Fast Flux PDP WG Teleconference
TRANSCRIPTION
Friday 24 October 2008 15:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Fast Flux PDP WG teleconference on Friday 24 October 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-20081024.mp3

http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#oct

Present for the teleconference:
Avri Doria - NCA, GNSO Council chair, temporary chair
George Kirikos - CBUC
Christian Curtis - NCUC
Greg Aaron - Afilias Ry c.
Paul Diaz - Networksolutions RRc
James Bladel - Godaddy RRc

Observers - (no constituency affiliation)
Joe St. Sauver
Dave Piscitello
Martin Hall
Rod Rasmussen

Staff:
Liz Gasster
Marika Konings
Glen de Saint Gery

Absent Apologies
Randy Vaughn
Wendy Seltzer - ALAC Board liaison
Kal Feher - MelbourneIT

Man: Okay. Is the recording (on this started)? You can go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you very much. Glen, can you (unintelligible).

Glen DeSaintgery: (Unintelligible). We've got (Joe St Sauver, George Kirikos, Christian Curtis, Martin Hall, Dave Piscitello, James Bladel, Greg Aaron, Avri Doria, who leads the group, (Paul Diaz). And for staff we have got Liz Gasster, Marika Koningsand myself.

Woman: Excuse me please. (Rod Rasmussen entered the call).

Glen DeSaintgery: And now (Rod) has joined us.

Avri Doria: Okay, great. The first thing I wanted to go through is to talk about meeting in Cairo. We didn't quite have enough people that were sure that were going to be there on a Sunday. Plus the timing for Sunday was very, very stressed, very, very tight, so I asked Glen to see if another space could be found. Glen found another space in the - let me find your email, Glen, unless you know the answer.

Glen DeSaintgery: It's AL Menial -- M E N I A L.

Avri Doria: Right. It's on Wednesday.

Glen DeSaintgery: And it's - yes that's right

Avri Doria: And it's at - what time was it again?

Glen DeSaintgery: And it is at 17 to 18 hours. That is 5 pm to 6 pm.

Avri Doria: Oh. So we have that time slot assigned to a face to face meeting of the people that are there. I've also requested telecommunications access so that we can dial in anyone that's not there to give another hour on

the phone call so that we can hopefully in face to face - now it really depends upon where we are.

And that brings up the next issue of next Friday. I don't believe I can make a meeting because I believe I'm going to be traveling on my way to Cairo. So if we're going to have another meeting to talk about stuff before Cairo, it needs to be some day other than Friday. So I wanted to find out how people thought about that and if people thought it was worth doing it.

The other question I would ask is, is it perhaps worth seeing if we could find a two hour chunk of time to actually be able to try and make it through. I don't know how far we'll get in finishing the first pass today and I don't want to spend too long on the (unintelligible) stuff. But - and then we have to basically make another pass through to see that we're find with everything.

And so how do people feel about - first off, if there's any comments on the meeting on Wednesday, and feel about trying to find a time slot and not do that now, but ask Glen to help us do that afterwards where we can put in another - a two hour block Monday Tuesday or Wednesday of next week. Any comments? Anybody wish to comment on that?

(Paul Diaz):   (Auvrey), it's (Paul Diaz). I'm also traveling Friday, so that's bad. I can give you more time today if you want, on the call. I would just ask the group if we try and find time. Thursday and Friday next week are bad for me.

Avri Doria: Okay. So yes, those days don't work for me either.

(Paul Diaz):   Thank you.

Avri Doria: I don't know about more time on the call today. Is there anyone - let's say if we tried to go longer on the call today, is there anyone who can't do it?

(Greg Aaron):   This is (Greg). I'm scheduled for another call in an hour.

Avri Doria: Okay. Yes. And so I don't know it's good to actually do it longer. Does anyone object to trying to find another - a two-hour block of time Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday? And if we can't we can't, but I'll ask Glen to see if we can find a two hour black - block to speak beginning of next week, and then hopefully we can certainly make some more progress on this current draft.

                 Okay, jumping right ahead so that we have as much time, my view at the moment is to not go back yet, but to basically continue from where we were. Is that okay? Does anyone wish us to go back and review at this point, because what I'd like to do is basically see if we could finish as much of - as we can of a first pass with the stuff that came out of the voting you all did, and then we can go back and check where we are on everything. Any issues? Anyone not comfortable with that approach?

                 Okay then. And I do thank the people that worked out tentative langue -- the things that are in turquoise. That is a real temptation on my part to go back and talk about those now, but I'd really prefer to let them sit there and get back to them later.

So if I'm correct, the next tentative was at Line 549. Is that correct? And I don't know though if I skipped over any of the blue stuff from before that anyone wanted to comment on. There's - I see on that same Page 540 through 546. And I must say I don't remember whether that was a yellow or a color last time, or whether it was actually a blue. (Marika), can you fill me in on the history of 540 through 546?

Marika Konings: Let me just (unintelligible). You're on 546?

Avri Doria: Well yes, 540 to 546. There's a section that's blue underline but not highlighted. And I don't remember whether that is something that we already talked about last time, or whether those were previous changes that just needed to be accepted this time.

Marika Konings: Let me just think because (unintelligible) line numbers might have changed, because we've added...

Avri Doria: Oh that's right.

Marika Konings: ...(unintelligible) stuff to it. The blue part was green before. There was basically...

Avri Doria: Okay. So that's...

Marika Konings: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...that would be going back to - we'll leave that for now.

Okay on the tentative (unintelligible) we have - the first one is a support statement to add. Now one of the things that I've talked to (Marika)

about but she hasn't had a chance to do yet, is to sort of separate the support paragraph physically from the agreement paragraph and the extra view paragraph.

So is there any issue with this support add? Is support to add the correct designation for it? Something that did not have full agreement and so on. Okay.

Then moving on to 555, there was another support paragraph. Now one of the things that I wanted to ask (Marika) - the line in the middle, individuals to purchase (bogus) projects, especially pharmaceuticals, may be physically harmed from using (such). That was a statement that everyone agreed to. Is that correct? And then if not (unintelligible) a support to add that's lost in the middle.

Marika Konings: Yes.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Marika Konings: So there - this was one that was accepted before...

Avri Doria: Right.

Marika Konings: ...(unintelligible) in the middle, because all the proposals were basically made linked to the...

Avri Doria: Okay. So what I...

Marika Konings: ...(unintelligible).

Avri Doria: ...would recommend doing here is obviously moving that sentence before the support paragraph, and then separating the paragraph so that we don't have a one-line sticking in the middle between two support statements.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Avri Doria: But, you know, we'll need to talk and see how that looks and flows with the writing. And understand what you said about it being somewhat confusing where these things are interspersed.

Marika Konings: Yes, there's some parts...

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible).

Marika Konings: ...where there's indeed agreements that are fellow support statements. We need to look that indeed how we can make it flow well and still be able to separate the support agreement alternative view (unintelligible). That's something we can review.

Avri Doria: We can also talk about numbering paragraphs so that a particular topic is a numbered section of paragraph. And there's various other ways to organize it so that it's very clear when people read the document where there was agreement, where there was support, where there was additional, you know, additional point of view.

Okay then the next statement is 555 through 569. I think - does it go any further? No. Where there was support to add that the harm could occur in a variety of ways and then example. Any issue about that being a support to add and such?

And I just say, on any of these issues, if somebody's got an additional point of view that they feel that is important to add that counters the support to add, then certainly they should. I find that that's often the case, and I don't know that we left things necessarily open. So on any of these support to add, if there's an extra point of view to add, and that should be contributed.

Okay. Now the individuals who purchase (bogus) products, especially pharmaceuticals, that was underlined as a change from before. So is that change okay? (Unintelligible) that can go as regular. Any issue on that -- 553 through 555?

Okay having no issue, moving on. Then the next one in line 575 through 584, we have -- I guess we also have some at 571 -- we had changes there were made before. Are those changes okay? Are they as expected? Is it okay to accept those changes? Okay. Okay to accept those.

On 589 through 597, (unintelligible) currently (C), those were changes that were made before. Is it okay to accept those changes?

Marika Konings: (Auvrey) this is (Marika). I'm looking back on my notes from last time. I think these are ones that we already covered, because the ones in blue are...

Avri Doria: Oh, because I thought things that were accepted last time would be...

Marika Konings: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...accepted and wouldn't be marked in blue anymore.

Marika Konings: No. The ones that are marked in blue were like green or yellow before.

Avri Doria: Oh okay. So that yellow was interspersed there. That wasn't the blue...

Marika Konings: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...from before. Oh okay.

Marika Konings: Yes, because I have from my note that we actually got to the - who benefits from the use of...

Avri Doria: Oh so, okay...

Marika Konings: ...file (flux) (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: So the 549 tentative was something we missed? Oh well, it doesn't matter. Okay so what line do you think we should be starting at?

Marika Konings: I'm just checking where we are...

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible).

Marika Konings: ...the line numbering (has changed).

Avri Doria: We have to deal with the document as it is, because the next one I see is the color (unintelligible).

Marika Konings: Yes, I think they want - what I have in my notes is line - the new line 620, benefits from the (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: And so anything that's marked in blue is stuff that we talked about last week. Okay.

Marika Konings: Yes, so (unintelligible) what I have in my notes.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Marika Konings: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: And the yellow was perhaps one we just forgot about.

Avri Doria: Well I think there were some - the yellow ones there I think is where we didn't have agreement, and I think there was a question at that point whether an alternative statement would be submitted. And I think that what (Wendy) spoke to, but that was in the end I think put into the introductory paragraph.

Avri Doria: Oh okay.

Marika Konings: We really need to talk about all the harms and the...

Avri Doria: Okay, great.

Marika Konings: ...all the things that can go wrong. So that's I think why it stayed like that.

Avri Doria: Oh okay. Sorry. (Unintelligible). Okay then 620...

(Joe St Sauver): Excuse me.

Avri Doria: Yes.

(Joe St Sauver): So basically that means we should go back and look at 462? Is that what I'm hearing, or...

Avri Doria: 462?

(Joe St Sauver): Because that seemed like a new chunk from last time.

Avri Doria: Yes. No, that is a new chunk, but what I was saying is - and that was a chunk that was agreed to, but that's something that we'll come back to in the next pass.

(Joe St Sauver): Okay.

Avri Doria: In other words what I'm trying to avoid is redoing anything we did last time. And I guess I didn't manage to do that successfully. But I'm trying to avoid, and so we can finish getting through the stuff that was all the voted on stuff.

(Joe St Sauver): Okay.

Avri Doria: And then we will make another pass through but we'll have a cleaner - we'll have a document that doesn't have this coloring in it.

Okay, so then we had a 626-22, an agreement statement that is tentative. Is that a correct agreement statement? Hearing no

objections, (Marika), I also want to check -- in this section, the stuff that's marked in underlined blue...

Marika Konings: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...at what point are we at stuff that is previous changes that we didn't accept last time?

Marika Konings: That (unintelligible) the (unintelligible) start with the number one are basically changes that were accepted by the group in previous calls before you took over the chair role. So those were accepted in agreement.

Avri Doria: Starting at which number?

Marika Konings: 624.

Avri Doria: 624. Okay, so 624. Okay. So at 624 are there - so in other words 613 is something that was already accepted or is that changed from last week?

Marika Konings: No that was already there I think in the original.

Avri Doria: Okay. So (unintelligible) does anyone object to accepting 615 through 618? I have to do a better job of marking where we got to, so that we have a clearer start. Does anyone object to accepting that change from previous 615 through 618?

Marika Konings: I hear that 615 and 618 was green and was accepted last time. Sorry.

Avri Doria: Okay. I see. You said number one. Okay 624 through 629 was something that had been changed previously. Is that accepted? Anyone object to accepting that? No? Good. Okay 631 through halfway through 636 on (content) distribution. That is old change. Any issue with accepting it? No? Okay thanks.

Starting mid-636 -- and I'm someone will jump in quickly if I go too quickly on (saying yes). Starting 636 and going through (unintelligible) working at this (unintelligible). 636 through 640 was a tentative agreement based on the voting. Is that agreeable that it's there as agreement? (Unintelligible) we'll still get a chance to look at it next time before we do a final acceptance.

Okay, 642 through 643 number 3 was a previous change. Is that accepted? Okay, thank you. Hearing no objection.

(Greg Aaron):   643 is just a little ungrammatical.

Avri Doria: And what change do you recommend?

(Greg Aaron):   Minority advocacies activities for revolutionary (unintelligible)?

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) minority advocacies and activities. Actually you're right. Or/and -- and or or would be the right one. Yes. Or is probably correct.

Liz Gasster):   And maybe taking out the comma after advocacies might help too.

Avri Doria: Well - oh okay, because you've got a clause there -- minority advocacies and activities.

Liz Gasster):   I think - yes I think that's one concept.

Avri Doria: Right. That comma goes away and then or revolutionary thinking.

Man: I'm not clear on what's meant by revolutionary thinking. Is that sort of like unusual thinking or thinking about revolutions or...

Avri Doria: I think...

Man: ...seriously I'm not...

Avri Doria: ...it could probably be either, I would assume, because it is people that are trying to avoid detection.

Liz Gasster):   And then you could say it's politically controversial, you know, if that's clearer.

Man: I think that one a lot better.

Avri Doria: Does anyone object to making that change?

Man: Can we just say controversial, because some revolutionary thinking isn't necessarily political.

Avri Doria: Fine with me.

Man: Well if we're talking about revolutionary as in - (unintelligible) government, then it's inherently political.

Man: Right. But if it's revolutionary as in out-of-the box thinking, it would still - (can) be controversial.

Liz Gasster):   (Unintelligible) talking about avoiding detections (unintelligible) free speech minority advocacies and activities. I think it's more consistent with what's there. I mean you could make it broader by just saying controversial, but that is a...

Avri Doria: Yes, that's...

Liz Gasster):   ...that's a change in meaning as opposed to just a work - a clarification in meaning.

Man: I'm thinking that there are probably situations where something might not necessarily be politically controversial, but it could be controversial in a religious sense. And people still want to be able to speak freely about, you know, such things as stem cell research and abortion. And they are political issues, but in some forums they are not political; they're simply social.

I mean I don't have a strong opinion, it's just that revolutionary has multiple meanings. So - when I first read it, I thought of innovative as opposed to (terrorist).

Avri Doria: Yes, not - well, I don't think it's either of those.

Man: Yes.

Avri Doria: One can be a very (unintelligible) revolutionary (unintelligible) couldn't assume terrorist in revolution.

Man: (Right). But - so there's lots of different weights to it.

Avri Doria: Right.

Man: I don't have a strong opinion one way or the other. I think...

Avri Doria: I think it would be best at this point to stick with the grammatical fix and leave it underlined so that we come back to it again. And if anybody wants to suggest a corrected language on it for political or such, we can come back to it. So I would suggest making the removal of the comma after advocacies and put in the or revolutionary thinking for now, but leave it blue underlined and not accepted and come back. Is that okay? Okay.

Next we have 645 through 656. Also (comes) changes that were made before that need to be accepted. Any objections to accepting them? Okay. Next we have some green at 661. This was a voted-on agreement statement. Is that correct as - correct designation for that statement? Okay, then I guess (unintelligible) stay in and be available for the next pass for acceptance.

(Joe St Sauver):   One question as we go through this particular section. Is there any plan to go ahead and add something for 5.4, which is currently not really fleshed out?

Avri Doria: That's a good question. And that would also be the case for 5.5. Those are both empty slots. (Unintelligible).

(George Kirikos):   Well 5.4 - many would be because - for the double Fast Flux, because they're responsible for changing the name servers through their, you know, API interface. So to that extent they're involved.

Avri Doria: Right.

(George Kirikos):   And if they're running servers themselves, but that doesn't necessarily reflect their registrar function.

Avri Doria: My...

Man: I'm willing to sit down with (Joe) or (Greg) or anyone who's interested in writing some tests for 5.5. You know, I think it's fairly obvious that there are whole classes of registrants who protect their own brands who have their own, you know, own internal staff.

And they also use third parties like (Rod Rasmussen)'s company to, you know, to go after people who are running Fast-Flux networks to identify them and trying to (unintelligible) shut down. And I think that there are obviously registrars like (Mock Monitor) and Melbourne IT and others who have similar protective services that, you know, that, you know, and groups that go after those kinds of domains as well.

Avri Doria: Okay. So I mean that's probably the correct approach is that if we have someone or a group of someones that are willing to contribute paragraph for those on the mailing list, but then people are interested can discuss and come up with something that then we can view as a group and figure out whether it's agreement support or individual viewpoint. I think that's the only way to approach it.

So - now I understood you to be saying you were ready to write something for 5.5. Were you also speaking of readiness to write something for 5.4? Do we have...

Man: Well, I think we can fill out these sections with at least one or two paragraphs that describe some one of the things that go on today. And I'm willing to help with that, so...

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Anyone else willing to work with him?

(Rod Rasmussen): This is (Rod). I'll help out on that too.

Avri Doria: Okay, fantastic. And of I expect (Marika), you also participate in the (graphic) (unintelligible) if necessary.

Man: Right. Yes I - I mean I'll write something down and send to (Rod) and (Marika) and - as sort of a first pass. And that will, you know, when we agree on it, we'll post it to the (GNSO) list or the Fast-Flux list rather.

Avri Doria: Okay, fantastic. And then (Marika), when you stick it in the document, you can, you know, especially if you're mentioning it as agreement, I think you could put it in as a color coded thing so that we know that it's something that we have to come back to and talk about further. Is that okay?

Marika Konings: Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay, (great).

(Joe St Sauver): Could you also add me to the list? This is (Joe).

Man: (Unintelligible). Yes, absolutely.

(Joe St Sauver): Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay. So then we did the 6.1 through 6.6, correct, or did we? Just want to make sure it's worth going - so it's okay to have that one in there as an agreement statement. I think I started to do it, and 5.4 or 5.5 was brought up. So on 5.3 that is a correct agreement statement? Okay.

                 Moving down, we've got - for 5.6 we've got a whole section here that is (unintelligible) an introduction for 5.6, how internet users are affected by Fast-Flux hosting. We have 574 through 595. Is that correct as an agreement statement? Okay. Then after that we had tentative - there was support to add, and went from 697 to 732.

(Joe St Sauver): One formatting note on that, and that is some of the stuff that's showing currently with the underlines included in there are meant to be section headings I think. So those should be rendered appropriately for like sections...

Avri Doria: Right. Like 699 through 700 is a section heading.

(Joe St Sauver): Correct.

Avri Doria: And 711 is a section heading.

(Joe St Sauver): Right. And like 684 was the same sort of thing.

Avri Doria: Yes. Yes. Okay. Good comment. Any issue with the section - the large yellow section, 697 being listed as a 732? One of the things that I have a question on, and then we have something that was agreement after it. And I want to make sure that - those are (a lot) here. Those may need resorting. But anyhow, I'm curious to see how it looks once we start putting in the support headings and such.

                  Okay so starting at 734 through - goes on for quite a while. So 779, we have a long section that is listed as agreement to add. And again the same comments about 736 looks like a heading, 749 looks like a heading, 767, - I mean 768 looks like a heading. Any issues with those paragraphs being added as agreement statements?

(Greg Aaron):   This is (Greg). My only suggestion is it was submitted in a pretty colloquial style.

Avri Doria: So you're saying it needs some wordsmithing.

(Greg Aaron):   Yes. That's all. I mean the content I think everybody's agreed to. It's just - there's just some stuff like, "Hey, someone's serving stolen software from your system."

Avri Doria: Yes. Typically the owner.

(Joe St Sauver): And I'm fine going ahead and having those kind of adjustments made by (Marika) or whatever.

Avri Doria: Yes. I think so, and especially since the text will remain in the underline needing to have, you know, the final acceptance when we go through it

in the next pass. So it'll still be marked as stuff to be looked at, at least one more time.

Marika Konings: And this is (Marika). I think once we have all the changes agreed or a more final document, I think there is a need anything to go through the whole document and make sure as well it's consistent in style and as well has certain concepts are...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Marika Konings: ...named and then described. So I think that's something that needs to be done anyway for the whole document.

Avri Doria: Okay. So we've made it that basically there's a note there that it needs wordsmithing. It needs clean-up and it needs headers, but otherwise it's okay to leave it on this pass and remove the green color.

Okay the next - at 781 we go into support statement. And basically that's 783 through 797. Any issue with that being in there as a support statement? Okay (unintelligible) supported but not full agreement.

Then we go into agreement again, 799 -- well, it's 801 actually -- thinking of fluxing name servers. Assume that 801 is a heading (fine). Any issue with that being in there as an agreement statement? Okay. Then that (unintelligible) on to (unintelligible).

Okay, 808 -- another support statement dealing with port blocks. Again, that's a heading statement. Any issue with that being a supported statement? Then the - there's probably language in that that needs to be (unintelligible) the (spewage) of (spam).

(George Kirikos):   Can we - (George) here...

Avri Doria: ...(paraphrase).

(George Kirikos):   Can we change port blocks won't to port blocks might not, because conceivably they could have an affect on reducing the...

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) that change the level of support on this statement at all? I mean those who supported the statement - I don't know if you're one of the ones that supported this statement, but those - (unintelligible) the same port blocks might not make the statement have a stronger level of support.

(Joe St Sauver): I think I contributed that paragraph, and I can live with that change in the heading if it makes folks happy.

Avri Doria: Okay. Does anyone else - does anyone object to changing that? Okay I'll leave it. Does that change the support on it? Or those of you that didn't support this before, do you still not support it? Not hearing - I guess the people that perhaps didn't support it (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: No one is making a comment, so...

Woman: (Unintelligible)

Avri Doria: Okay so I'll leave - so okay change that to might not work, but leave it as support. I would leave a note (Marika) to just check on that level and see whether that change changed the level or not at the next pass.

Marika Konings: I mean I can go back into the server and see...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...who are the people that...

Avri Doria: Right.

Marika Konings: ...didn't support it to see if it - if this will change something...

Avri Doria: Okay. That (unintelligible).

Marika Konings: ...(unintelligible) support to....

Avri Doria: Right. That would be good.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Avri Doria: And if so though, when you change it, leave though a - if you do change it from support to agreement based on that, leave it marked as tentative so that we - it forces us to notice it at the end the next time.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Then we come down to 822, 829, where there are two alternative views offered. Any issue on including those alternative views? Is that the correct level for them? I expect that those two alternative views, now that I look at them, are probably the reason that the previous one will remain a support, but we'll see. Okay.

Moving on to 831, another support statement. (ISPF) (unintelligible) Fast Flux and double flux result and collateral damage. And there was support for that statement. Is that a correct listing for it? Any other issues with that statement? And it goes to uncolored. We remove the tentative.

850 to 857, attempts to statement that was voted on as an agreement statement. Is that correct? Any issue with that? Okay, then that goes to uncolored and loses the tentative, but remains for...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: ...further acceptance.

Okay, I get to 891 where we add a bullet. I think that's probably quite accessible. 894, tentative (unintelligible) support. Now this is one where I have a little bit of (burn) with formatting. And what I would recommend in a bulleted issue is if we change from the top bullet (is agreement), then we would have sub-bullet under that would be moved over one more level that would include the support and the alternative views so that it was really quite visible.

But any issue about that being a support statement? Because I'm really concerned about having the same clarity of view that we have with the green, yellow, and I guess it's blue criteria without having those colors, so that people really see the difference between agreement statements, support statement, and alternative views.

So - okay so any issue with removing the tentative and the coloring from that one, but making sure that it's visibly different as a support? Okay, moving on. There was in the footnotes a deletion and an underlined statement there from a previous edit. Is that acceptable? Is that an accept?

(George Kirikos):   Sorry, what line was that?

Avri Doria: It's in the Footnote 7.

(George Kirikos):   Oh okay. Sorry.

Avri Doria: There was a deletion and there is underline replacement that was done at a previous edit.

(George Kirikos):   There's a typo of who is in the middle of the...

Avri Doria: Oh yes. Okay.

Man: Is there a word missing could provide similar of additional (that)...

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) provide similar...

Man: I think it's supposed to be or.

(George Kirikos):   Or additional, yes.

Avri Doria: Or additional. Okay, so two typos.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Okay, so leave that one marked for the next (pass), fixing the typo
                  (unintelligible).

(Joe St Sauver): What's the bar on Line 903 relating to?

Avri Doria: Oh (Marika)?

Marika Konings: Nothing. It might be that I pushed an enter or something. Sometimes
                  these - there's no visible change. I think it's just probably a formatting
                  one that's still there.

(Joe St Sauver): Cool, thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay. If need be, we could always go back to an older document just
                  to make sure that nothing was lost. Okay, the last one I have is at 919,
                  an agreement statement that basically says - that modifies the idea for
                  active engagement were discussed include the following. And then of
                  course you put that statement before the colon.

                  It - I think it needs wordsmithing in any case, you know, that you would
                  basically want to include, you know, a set of ideas for which the group
                  did not reach consensus or endorse (unintelligible) the following or
                  something like that.

(Greg Aaron):   Yes, I think it's included in the following semicolon -- group did not reach consensus on, or endorse any of them colon. So that would be grammatically correct.

Avri Doria: Oh okay. So if that works grammatically. (Unintelligible) a semicolon and then a colon (unintelligible). Okay. So any disagreement with that being in agreement, a clause (that is) agreed to.

Man: I had a question.

Avri Doria: Sure.

Man: I think that this and several other line insertions were recommended with the understanding that we were going to have an interim report in time for Cairo. And given that we're going to study this further, isn't there an opportunity for the group to reach consensus on some of these?

Avri Doria: I don't know. First of all one of the things - I mean my goal is still to get an interim report out as soon as possible, even if it doesn't make Cairo, which it's obviously not going to make Cairo. But - and then to send that interim report to the council and constituencies.

                  Looking through your agenda, you did have another pass that - and so what we had talked about and what had been my strategy on all of this, is to not spend a lot of time trying to reach further consensus on things unless we can.

So I think it's certainly fine to spend time on the list, seeing if we can reach consensus on a lit or we can come up with a short agreement list support list alternative view list, which is sort of a step between consensus and (unintelligible), but I don't want to spend a lot of time trying to reach consensus.

So is there a feeling that consensus could be reached on this, or that this could be divided into three piles -- an agreement support and alternative view pile? (Unintelligible) comment.

(Greg Aaron): Seems like it may take a while.

Avri Doria: That's kind of my feeling. And as I say - but what I would recommend, if you basically that there as way to reach consensus on it, or if you think it's possible - as I say, I think that we have a better shot if we were trying to hit a, you know, there's no agreement on any - there's support for the following three and the following are two alternative views, then you might be able to get something that adds a bit more content but is not all the way to consensus (statement). So I certainly think if you feel you could suggest such a change, it'd be worth looking at on the mailing list.

Man: Okay. That works for me.

Avri Doria: Okay. And, you know, and I think that that's always the case where there's no consensus, but - so (if there's a) statement everyone agrees to other than the one that we haven't reached consensus on, then that'd be great. Otherwise, move to the other.

Okay, there's a tentative green one. Now this is the curious one in that I guess everyone agreed that this statement could be in the group of statements that the group did not reach consensus on. Is that a correct interpretation?

(Joe St Sauver): For me at least, yes.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Man: Yes, I think this is essentially adding to the list.

Avri Doria: Right.

Man: Let things be as they are.

Avri Doria: Right.

Man: Yes.

Avri Doria: Okay. Yes, that's the way I read it, but I just wanted to - when you had an agreement statement and a set of things that wasn't agreed to. Okay, so any issue with leaving this in that list that way without the green color?

Okay, moving on. At 952, issue 953, it's a support statement. There was support for the following responses. Any issue with that? Now one question I have seeing that statement there, is if there was support for that, were there some people with - I mean (unintelligible) it wasn't full agreement. Are there people with tentative views that they want to contribute and get listed here?

(Joe St Sauver): Well for example, I would say that I think we do actually have a working definition that could allow us to go ahead and make progress and so forth. So if it would be helpful to have that kind spelled out explicitly through the text, I can send something (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Right. Basically if you believe that that alternative view belongs there, then I would say yes.

(Joe St Sauver): I'll do that then.

Avri Doria: Right. And basically so you'd have the support statement. You know, there was no agreement statement. There's a support statement and alternative views. I mean I think by and large, for this document to give a fair picture, you need to - if you - if we didn't reach consensus on something, then there's obviously some alternate views that need to be captured.

Okay, the same thing would apply for 5.9 where there's support for that, but obviously some people have an alternate view of something else. So I'd say of those people want to, it'd be good to capture it. Any objection?

Okay then we have 510 that has no content. So we either have everybody volunteer to write a paragraph that we discuss, or we remove the 510. Any...

(Rod Rasmussen): This is (Rod). I think we can pull some stuff out of the registrar best practices document that the (APWG) put out for the registrar

constituency to add to that there. I mean we directly addressed the best practices issue.

Avri Doria: Anyone object?

Man: I think we can complement that. And I'll try to find some time to do this, but certainly it's not just the registrars that, you know, might have some best practices. There are good best practices that still apply from (unintelligible) 25 in terms of what a registrant or an individual user could do.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Man: And we can...

Avri Doria: Right.

Man: ...if we don't want to write a lot of - a lot in here, we can certainly refer to both those documents

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible).

Man: ...and say that the best practices that were mentioned therein, you know, are still applicable.

Avri Doria: I think that's probably a good approach if there's things that can just include by reference. And then we have to decide whether, you know, and could put in a neutral statement, as obviously the group's done endorsing all of those best practices. But (unintelligible) a set of best practices that may be helpful can be found in the following documents,

might be the proper way to answer it. That make sense as an approach? Anybody...

Man: (Sure).

Avri Doria: ...object to taking that approach? Okay, then the next thing we have - and I don't know - think we have to handle this differently, because we're now getting into the constituency statements and other statement.

Marika Konings: Just maybe to explain (Auvrey)...

Avri Doria: Okay, yes.

Marika Konings: ...the history of...

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) so also though anything that the constituency statement, that constituency needs to be the one to approve it, not necessarily us. But go ahead.

Marika Konings: Different (here is because it) used to be just constituency statement. So - and I think that was fine, at least I believe that most...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Marika Konings: ...of the constituencies were fine with how it was summarized, but then there were several proposals saying that why are (only) constituency viewpoints here...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Marika Konings: ...and why can we not have other people's comments in there as well that basically comment to the viewpoint of the constituencies. So basically the proposal was to integrate those proposals into this chapter, which would turn it into a constituency statement and other point - another viewpoint.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Marika Konings: So what has changed basically is the other viewpoint that have been added throughout the document, throughout this chapter.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) in this chapter anymore.

Marika Konings: Sorry?

Avri Doria: They're not in this Section 6 anymore.

Marika Konings: They are in here. I think - I need to look back, because I think it's - it was (unintelligible) several - I think it's in the...

Avri Doria: Yes. And (unintelligible)...

Marika Konings: ...original email proposals 30/32 or something - three or four proposals that were made that have been integrated into this text.

(Joe St Sauver): Part of the issue was I think that, you know, the constituency statements are actually in the annex.

Avri Doria: Yes, I see that.

(Joe St Sauver): And as such, I think they should be in violet. But I think the issue came up that this section attempts to kind of recapitulate or summarize or endorse some of that. And that's why it kind of became subject to discussion, in my point of view.

Avri Doria: Yes, I have kind of a - I kind of think it's better to just include them there. I don't know that this adds much other than controversy. It also has some numbering problems, because we have a four one in the middle of a six, but that's beside the point.

Marika Konings: That is my fight I'm having with the numbering...

Avri Doria: Yes, I understand. I understand.

Marika Konings: ...of this document. (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: I'd like to hear some discussion. My first view is I'm not sure I understand why this belongs here, other than if we want to say the first part, you know, that basically talks about we've received the following constituency statement, they can be found in appendix A. In addition, a number of individual statements that submitted can be found in Annex 4. And then I start to wonder about 997. But it looks like you all agreed to this that voted on it, so I guess it's fine. Or are there other opinions?

(Joe St Sauver): I would prefer to see the option you just described.

Avri Doria: Yes (unintelligible). What (unintelligible) people think on that and just tell people to go read them as opposed to trying to abstract them. Well you've kind of already abstracted things all the way through the

members as (unintelligible) participating, but I worry that anything that's doing in - a (synthesis), which is essentially what starts at 4.1, a (synthesis) of the constituencies in the individuals then really needs to be approved by the constituencies in the individuals and not this group. Does that make sense?

(Joe St Sauver): It does to me.

Avri Doria: Anyone else object to removing (unintelligible).

Marika Konings: (Auvrey) this is (Marika). My only problem with that would be that I doubt that you get many people actually really going to the annexes and reading all the statements there. I mean I wouldn't have a problem in going back to those that submitted the statement - the constituency statement to see if they are fine with how we have summarized their contributions, because personally I would see a value of having, you know, a short version of - because if you look at the annexes, there are a lot of pages there.

Avri Doria: Yes Yes, I did. (I did that).

Marika Konings: So I don't know if the - how the rest of the group feels about that, but I, you know, from the reader's perspective I think there would be the value of having the summary of certain line documents there.

Avri Doria: Right, because they basically talk about, you know, the registry and (MPC) and a number of individual (RC) members.

Marika Konings: Yes, that's another challenge, because they - I don't know if they're still working on that. And I remember that some time ago the business

constituency actually mentioned as well that they were working on a statement too, but I don't know if that has stopped or where they are. But I think the registry - the registrars didn't have enough time to get (unintelligible)...

Avri Doria: Is there anyone...

Marika Konings: ...a full constituencies report, so they have a number of them signing on.

Avri Doria: I'm curious, is there anyone that objects to leading this at this point other than (Marika)?

Marika Konings: I'm not objecting. I'm just...

Avri Doria: Right. I understand but think it belongs there. And I think that that, you know, you're writing this thing and you're trying to do this (unintelligible), so I think, your objection is on a - is not on the principles being discussed but on the form of the document, whereas the editor of the document you certainly have a certain amount of say about that (unintelligible).

                But anyway, now that I've (unintelligible) (muttering), does anyone object to removing this? What I would recommend doing is basically taking out the green for now, changing the format to line through, leave it there. And also, if you do think it's important that it be included, check with those whose work you're (synthesizing). Make sure that they're comfortable with the synthesis.

And I think if you come back next time and say, "Yes, everyone that contributed to the thing is comfortable with this synthesis," then, you know, and maybe if we have more people in this participating that are here now, because just like adding something, I want to get a second pass to accept it.

Also deleting something this large, especially something that was voted in, I would want to get a second pass on accepting that deletion. Does that - is that okay as an approach -- that we mark this for deletion by just changing the format to line through, but that in the meantime you confirm the (unintelligible) (practice). Okay?

Marika Konings: So let me just (unintelligible). You want to delete it, but you still want to confirm whether...

Avri Doria: Right. In other words, just like adding something needs to be - it's two pass system that I'm trying to use, where yes it's added but we'll come through one more time and accept that it's been added. Same thing with a deletion. I would say just - as opposed to just deleting, let's put a line through it.

Marika Konings: Okay. But you still want me to check as well with those who submitted when their...

Avri Doria: I - yes, I would like - because I would like the confirmation. How do they feel about it being included since this is trying to include their stuff? Do they agree with it, do they - are they fine with it? (Unintelligible).

Marika Konings: But I would be asking them to define with a summary and then have to tell them like, "But actually we're going to delete it."

Avri Doria: Yes. Basically that we're looking to delete it; what is their view?

Marika Konings: Okay.

Avri Doria: Are they fine with it? Do they think - and then we could bring that point of view into the meeting when we talk about it one more time.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Avri Doria: And - that didn't make sense? I know the way you said it, you know, I'm asking (unintelligible) something that we're then going to delete, so it does take us to (unintelligible). I think it's (unintelligible) describe the situation that there's a recommendation to delete this, A, how do they feel about this inclusion or deletion, and B, do they accept that it's a correct interpretation of this correct abstraction of their views.

If they come back with, "We definitely don't want it deleted," that says something. If they come back with, "Oh well definitely do want it deleted," that says something. If they come back with, "Well I'm not comfortable with this abstraction, because of this, because of that," then that's extra content that we can use and sort of thing.

Yes, whereas if they come back and say, "Listen, we think that's perfect. We think it belongs in the report. We think you should reconsider deleting it," then I think this group needs to say, "Hey, you know, they think it's perfect. We should reconsider deleting it."

But there's - does it make sense now? Is anyone uncomfortable with what I just said? (I said) I don't want to do anything precipitous on this, but I also want to make sure that we don't have constituency statement that you're uncomfortable with, plus I think it's probably fine for people to go read the constituency statements. But I understand.

(James Bladel): This is (James).

Avri Doria: Yes.

(James Bladel): Just - if I'm following correctly, I would - my personal preference would be to just introduce the constituency statements, lay out that they can be found in the annexes, and then is anything else really needed in this section?

Avri Doria: That's - okay, that's pretty much what we were saying is that we would keep 977 through 995. We would change - wordsmith it a little. We would actually probably take out 977/78.

(James Bladel): And probably 983 and parts of - the last word in 982?

Avri Doria: Right, yes. But basically we'd keep that kind of content saying, "These were submitted. They can be found. They should be read."

(James Bladel): Okay. Because I just think keeping the constituency or the participants statements (automic) and, you know, not attempting to summarize them, I think will just minimize any further controversy or misinterpretation opportunities.

Avri Doria: And I think that that's basically what's being recommended.

(James Bladel):   Okay.

Avri Doria: And that's the point with - but because I'm using this two-pass system in terms of we market for deletion but we don't actually delete it until we've gotten a bit more information. And since this is their work, I'm also curious to know, you know, their view on it. But thank you.

                  Okay we only have three more minutes. Under challenges, we had 1102, 1103, a placeholder. Include information on (unintelligible) abuse funnel request document, which received agreement from the working group, Proposal 41. So I assume that needs to be done.

Marika Konings: There was a request to do some - I think I replied to - I don't remember who made that comment, but to see if people wanted to work on a proposal for that. (Unintelligible) put in the placeholder, I think (Joe) was one (who initially) put in a placeholder. And I think it was (Greg) who comment and saying we need to see a specific wording there that the group can review and then basically ask those two to see if they could maybe come up with something. But I haven't...

Avri Doria: Okay. We're still waiting.

Marika Konings: ...seen anything so far.

Avri Doria: We're still waiting.

(Joe St Sauver): My bad on not getting you (unintelligible) (on that). I've been on the road this last week. Sorry about that.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Marika Konings: No problem.

Avri Doria: Okay so then that one is there. And I think that's it for today. Where we go next, we have this section on (coclusion) and possible next steps. I'd actually like to leave that alone until we've made our second pass, if that's reasonable. Or is that reasonable?

And I'm not too worried about the first part and the (coclusions) there, though. And I'm certainly then - the next step with one of the things that I said that I did not want to get into at all until we had taken care of the substantive part.

But actually - perhaps - first of all I would actually do two things here. I'd recommend dividing the chapters from (coclusions), you know, and turning it into interim conclusions and another chapter called possible next steps as opposed to one chapter here, because it's - gets sort of confusing.

And in (unintelligible) (coclusion) -- or interim conclusion since it's an interim report -- we do have 1132 through 1179, which were things that you all voted as being in agreement. So perhaps those - is there any objection to including them that way?

But what I'm suggesting here - and if the change can be made and then we can go back through it next time. We changed Chapter 8 to interim conclusion and we include the stuff that's green now (unintelligible) be reconfirmed, and then we have possible next steps, which is 9, which we don't talk about yet except that we highlight the

thing that says we couldn't reach agreement on it. But we try to talk about that some after we finished on the content. Is that - anyone object to that approach?

Okay then, it's 12:01. Well actually where I am it's 12:01. It's the hour 01. I think we've made it through a full pass of this, and so next time we could start the confirming acceptance pass of all of this.

And I've asked Glen to see if she can find us a two-hour slot in the next days, because at that point, other than the next step, we'll actually have something that may be qualifiable as an interim report, but I want to see where we're at on that. And if we can't get a two-hour block in Monday through Wednesday, then we'll just have to wait for our next meeting in Cairo.

Glen DeSaintgery: (Auvrey)? Hello. Sorry this is Glen. I've just (turned out to doodle).

Avri Doria: Okay great.

Glen DeSaintgery: So if everybody clicks on that link and fills in, we should be able to get it out by the end of today - get out the new time.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you very much everybody, and I'll talk to you again either next week or the following week in Cairo.

Man: Take care.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Man: Bye everyone.

Man: Thank you.

Liz Gasster):   Thank you.

Avri Doria: Bye-bye.

Man: Thank you.

                          END