: Bye-bye.

Woman: Thanks (Marika).

END