Coordinator: **Fast Flux PDP WG Teleconference**

TRANSCRIPTION

Monday 27 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 Monday 27 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-20081027.mp3
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#oct

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

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

Staff:
Liz Gasster
Marika Konings
Glen de Saint Gery

Absent Apologies
Randy Vaughn
Martin Hall

This is the Operator. I would like to inform parties that today's call is now being recorded. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you very much. Glen, could you read through the record of who we've got?

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes, certainly Avri. We have got yourself, Avri Doria who is leading the group, Joe St. Sauver, James BladelPaul Diaz, Dave Piscitello, George Kirikos, Mike Rodenbaugh, Greg Aaron and Rod Rasmussen. And for staff we have got (Marika) and myself.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Thank you all for...

Glen DeSaintgery: Have I missed anybody?

Avri Doria: Thank you all for making this extraordinary non-Friday meeting. I appreciate it because I did want to try and get a little bit further with the document before actually going to Cairo, and other things.

Things I wanted to remind people of, we do have a meeting scheduled for Cairo from 17 to 18 on Wednesday, 5:00 to 6:00 on Wednesday. The room will be set. Glen may know what the room is, but it will be on the schedule and we will let people know.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes, the room is called Al Manial, M-A-N-I-A-L.

Avri Doria: And we will have dial in capabilities for those who are not...

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes, and it will, sorry Avri...

Avri Doria: ...(unintelligible) to Cairo.

Glen DeSaintgery: …and it will be exactly the same as our calls that we have every week, so you can just dial the same number and you should reach us in Cairo.

Avri Doria: And the two things that I would like to really do in that (safe safe) meeting, and of course that could change depending upon where we get to today and going through the text is to talk somewhat about the section that I have avoided completely, which is the What's Next, and also to set down the gate when we believe that we will be ready to pass this on.

If you guys look at the table on the WIKI page, you will notice that I stuck in an extra line which is basically (Unisell) Council Review where we will (unintelligible) send the documents to the Council and then have a discussion in the council on where to proceed, whether to go out to for more constituency comments at that point, for public comments at that point, or to come back into the process, sort of following the process that this group recommends.

That would also be my notion of a time to figure out, you know, electing a new Chair if it is continuing, so that then it can continue properly along.

So any of you that are into doing things like chairing working groups on the assumption that this group will continue after that GNSO review, at that point I think we should look at the whole notion of electing a new chair because we will have reached a stopping continuing point, we will have re-talked to the charter, etcetera.

So, anyhow, that is sort of - it is that more practical side of the issues that I hope to get into in the face to face meeting, having avoided them as much as possible now.

Any questions or issues on that before I move on? Okay. What I was thinking we would start with today since last time we made it through to the end of the - basically to the end of the highly colored parts that indicated the results of the voting path that you had all done.

So what I would like to do now is basically go back. If you remember, we talked about things, we took them out of the coloring, but we left them marked as changes so that we could take a second path through them and make sure that people are still comfortable. It is sort of a two-path insertion.

One of the things that (Marika) has done since the last time, and I am really grateful to her because between a Friday and a Monday meeting, she actually put out another version of the document, which is probably more than anyone could have wished for, but of course I wished for it.

So I very much appreciate that, but has started using bullets within the text to indicate where there was a support statement as opposed to an agreement statement and where there was an alternative view.

I think with the bullets, it does start to show up visibly. One of the discussions that (Marika) and I had that, you know, we will bring up to the group and see how it goes in the long run, whether it is better to put these things in boxes as opposed to just there as bullets, but that is a stylistic thing we can get to later.

One other comment that I did make to her is that whatever we do in terms of making these things visible we will need to add a paragraph to section four that says, you know, except for text that is marked specifically that there was agreement on the text.

Where there was either support or an alternative view, it is (dark) (vimarcated) thusly, and then whatever that thusly is.

Okay. Any questions on that? And in which case, I will start going through the document again from the beginning. If I come to a line number because that is the first place I see something, but there is something else that someone wanted to bring up an issue or a question on please jump in front of me and say so.

One of the other things I want to start doing now if it is okay is anything that does not get resolved in this path that we start building a to do list of issues that need specific work, of who has an issue and how we go about it. And we perhaps can build a table.

Hopefully it will be a short table that basically will then drive our next session, because what I want to try and do as we hit something that is problematic, talk about it for a while, but not, you know, spend the whole meeting on it. Talk about it for a while, say okay more work is needed on this. Put it on the list. We will come back.

And so going through the things iteratively until we get to a point where, you know, we do not have any of these issues that are in the way.

Okay. Somebody needs to mute. Okay, so then getting to the first comment, I mean first marks - (martation) it looks like we have underlined text. I am not sure. It is not in blue but we have underlined text 87 to 91. Is that something that was recently changed?

If it is not - it is not a blue underline, it is just a...

Man: I think that it was just part of the emphasis on our language, but...

Avri Doria: Okay, that is okay.

Woman: Yes, I think that comes from the original...

Avri Doria: I thought so too I just wanted to make sure.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Okay, so there is no issue there. I do not want to skip over anything through accident. Okay.

Man: (Unintelligible) in the actual documents?

Avri Doria: Excuse me?

Man: Would that be italicized in the actual documents?

Avri Doria: Actually would it be italicized or underlined? I do not know. Is there a preference?

Man: It would move the emphasis altogether I think. I do not think it was in the original issues report. I am not sure why it was emphasized here.

Woman: No there is a quote from the issues report...

Avri Doria: Right.

Woman: ...on the recommendation that staff made.

Avri Doria: Right. Well there are quote marks.

Man: Right.

Avri Doria: Now it may be along enough quote to, you know, to set it off underneath in sort of that indent from both sides style, but I do not know that it needs to be underlined if it was not underlined in the original.

Woman: Let us take the underlining out.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. I was going to say, it is borderline between a quote that is long enough for, you know, a quote section and short enough for just quote marks.

              Okay. We have at 123 the word partially.

Woman: This is something actually I inserted because there is further down there is a - there have been - some changes have been made, and then another proposal has been made to insert so I just wanted to

avoid people thinking that everything we are seeing from the issue's report, so.

Avri Doria: Okay, is there any objections to that partially?

Okay, in which case moving on.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Oh well, I got a question about some of the other italicized language here in this note. Do we really need this depart at from indeed to the end? And is that really one of the major conclusions of this working group?

Avri Doria: (It is) actually have a conclusion section.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes, I mean, I just do not think we need this comment here. It is kind of distracting.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I would agree with that.

Avri Doria: Anyone object to removing it?

Okay, could you mark - could you do this thing that we talked about last time for deletion is put line through on it for deletion and then we will come back next time and confirm that we still want to delete it?

Mike Rodenbaugh: That is from indeed through the end.

Avri Doria: Right. Yes, and I do not know, you were not - I do not know if you listened to the calls Mike. What we are trying to do on anything, for example, in terms of this, we will mark it for deletion now, but then in

the next pass of the document, we will make sure that everyone is still comfortable with its deletion before actually deleting it.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Sounds fair.

Avri Doria: Okay. That anybody that misses a meeting or thinks about things later and says oh but wait is not - is, you know, still has a chance.

Okay, so if you could just do the line through change on it I would appreciate that since that seems to be the easiest way to visually mark something as deleted.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Is that for me or for (Marika).

Avri Doria: That was for (Marika).

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay, thanks.

(Marika): I will do.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Okay.

Mike Rodenbaugh: And I have the same issue in the next comment basically it is the same thing. There is another (unintelligible)

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: From the - you are talking about line 141 to 44?

(Mike Rodenbaugh): Yes.

Avri Doria: Any objections to marking that for deletion? Okay, please do the same.

Okay, then the next thing I hit is 210 where we have the new language that was developed after the meeting - two meetings ago that certain service providers and registrars provide a name resolution service when they have a Web hosting service for individuals and organizations who are assigned dynamic IP addresses.

These DNS entries in these scenarios do not (unintelligible) DNS entries. And these scenarios are typically assigned low TTL values. The IP address assigned for individuals and organizations by such providers commonly fall within a single ASN.

Now there is a quote at the end of that, but I do not see a beginning quote. (Unintelligible).

Woman: I think that is my mistake. It needs to go out.

Avri Doria: So any issues with this addition?

Man: Do we need to define ASN anywhere?

Avri Doria: Does this report have a glossary is that a same thing. I mean I would recommend that we follow standard usage which is the first time any acronym is listed. And I do not know if this is the first time, but if it is, the first time any acronym is listed, in parenthesis is its definition.

Man: I think we need to stick an autonomous system number there then in parenthesis or whatever.

Avri Doria: Right. And then you can do either way. You can do within a single autonomous around the our parenthesis ASN or vice versa and I do not think it matters.

Man: N-O preference?

Avri Doria: I tend to think you use the full word the first time and all the abbreviations after. But I think that is purely stylistic and I think whatever (Marika) feels most comfortable with unless people in the group care.

                Okay. The next thing we had, so...

Man: Hold on Avri. I think before we get to the next step, on line 224 there seems to be a typo.

Avri Doria: Well actually the next thing we had was 216, but okay, we will get the 224. We had illicit usage of Fast Flux which was accepted last time and looking for confirmation on accepting it? Any issue? Okay, accepted.

                Okay, 224 typo. Oh where, let me see. I do not see it.

Man: Well it says in extent, networks create robust obfuscating service delivery infrastructures. I am not sure what that is supposed to mean.

Avri Doria: Hm, that is right. Let me see. Fast Flux service has create robust obfuscating service delivery infrastructures that make it difficult. I think they are saying that network infrastructures do obfuscate.

Man: I would say change create to are because the networks do not create them. They are that.

Man: They are robust. I see. And then they obfuscate service delivery infrastructures.

Man: You can say robust...

Man: I would say probably put a full stop after infrastructures.

Man: You can put robust and office scanning service delivery network.

Avri Doria: And is reasonable a word (smith). And then you are suggesting a period after infrastructures, and then you would go they make it difficult, because you would not want a that beginning that sentence.

Man: I am flexible on whatever you want to do on that.

Avri Doria: Okay (Marika), would you adjust a - but yes, I think that is a vi - making shorter sentences is always a good thing. It almost always makes things clearer.

            The Fast Flux service network are robust obfuscating service infrastructures period. They make it difficult etcetera. And then mark this as change so that we can confirm it on our next pass through.

(Marika):   So just to confirm, are we taking out delivery as well? Did I understand that correctly?

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) delivery, no, no, no, no, no. We are not.

(Marika):   Okay, so the only...

Avri Doria: I just glanced over (unintelligible).

(Marika):   ...the only chances for create and then a full (unintelligible) infrastructure then these make it difficult, or they make it difficult.

Avri Doria: Yes.

(Marika):   Okay.

Avri Doria: Right. And as I say, mark it so that we can confirm it next time.

(Marika):   I will do so.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I know I am being redundant, but. Okay, I see the number has gone up on emails to 39 now it says 700. I am sure it will go up again although at any point at which we stop saying over, you know, I think it will be fine. But of course, if we were to hit 1000 then it would be interesting, but I do not think we will.

Okay, as I say, this section will have to have something added that describes the how to identify what text is agreement, what text is support and what text is alternative view.

At the moment, it is set off by bullets where the first word is either the (subpart) or alternative agreement, I mean alternative view.

It may be that putting these things in boxes ends up a way to do it and I think we can leave that for later and see how it works. In fact as we are going through the pass today, people can look at the places where those things are bulleted and see if they think it works for them.

Members of the group, okay. We have the text 255, 258 which last time we thought was okay but I want to confirm. Any issues? Okay, the change we did make last time for anyone who was not here is we added our employers to what had already been excessive there.

Okay, we cleaned up some names in the table. People are responsible for making sure their entry in the table is correct.

Man: No, I see mine is not correct, so.

Avri Doria: Okay, well then send (Marika) a correction of what yours should be.

Man: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Basically what you (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible), yes.

Avri Doria: We are all responsible for our own issues there. I got mine corrected. Okay, 266. There is an addition, a working group was supported by the following ICANN staff members, Glen, (Liz) and (Marika). Does that sound is that acceptable? Okay, be accepted.

Moving on...

Man: Can I stop you at 282 please?

Avri Doria: I figured. Yes.

Man: Yes, these notes, I am just - I feel like maybe the working group has gone beyond these notes now. These are old and not relevant. I would strike the entire note.

Avri Doria: Any other comments on striking the entire note?

Man: I would support that.

Avri Doria: Anybody have any objections?

Man: Yes, so do I.

Avri Doria: Anybody have an issue with it? Okay, please put a line through it and we will confirm it at the next pass.

                  Okay. Moving on. In other words, mark it for deletion, but. Okay, 309 through 317 was discussed last time and is there any issue with accepting it?

                  Now, line 319 through 322 is new text.

Man: I missed one thing there for a second, on 317 I think it should be Web servers, just a missing S.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Is that it? Okay, thank you.

                Okay, so then line 319 through 322 is new text. Any discussion on the new text?

                Okay, then we will leave the new text in but leave it marked as a change so that we can confirm it on the next pass.

                Three twenty-four through 327 is text mark as support. Here it has been put as a subordinate bullet showing that there is support. Now one of the things I was not sure of and I am looking for opinion is is the word support enough or should there be a phrase for there was support for colon. And that is just a question.

                And then the other would be an alternative view was presented colon, or something like that, or is just support alternative view sufficient and, I just want to make sure these things are there, are well represented and stand out so no one mistakes the level of statement is accurate.

                Okay, any issue with accepting the support statement?

Man: Should there be bullets or dashes before the two sub-elements?

Avri Doria: Makes a certain amount of sense. (Marika) what do you think?

(Marika):   Yes I would agree because I think it is a...

Avri Doria: They are support.

(Marika):   ...support drive to the previous one so perhaps I can put in dashes.

Avri Doria: Okay 329 through 333 was discussed last time. Any issues before accepting it?

Man: Isn't that first sentence the same as the first sentence of the support statement above? Elements of the attack network run on compromised computers. Isn't that the same as distribution and use of software (unintelligible) on host without notice?

Man: I think it...

Man: Well...

Man: ...emphasizes it because all of the previous ones were...

Man: (Unintelligible) where I was going with it but support I feel like maybe that is weak. I thought we had consensus on at least that first part.

Avri Doria: Well there is two things. I think what is listed on the support is sort of a declarative statement, whereas this one has the - it is a characteristic. And it is a softer statement than the one that says there are elements of an attack network running on the compromised computers, so one does seem likely strong to another from my reading.

Man: Okay.

Avri Doria: Whereas this statement is it is among - there are several characteristics. This is one of the important characteristics. And it is one of the things that distinguish and goes onto.

Man: Yes, I agree 329 through 333 is important and should remain. I just
              question whether 325 undermines it somehow or makes it confusing.

Avri Doria: Yes. I read the one in 325 as saying that is always the case.

Man: I see.

Avri Doria: Whereas I read 329 as saying it is, you know.

Man: Okay.

Avri Doria: But we can come back to it. We, you know.

Man: All right. If it makes sense to you guys. It is just not, you know, I just
              was pointing it out as something...

Avri Doria: Right.

Man: ...that didn't make sense to me.

Avri Doria: Anyone else want to comment?

Man: I have got a comment on 333. Should resiliency be resilient?

Man: Yes.

Avri Doria: Any issue, any agreement, (unintelligible) reasonable change?

              What I recommend, since there is a question on 325, that that be left
              underlined and we see in the next pass whether there is a reason to -

whether there is a reason to come back and accept that so that we leave that question open.

Okay, and so we will change 333 to resilient, but we will accept the rest of the paragraph.

Man: Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Man: I am curious what is different in line 325 versus, let me flip back a page, line 293?

Man: There you go.

Man: Yes.

Avri Doria: Those two do seem quite similar.

Man: I think that what happened was at some - we suggested that line 325 be replacement text for line 293.

Man: Yes, I think I agree with (Derek). I think 325 should come out because it is addressed.

Avri Doria: So it is addressed now certainly in 293. Okay, in which case put a line through it and we will confirm it at the next pass. Is that okay (Marika)?

Man: And then (unintelligible) I believe that line 326 and 7 was intended as a substitution for line 315 because someone last week objected and rightly so to the sort of (pejorative) poor quality WHOIS.

Avri Doria: So you are saying that poor quality WHOIS should have a strike through it because there is support for WHOIS records are fortunately created.

Man: Right.

Man: See it goes beyond I think just having them being fraudulently created. In some cases they do not have stolen identities, they just have absolute gibberish in their for the data. And literally, poor quality is the only description that really fits.

Man: Poor quality can even be proxy WHOIS so they are not necessarily overlapping.

Man: Well I mean, I think what we are pointing out here is that neither of the two are yet sufficient because I think poor quality tends to invoke a notion of incompetence on the part of the people who are collecting and maintaining the WHOIS as well.

                        So what we want to do is, I mean, if we can certainly tease those two out if you like, but I believe that what Joe has, you know, is saying is very true. That there is a lot of characteristics that collectively help identify, you know, you know, a WHOIS response as, you know, as a registration record that is, you know, sufficient.

Man: Does that make sense?

Woman: It makes sense. And perhaps what you would do then is move the support statement, especially if it ends up only about WHOIS records who underneath the poor quality WHOIS.

          And now there is a poor quality WHOIS is I have also, if I forget to change my phone number when I move, or change a phone number, that makes it poor quality WHOIS, but that is certainly not what you are talking about.

Man: Right. We are, I mean...

Woman: Right.

Man: ...there is an assumption of intent here. And in fact we are talking a little bit about this in the (targress) we are writing about Section 5.4 where, you know, the composition of these records, you know, is intentionally wrong. And in some cases it is right at the beginning and then made intentionally wrong so that you hide the fact that you used a stolen credit card.

Avri Doria: Right, but there also may be intentionally poor quality WHOIS that has nothing to do with Fast Flux. It is just people that are lying on their WHOIS because of their own notions of privacy.

Man: Right.

Avri Doria: So how do we fix this to make it work for basically both getting the longer statement about fraudulent creation and the fact that the WHOIS is one of the possible parts of the single print, excuse me.

Man: And maybe worth noting, it is not even necessarily at time of creation. It can go ahead and be creative of perfectly valid stuff that actually gets verified by the Registrar, but then people will go in and actually change it using the direct Web interface that many Registrars now offer. And that in some ways is the harder thing to detect.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Man: Plus it could be fully accurate WHOIS like a P.O. Box in Nigeria that forwards to a company in France. It is accurate, but it is poor quality and it is not fraudulent.

Avri Doria: But really almost looks like we need to describe better what are some of the aspects of poor quality WHOIS and that what we have here may not be adequate.

Man: Given the length of time of the WHOIS debate though, I do not think anybody wants to open that kind of worm.

Avri Doria: I understand that, believe me. Like I said, I do not feel too bad about the WHOIS debates since I do not know anyone in the world that solves this particular issue.

                So would a compromise be to keep poor quality WHOIS and then move the support, especially if we are striking the first line of the support as a sub-bullet there that says WHOIS reference are fraudulently created or altered, and leave it at that?

Man: I can live with that.

Avri Doria: That works for others?

Man: Yes.

Avri Doria: Okay does that make sense (Marika)?

(Marika):   Yes. You just want to move this up under the poor quality (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Right. On the poor quality move up...

(Marika):   Yes.

Avri Doria: ...report, and WHOIS records are fraudulently created, and then we added or altered.

(Marika):   But still leave it as a support issue.

Avri Doria: Still leave it as a support, right.

(Marika):   Okay, will do.

Avri Doria: And leave it as change so that we can come back to it again and make sure that it still works for people.

(Marika):   Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. And we will have put a line through elements of the attack run on compromise computers and we will just confirm that that is supposed to be deleted next time. Okay. Moving on.

Okay, we have another note here at 345. Is this another one of those notes that needs to be struck?

Man: I believe so.

Avri Doria: Anyone have issues on it? And as I say, this notes, if there is content from these notes that still belongs in the report, then it probably goes down towards the bottom where we are talking about conclusions and next steps. Any issues? Okay then, please put the strike through and we will confirm next time.

Next thing I find is 375. Agreement statement was talked about last time. Is it confirmed? Okay.

Then the next thing, we have an alternative viewpoint. Any issues with that in terms of modifying an alternative viewpoint? We would obviously need the person that is putting the alternative viewpoint there to agree with whatever we changed.

Man: Was there any (unintelligible) clarification what is meant by private DNS networks?

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible). I mean I do not know who put in this alternate viewpoint, but...

Man: I am just not sure what is meant by that statement and I figure if I do not get it, I figure probably we - a couple other people will not get it either.

Avri Doria: Right. Well, I thought privacy NS networks were closed off networks that were not part of the Internet and had their own DNS and had a gateway between themselves and whatever else was being dealt with, kind of like 20th century...

Man: I is almost like abbreviation for networks that lend, you know, their own DNS or an internal DNS.

Avri Doria: Right. Well yeah, I (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Man: That be (unintelligible) we operated.

Avri Doria: Huh?

Man: That works best (unintelligible) operate DNS?

Avri Doria: I would, I - who - is the person whose alternate viewpoint it is on the call because as I say, I would be cautious about changing an alternative viewpoint without the alternate viewpoint key.

Man: That is correct.

Man: It is not a big deal. I just figured if it was something that was confusing to me.

Avri Doria: I would recommend leaving it, but it may be worth (Marika) if you know who the viewpoint is to check with them if they want to amplify.

(Marika):   I need to check back in the survey who made a comment, but I will do so and then check with that person if they agree to that change.

Avri Doria: It would be privately operated. DNS networks would be a reasonable change if that is what they meant. They say yes, alternate viewpoint pretty much belongs to the person that wanted it put there.

Man: Doing a Google search for private DNS networks do not show any matches. Looks like it is like people that are running their own route basically, which...

Avri Doria: Yes...

Man: ...(unintelligible).

Avri Doria :   they would (Beasley) on the preview of ICANN. I am not sure everyone agrees, but anyway. Okay. There is a change there in 41, oh there was a deletion. Needs to be confirmed. And then 412.

Man: So 409 and 410 are repeats of 410 and 411, the sentence is stated twice.

Man: Nice catch.

Woman: Yes, I think (gradding) is just one of those is probably adequate.

Man: And then, I mean, is it a possible minority view or is this going to be somebody's alternative view? What is this?

Avri Doria: Well it is being listed as - it is actually reasonable because it is listed as an alternate view.

Man: That is - I think that is right.

Avri Doria: If someone is making it, I mean, and (Marika) you would be able to answer that. A possible minority view is that no one is making it, but some people in the group think that there may be someone in the world that would make it. So it is not really an alternate view of someone in the group, it is just (sumly) stated.

Man: I actually want to get...

Avri Doria: An alternate view is somebody in the group is saying this.

Man: You can tack my name onto it.

Avri Doria: Okay, then I would mark it as an alternate view.

Man: Actually I think that it - now that I am reading this, I think that that was actually the majority view of the group compared to what is here in the text from 402 to 405 which I would characterize as an alternative view actually.

Man: Weren't these connected by polls though, so...

Avri Doria: Yes. And I...

Man: ...get the poll results (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: ...definitely do not want to go back on - it looks like that that has been something that has been in agreement for quite a while. And I definitely, as part of not reconsidering things that have been stable for a while, would be loathe to touch it, whereas possible minority view is the kind of thing that is not unreasonable to...

Man: Okay, well I think then that this probably raises the level of support rather than an alternative view. In other words, I think there was broad support for this, but there was really no evidence presented to support this view.

Man: I am (ora teasement) out and note there are two different views in that paragraph. Actually one saying that there is basically not evidence, and the other one saying that the folks would be reluctant to go ahead and describe it for obvious reasons, so there is really two alternates or alternatives or whatever.

Avri Doria: Right, there is actually three because some people are saying and there is a third technique, which is (tore). So how would you (unintelligible).

Man: Just would agree what we could do is try to combine them all into a statement that can be - that can have consensus.

Man: Part of the problem with this group though is you cannot necessarily change things by attrition, that, you know, a lot of the people are not participating anymore.

Man: Right. Well 402 to 415 though I do think can be basically boiled together into something that we would all agree on. At least those that are still participating.

                Those who are not, you know, that is just too bad. There is not much we can do about that.

Avri Doria: Well I do think we need to keep the content, make sure that the points of view are still represented.

Man: Well...

Avri Doria: If you can suggest a alternate for 402 or 415, we could look at it the next time we talk through.

Man: Okay so we are basically from 400 to 415. Do people on the call at least agree with me that we can probably boil that down to some language that we can all agree on?

Avri Doria: I think it could certainly be worth (mist). I mean I think you have to be careful about putting too much weight, and I just know what point of view people might take putting too much weight on a lack of evidence. In other words, people are hiding. There is a lack of evidence that they are hiding or they may be hiding well.

                So, you know, I think you are definitely right, we have to strike the repeat of the line. That is the easy change.

Man: Right.

Avri Doria: I think the rest of it could actually just be done with alternative views and then list them as three bullets. Some indicated that there is a lack of evidence to support this.

Bullet techniques such as Fast Flux are often used by groups to avoid discovery and then thirdly, you know, other group members point out that operators and network (unintelligible) category understandably less than any information about these networks will always be difficult to obtain.

And if you would just put as alternative views those three as bullets, it may just work.

Man: So the problem is I feel like it is minimizing those views when actually they were supported by the majority of the group.

Avri Doria: Well two of those views are contradictory. In one sentence you are saying some indicated that there is a lack of evidence and as a counter to that, you will have some people saying that yes there is a lack of evidence because people in this category are understandably reticent.

So you are not going to get evidence. So you have got two of these that are oppositional statements. And then you have got a third one that says and some people may hide by using (tor). So...

Man: The third part is just basically irrelevant to us I think, but...

Avri Doria: Well but there is other techniques, yes. I am just giving an example.

Man: (Face) is relevant.

Avri Doria: Yes. So I think what we have here is three alternative views. Two of which are in contradictance to each other and it is probably just worth listing them as such.

                And if we put them as three bullets, then they would be more visible. And as first bullets, some indicated that there is a lack of evidence. Second bullet, some point out that operators of networks in this category are understandably reticent. Those two views are in counter to each other.

                Third, some have pointed out that techniques other than Fast Flux are used by these groups to avoid discovery. And then you have covered it all. You have not deleted any points of view. You have brought them out so that they are visible and...

Man: Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay, so...

Man: Better than what we have now.

Avri Doria: So (Marika) will you have that - and then have that obviously as something that we need to look at again once it is done.

(Marika):   Okay.

Avri Doria :   Thank you. And you could work smith in so that they are sort of equivalent weights in terms of some indicated, some indicated, some indicated.

(Marika):   Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks.

Man: Right, then one other comment on this is the link to the email threat that is in the text there at line 405, wasn't there also a subsequent email from you Joe that further explained what was going on with that (oktra reet) site and that it wasn't really Fast Flux.

Man: There was, and I can probably try and find that one and send it along to (Marika) as well.

Man: I think that should definitely be included in it as well. In other words, I jut think this is factually wrong the way it is stated right now.

Man: Mike?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes.

Greg Aaron: I (posted) some information to the group last week and the (ultra reach) actually does meet the definition.

Mike Rodenbaugh: All right. So I am guess hearing Greg and you and Joe do not agree on that point right?

Greg Aaron: Yes.

Mike Rodenbaugh: That w should just make sure we have the balance documented.

Avri Doria: What you might want to do is take that one out of the mainline text and put it in a footnote with the other two emails. A discussion of this can be found in dot, dot, and dot. That work?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Think so.

Greg Aaron: Sure.

Avri Doria: Okay (Marika)?

(Marika): Yes, thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay. Moving down to 430. This was a statement. This is marked as a sum statement and yet has not been set off as a sum and then we have an alternate view below.

So this one probably needs to be set off in the same way and support statement is that correct?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Is there anyone who disagrees with this? This is going in as a standard text, not an alternate view, right?

Man: Yes, I think we should just delete the phrase some in the working group would point.

Man: Yes, I am just trying - that is exactly what I am asking. So you are...

(Marika):   I think that is a correct assessment because I think on the - when we did the poll I think everyone agreed with the statement.

Avri Doria: Okay.

(Marika):   It was just in the original phrasing it was put some in the working group, so.

Avri Doria: Okay, so then fine. So then eliminate the some because it is the some that makes it look to me like it is a support statement as opposed to the...

Man: So it is just when they (come) in actually. It is the first two words needs to go.

Avri Doria: The working group points out or would point out. Okay, any issue with that? Okay. So the rest of this can be marked as accepted, but do leave the deletion of some of the working group as a mark for deletion, but still there so we can go through next time just in case there is anyone that is not on this call at the moment, but that have an issue with that change.

              Okay, any other comments? And then stepping down to 451? I actually like the lifting alternative view in relation to the previous paragraph as a way of delineating it.

              Okay? Well then that is accepted and the only thing that we will up for approval next time is the deletion of some (inch). Okay.

Then we have some new language 463 to 468, which the group does not suggest that mitigating Fast Flux attack would eliminate the need for attributes for law enforcement work, nor do we intend to saturate the benefits of this attach technique would be malefactors by calling detailed attention to the car.

Either we call attention to these text in a markedly strong matter to emphasis the Fast Flux attack has considerable influence and information in the (thickethy) of harmful activity. And that was basically a - several people worked on that paragraph as a sort of replacement for somewhat mangled wording that was there before. Any issue with that one?

Okay, then we will leave it there for - remove the highlighting but leave it underlined for confirmation of the next go through.

And we have a note.

Man: Read the note.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) still true.

Man: I do not think the note is still true.

Avri Doria: Do we have a robust technical process and technical and process definition of Southbrook. I am not sure what a robust definition is, but there is certainly definition.

Man: I think the note was put in there at the time where we were not answering the questions, so we later decided we would answer the questions.

Avri Doria: Okay. I am just checking through, do we have reliable techniques (unintelligible) and they have certainly been mentioned and as (wow) maintaining in the (unintelligible).

Man: Let us keep these in the (unintelligible) frame where.

Avri Doria: Huh?

Man: I would keep these - those words in the document somewhere because, you know, some of the techniques are imperical and I wouldn't apprise those as nearly robust, so.

Avri Doria: All right, so in other words, while there have been answers on definitions, are those definitions robust technical in process? Are the techniques reliable? Certainly there has not been definition of reliable techniques.

             There is pointing to techniques to the fingerprints, to the whatever reliable information on the scope and penetration, reliable information.

             But we may want to change the first line in terms of did not answer the following charter questions.

Man: I think we have some data that is also just pending in the queue. I do not know whether or not that is going to be cleared in time for a draft or not, but there is some data out there.

Man: Well it should all be included in the report as it is perceived as of today.

Avri Doria: Well, as I say, we are still going to be working on the report. The report is not going to be ready for this meeting. And I mean, we have known that. But I am hoping that we at least have some text that is fairly clear, even if it indicates still further work. But then we go on to answer those questions.

Man: Yes, and I think all these issues are discussed in the text below anyway.

Avri Doria: And it may be possible to substitute the first line, the working group did not answer the following charter questions. Obviously that is wrong because it did attempt an answer.

                You know, and perhaps something to the effect of the working group has given initial answers to the following questions, however, more information may be available concerning, you know, and then the following bullets, or something like that.

Man: Or was unable to consent to this because...

Avri Doria: Well basically it is also seems to me that it is more than just a reach consensus because there is a lot of stuff there that has consensus over some stuff that does not. It is that, it is more work is required.

                So in other words, it is kind of like the working group had working answers to the following questions, to the following charter questions,

however more work is required due to now work in progress on. How is that?

Man: That seems reasonable.

Avri Doria: Does that mitigate it? Well the working group has given initial answers to the following charter questions, however more - I cannot remember what I said.

Man: It may help to know that the notes were originally introduced by the formered share at one point.

Man: Yes, they were really introduced a long time ago. I think the event just passed the notes by.

Avri Doria: Like well some people though in the group are sort of saying, and even in reading through these, you know, as I say, what is a robust definition. We have working definition.

Man: Well yes but...

Avri Doria: And what is a reliable technique to do the test? Well you have talked about fingerprints, you have talked about whatever things, but have you really dealt with the whole notion of maintaining acceptable rates of both positives and everything in that.

So the questions are probably still useful. Further work is required on these things. And that is what I understood somebody to be saying.

Man: Maybe that is an alternative view that belongs somewhere else, but I do not think it belongs as a note at the head of the section.

Avri Doria: Any other comments on that?

Man: Well it definitely belongs somewhere in the document.

Avri Doria: Now why wouldn't it belong as a note before the questions, if these are only questions? And in fact I have noticed that just, you know, some of these like 5 4 are, you know, wording is still coming in, so, or some other. Maybe it is in a different section I am thinking of. I guess...

Man: When you think of the...

Avri Doria: I do not get (pumped)...

Man: ...when you think of the head of the sect...

Avri Doria: ...sorry, go ahead.

Man: At the head of the section, I think it gives it an awful lot of emphasis and probably more weight than it really has at this point. I do agree that it should be there as an alternate view of some sort perhaps.

Man: I mean a lot this stuff really is discussed a lot. There is talk of the definition. There is talk about false positives. There is talk about the scope and penetration of the network. And there is plenty of information about the impact of the network. I just disagree with the content of that as well.

Avri Doria: Yes, I understand that. I am not quite sure what else you would do with that note.

Man: Unless somebody wants to support it, that is true.

Avri Doria: Well there has been support for keeping it. I mean, there is definitely a statement by at least one person saying that belongs in here somewhere.

                 So if it belongs in here somewhere, the question becomes where, if not here? So say it may be a footnote.

Man: I would not put it in a footnote.

Avri Doria: You would not or would?

Man: I would not. It would need to be highlighted more than that.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Man: I mean people have left the task force because of, you know, not being able to necessarily agree with the work group and any of those who were supporters of that statement.

Avri Doria: Right. Okay.

Man: Like (Eric) group, (Eric Williams), I cannot remember the name.

Avri Doria: Oh okay.

Man: He would be one of the people I think that would agree with that.

Man: And I actually think we should keep it in the main body of the text as well just because we want to encourage more research here. We have data. We have information. We do not have it all. We do not know the full picture of what is going on. I really do not want to discourage as we got more.

Man: True.

Avri Doria: Okay so, perhaps something as - the note you can basically change the character of the note. And that was the wording that I was trying to come up with before on the fly, is first of all the working group, no, offers the following working answers.

                  I am writing this down while I am saying it so I do not forget it as soon as it is out of my mouth. The following working answers.

Dave Piscitello: No need to - Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Dave Piscitello: This is Dave.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Dave Piscitello: The part of the note that confuses me most is the part that says the work just did not answer the following charter questions because I think we are entering charter questions...

Avri Doria: Yes, exactly.

Dave Piscitello: ...by the time we finish. I mean, I, you know.

Avri Doria: And that is what I am trying to basically - I think that...

Dave Piscitello: Well, I had a suggestion.

Avri Doria: Oh great.

Dave Piscitello: I sensed that we can say, and preserve this what they are here saying that the working group, you know, does believe that, you know, continued work is necessary in the following areas, a robust technical and process definition of Fast Flux as an example, because I think we have a good technical definition, but I am not certain that we have a process definition.

In the second one, again I think that we have some techniques that some people argue have a very low rate of false positives, other people are not convinced, so more work is needed there. And I think we can go on each bullet.

So I think that this is just identifying, you know, you know, that as the working group answer these questions we feel that the following areas should be considered as subject of ongoing work.

Avri Doria: Okay. So you are basically saying something like the working group does provide initial answers to the following questions. They believe that further work can be done in the following areas.

Dave Piscitello: Exactly, that would, I think, preserve the spirit of what's said there.

Woman: Okay, (Marika) did you catch that?

(Marika): Yes, I did.

Woman: Okay, is that okay with others? And of course, we'll come back to it like any change we're making today before the next time. And it doesn't need to be a note then, does it or does it? Or is it just inline discussion paragraph?

Man: You know, if we're gonna put down what you just proposed I'm comfortable with it being, you know, part of the main body.

Woman: Okay.

Man: It could go into the conclusion perhaps. It's definition one of the...

Woman: Well, why don't we try leaving it here for now, not as a note but inline text and see how it looks?

Man: I mean, wasn't this identical inline text and multiple places like...

Woman: That's true; we could also put it in the conclusion. Okay, is that good for now and then we'll review it again? So not as a note, not as italics, with the new wording with the four bullets remaining as they are.

Okay, moving on, the next comments I got are 536-537, a couple of examples, GLBA and the HIPAA.

Man: What line was that?

Woman: 536-537, basically someone included, "May be affected by specific loss. For example..." and then it was spelling out what GLBA and what HIPAA were I believe so that should be fine, I would assume. Issue? Then we have 542-548. Issue?

                Okay, so that would be accepted. Then we have a support statement inserted 554-575, it was one that was discussed last time, highlighted and supported statement. Any issue?

Man: Are there two separate supported sections there? So there's one that basically start 554 and then is there another one that starts on 559? Does that have like a paragraph there or something?

(Marika):   I just know that as well, I think it should be separated out. (Unintelligible) for that.

Woman: Okay, then we added (work) service providers, 577, their domain name issues there. And we have 581-589 which was discussed last time and is now acceptable. Accepted? 594-602, issues? Accepted?

                Okay, 613-617 a support statement bulleted out. Issues? Accepted? 621-624, (unintelligible) accepting it?

                Okay, 626-627, accepting it?

Man: Seems kind of weird to have 627 in there. Did that fall in from some other place?

Woman: Was it left over from some previous discussion? Well...

Man: I think it is.

Woman: Look at it.

Man: We addressed short TTL's up above so maybe this could be deleted?

Woman: And also the...

(Marika): I think it should be a separate heading, like who benefits from user (unintelligible) the title. That should be, that's why it was confusing.

Woman: And then the short TTL's are just an introductory into that section and then you've got the numbered techniques of people who are using short - aren't they?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Yeah, and then you have a couple of examples of legitimate uses, correct? Not legitimate uses but who benefits from various uses. So, yeah, I think that should just be a header and then...

Man: Should 632 be at a (dotted quad) an IP address because under (IPV) 6 they're not (clause) they're longer, I think.

Woman: So...

Man: What's that?

Man: For 632, (dotted quad) does that work in an (IPV) 6 world?

Woman: Yeah, is anybody doing a (unintelligible) in an (IPV) 6 world? Yes.
            (Quad a) (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) know.

Woman: Right.

Man: But the IP addresses are no longer (quad).

Woman: So you might just put (IPV) 4 in parenthesis behind it, (IPV) 4
            (unintelligible).

Man: IP address I think would be fine there. I mean, it really does have the
            potential to show up in either place even though it's not there now. I
            think the point's a good point, it's just casual usage. I think I was
            actually the guilty party.

Woman: Right. I can't imagine anybody doing...

            Okay, yeah, and probably and just for the readers it's probably - so
            you're recommending getting rid of (quad dotted quad) or just targeting
            an IP address, replace (dotted quad) with targeting an IP address?

Man: Correct.

Woman: Okay, any objections?

Man: That would be correct.

Woman: Okay. And 641-45, any issues? Accepted?

Man: I think also (FQDN) we haven't defined anywhere else before. That's the first (unintelligible).

Woman: Okay, if that's the first one then the (unintelligible) probably should say...

Man: It's the only one, actually.

Woman: ...fully qualified domain name for the first year, such as that's the first usage. (Unintelligible). Okay, 41-45 then no issues? 647-48? Issues? Okay, 666-671, any issues?

Man: I think we should have similar language at 674, shouldn't we, about registrars?

Woman: There's new language being worked on for 54 and 55 that we...

Man: Okay.

Woman: ...54 has been being discussed on, I guess they're both being worked on in the background but they're not quite ready yet. So I guess they'll show up in another version of this. So there will be language.

Man: Thanks.

Woman: Okay? Now as I understand the 5.4 language might be almost ready and the 5.5 language is still pending.

Man: That's right.

Man: Correct.

Woman: Okay, thanks. 5.6, okay, 679, okay, we start out with 679-687
                introductory paragraph. Any issues? Okay, 689-700.

Man: 689 should be rendered as a heading.

Woman: I think it is, isn't it? Oh, okay, you mean it's not in the right spot for a
                heading, okay. Yeah. Because it's set off like a heading, it's just not
                rendered. Thank you. 691, okay, then at 702 we have a support
                statement.

Man: Wait a minute, what is 703 and 704?

Woman: That's what I'm trying to figure out now.

Man: The way it works is there was a series of paragraphs essentially
                formed sort of a narrative and some of the paragraphs were accepted
                and some of the ones because of how it was voted only received
                support.

                So logically if it had been accepted or rejected as a block it would all
                have been one thing. But as it is there's some chunks, you know, that
                people didn't like, some chunks they did like.

Woman: And if I understand correctly this whole indented section though 741 is
                the stuff that got support but not full agreement.

Man: Correct.

Woman: So it seems reasonable. We might want to say a little bit more on the support link, there was support, you know, for the following issues.

(James):   Avri, this is (James).

Woman: Hi.

(James):   Hi, I don't mean to backtrack too far but you mentioned that someone is drafting language for 5.4?

Woman: Yes.

(James):   Who is that someone?

Man: It's (Dave Kisketella), (Rod Rasmus) and (Joe Sansalve).

(James):   Okay.

Man: You know, and it's just draft language which is obviously going to be a first cut.

Woman: Right, and then it'll be floated once that - I think the process we're following is once the three that were drafting it were comfortable with their first cut it would be put on the mailing list and then it would be folded into the document and then it would get passed over - not passed over but it would be discussed in several passes of the document like we're doing with everything else.

(James):   All right.

Woman: Is that okay?

(James):   I guess we'll see what they come back with.

Woman: Right, yeah, I mean, basically the last time it was sort of looking for volunteers to, you know, create language for the empty spot as a first place and then something we'll start talking though.

(James):   Okay, understood then. Sorry for taking us out of sequence there.

Woman: Oh, that's quite all right. No, anytime a question comes up that, you know, better to cover them, thanks.

Man: And not to speak on behalf of the other participants in that little drafting group, other volunteers are always welcome. If you missed it last time and want to join now I don't think there's anything that's blocked in stone. So...

Man: I mean, if you want I'll just copy you on the version that I'm about to pass one more time, pass (Robin) and (Joe) and (Marika). Your input is more than welcome.

(James):   That would be great, thank you.

Man: Sure, that was (James), right?

(James):   Right.

Woman: Yeah.

Man: Okay.

Man: Yeah, (unintelligible) to the list to, would you?

Man: Who was that?

(Paul Diaz):   (Paul Diaz).

Man: Okay, so (Paul).

Man: Thanks, (unintelligible).

Woman: So we're almost at the point where...

Man: Thanks, (Dave).

Woman: ...where, you know, as I say, it's gonna then go on the mailing list to -
            okay. So any issue with the 702-741 support statement? I've got a
            question on those heading things. It looks like - they're like single word
            things where there's a connecting space between each of the two
            words.

Man: They should all be rendered as headings, ideally.

Woman: Right, as subheadings but there wouldn't be an underline connecting
            them so that they're one word would there?

Man: Correct, that was just a way of trying to denote that in the original text given I didn't have the ability to show a word processing markup.

Woman: Okay, great, thanks.

Woman: Yeah, and there's something I just need to change. It was just copy and paste from the original proposal.

Man: Okay, I just wanted to make sure. Thank you.

All right, the 735-736, that's not how that - okay, coming down to 743. That was test that was previously agreed on although at 754 there's still, "Insert suitable illustration here showing reverse proxy setup here." So we either need to remove the note and insert a picture or remove the note and not insert a picture as people don't have a picture or don't think a picture is necessary.

Man: I'll find a picture.

Woman: You'll find a picture? Okay, great.

Man: I think maybe it'll be better to link to a picture because the document gets very big once we start including graphics. It can be nice and tight once it's only the text.

Man: I'm flexible either way. I'll provide a link and folks can sort out what they want to do.

Woman: Right, unless - yeah, somebody does an embedded picture and makes it fairly small as opposed to adding all the details of the picture. Okay.

Man: I've got a question.

Woman: Sure.

Man: The first two sentences of 745-748...

Woman: Yeah.

Man: ...they don't seem to read in a sensible manner. They start out, "Spammers actually replicated" and then the next one says, "That would be too complex."

Man: It should actually say, "Spammers do not actually replicate all the hundreds or thousands."

Man: All right, that's what I thought, right.

Woman: Yeah, okay.

Man: It's sort of missing a "do not" in the Ten Commandments or something.

Woman: That's why I've had all those problems with sinning all my life.

Man: And I.

Woman: Now I understand. Okay, so you caught that (Marika)?

(Marika):   Yeah.

Woman: That'd be one change and so - and leave that sentence high-lit, but underlined so that we can confirm next time. Okay, any other issues going down through 754? Okay, 756 I assume that's the markup about headers - I mean, headings again? And 758-772, any issues?

Okay, 774-785, any issues? They have been (unintelligible). Okay, and 787 is a support. I actually like this way of indicating support as opposed to the one that was (followed) before where it was one support with three paragraphs. Here it's a support for paragraph and that might be a better (unintelligible) than we have, 816 which would get its own (word). Each one of these headings having a support preceding it just for clarity, I think is good.

Any issue on 787-804? Okay, issue on 806-814? Okay, I think it would be good if there was a support before 816. Any issue on 816-827? All right, then we have an alternate view. Any issue on 829-837? Okay, on to another support.

Woman: Hey.

Man: Hello, (hon), how are you?

Woman: 839-856, any issues? Okay, that's accepted. 858-865, and conclusion statement. Issues? (Unintelligible).

Okay, 872 there's a note.

Man: Excuse me, actually I think there's a misspelling on 862.

Woman: 862 a misspelling? (Unintelligible).

Man: Struggle.

Woman: Struggle has two g's? Is that the one?

Man: Yeah, I think so.

Woman: Okay. Now, I mean, on a lot of those things it's good that you catch them but there obviously has to be a words missing, cleanup grammar, spelling (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Just letting you know I'm awake.

Woman: Huh?

Man: Just letting you know I'm awake.

Woman: No, I think it's great. When you see it, it's good.

Man: On that line fast flux is one word where in other places it's two words.

Woman: Yes, that one (Marika) point out that she - got to have consistency. Is there consensus in the group, is fast flux two words?

Man: Two words.

Woman: Two words. Do we have...

Man: The only thing I'd make if we're going ahead and having it be a conjoined word or whatever, or one word anyhow, is I'm sure Google is a whole lot better that way, you don't have to do the quotes and stuff to try and tease it out.

Man: Google says two words.

Woman: I see, so we don't necessarily have the consensus on one word or two words yet.

Man: Google says (unintelligible).

Woman: Google says it's one word?

Man: No, Google says it's two words.

Woman: Oh, if Google says it's two words then I'm sure - I just got a new (G1) and I believe that Google tells truth.

Man: I propose an alternate view of (F) flux.

Woman: Alternate view of, excuse me?

Man: No.

Woman: Oh, yes, put that at the beginning in terms of usage that there's support for fast flux as two words but an alternate view has it as one word. I think that would be silly beyond belief but hey.

Okay, 872 though 879, I assume that this note has the same sort of treatment or is this note still valid?

Man: Not valid.

Woman: Any other comments?

Man: Why do you say not valid?

Man: Because we've certainly reached consensus on the existence of negative effects of fast flux, lots of them, we just spent pages discussing them or agreeing on them.

Man: Okay, the second half of the note is about summarizing the ideas that were discussed by the working group and I think the second half of the note is valid.

Woman: Okay, would it be a note or would it just be the first paragraph of the section?

Man: Could be.

Woman: I mean, this section, I mean it's a reasonable line to have at the beginning of a section, this section summarizes the ideas, etc. "The working group wishes to emphasize that in until fast flux it's better defined and researched," and we before had a note about better definition and research, "they're insufficient underpinnings to recommend any of these. They are presented here as a draft to record incremental progress."

So is there agreement on removing note though this section and promoting this section to just a regular paragraph? Any issue with that? Okay, if not, (Marika) would you line though the first part and promote the second part but leaving it marked as a change?

(Marika): Yeah.

Man: I mean, I guess I still am a little concerned, that's a good incremental step, but I'm still a little concerned that the conclusion here there are insufficient underpinnings to recommend any of these ideas. I don't think that the majority of the group would agree with that. I would be happy if it said - I don't know. I don't know if the working group wishes to emphasize this at all.

Man: I think that really dates from our former Chair.

Man: Exactly.

Woman: (Unintelligible) and others, you're accepting the first statement, this section summarizes the ideas that were discussed by the working group?

Man: Yes, I can accept that statement.

Woman: Got one statement down.

Man: The other two sentences I don't agree with.

Woman: Well, we have had a discussion earlier that sort of indicated that there is cause still for better definition and more research on solutions especially.

Man: And I think the idea of the note was to emphasize that these are ideas that were discussed, these aren't necessarily all...

Woman: Right.

Man: ...endorsed.

Woman: What about if we just removed the - in essence, you went, "The working group wishes to emphasize that fast flux needs better definitions and more research. These ideas are presented here as a draft to record incremental progress." Remove the "insufficient underpinnings" the "recommendees" but not go so far as to say, "And all of these are recommended at this point." Does that help any?

Man: Yes, it helps a little.

Woman: But all the incremental steps on.

(Greg):   This is (Greg), I just - I wanted to be clear to the readers somehow that these aren't necessarily endorsed and there may be widely divergent ideas on how good these ideas may be.

Woman: So the edit that I just mentioned would that give that - would that leave that sufficiently for you?

Man: Okay, can you repeat it again?

Woman: Okay, "This section summarizes the ideas, (unintelligible), solutions, that were discussed by the working group. The working group wishes to emphasize that fast flux needs better definition and more research. These ideas are presented here as a draft to record incremental progress."

Man: Okay, works for me.

Woman: And will that be okay for you, (Mike)?

(Mike):   I think so.

Woman: Okay, thanks. We'll obviously have it to discuss next time though. (Marika), did you catch that?

(Marika):   Not completely but I'll check on the recording.

Woman: Right, okay. I can tell you quickly one note though working group, I mean, work though it, with it, is lined out. Next sentence stands. "The working group wishes to emphasize that," the word "until" is dropped, "that fast flux needs better definition and more research."

               Then scratch out or line though, "There are insufficient underpinnings to recommend any of these." Dash and then capital sentence, "These are presented here as a draft to record incremental progress."

(Marika):   Okay.

Woman: Okay, thanks. Okay, moving on. We get to a support statement in 903-908. Any issues? Okay, get to 944-946 a bullet, any issues? Okay, and we get to a note again, again, it's not true that we didn't answer them, there are answers.

Man: I have a question on 903.

Woman: Okay, sure.

Man: When it says support...

Woman: It means it wasn't full agreement.

Man: Okay.

Woman: That there was support for the following statement.

Man: The following statement but not the idea.

Woman: I'm not sure what you mean.

Man: Where we're not advocating that ICANN require people to give up this data and so on.

Woman: I guess.

Man: Some members of the group were saying that.

Woman: Yeah, so that's why it's a support statement.

Man: Okay.

Woman: I guess support for both the statement and the idea.

Man: (Unintelligible) active engagement if it's a requirement though?

Man: Excuse me?

Man: I'm sorry, was that statement a requirement on behalf of registrars or is
            that optional? Because if it's optional it stays there but if it's required it
            would go to active engagement? This says, "rather private entities
            given bulk access." Who's gonna give it to them voluntarily? They're
            going to be required to be given or optional.

Woman: Right.

Man: If it's optional it stays there but if it's required then it goes into 915 like
            in that section.

Man: Okay, I see.

Man: Look at Section - well, Line 894, "Supporting it's approach that it would
            not require ICANN or decide what types of (unintelligible)," etcetera.
            There's no policy issues for (unintelligible).

Woman: Are you suggesting a change to this?

Man: Did we cut off (unintelligible)?

Woman: No, I don't think so. I think people are just reading it.

Man: Hello?

Woman: Hello? I don't think we're cut off. I can still hear you. Can you hear me?

Man: I can hear you.

Woman: Several people can hear me. So...

Man: I can hear you.

Woman: ...yeah, I don't think we're cut off. I think people are just thinking. So is there any recommendation for a change in this section, the 903-908? Is it really an indication that we need to support?

Man: Wasn't this one we voted on?

Woman: Yeah, it was one you voted on and it got support. So I'm taking this as support needs to say, "There was support for the following statement."

Man: The second sentence - or third last sentence, I guess goes back to the question the previous person asked, "ICANN, the registrars needs only provide bulk access, the required data always available."

Woman: That would be in the...

Man: (Unintelligible), this is going to be required or not.

Woman: ...case of.

Man: I think...

Woman: I'm not sure I see the issue.

Man: ...there is support for the, I mean, there is support that such a system might be technical possible or feasible.

Woman: Right.

Man: But it wasn't support that the group thinks that this should be done.

Woman: Yeah, and this is already in a section that's bracketed by, "These are just ideas that need further thought."

Man: Right.

Man: Right. So I think...

Woman: So this is double further thought, I think.

Man: I don't think it establishes a requirement per se.

Woman: No, I don't think any of these are establishing a requirement. I think that this has a dependent requirement that if one were to do some of these things and if this was something that they do, then they would need to consider a requirement that - it's sort of a second level down.

Man: Almost like a commentary on the first point.

Woman: Yeah.

Man: But if (unintelligible) monitor, for example, is already buying bulk WHOIS from TuCows, (unintelligible), GoDaddy, they could conceivably create a (unintelligible) based query system for WHOIS or domain tools could do the same.

Woman: Yeah. Okay? Moving on, we had a 926-927, ideas for active engagement, "We discussed putting the following, group did not reach consensus on or endorse any of them." Any issue with that statement? Okay, 944-46.

Man: Where did that text come from?

Woman: I don't have the history. Is it one of the ones that was voted on?

Woman: Sorry which one was that - 26 - 27?

Woman: Yep.

Man: No...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...(44 to 46).

Woman: Oh 44 to 46, yeah, I believe that was...

Man: That was voted on a meeting or two ago.

Woman: Yeah.

Man: It was one idea. It was proposed by the - it's mentioned in both the registry and registrar statement.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Okay so any issue with it?

Man: Well we've decapitalized (farming).

Woman: Oh okay. Okay and now we're back to 948 (note) which again has the lack of...

Man: Same note if you believe it.

Woman: That's not quite the same note in that the first four bullets are the same. It does have two additional bullets that the previous one didn't. (Got) the same issue in that if (answers) have been answered -- or at least initial answers have been given -- were (there)...

Woman: (Right).

Woman: ...two extra bullets that were not mentioned in the previous 54 and 55. And 510 does not have an answer yet. So in this case the note actually seems truer than it did in the previous one in that they're very incomplete answers. There's definitely no consensus. There's two support statements; no consensus statements and so on.

(The one) could almost say note, you know, these are...

((Crosstalk))

...Working Group considered the follow question but - you (think)?

Man: Avri?

Avri: Yeah.

(Dave):   This is (Dave) again. If, you know, the origin of these notes is finally coming back to me in trying to piece together the chronology and history of this Working Group.

             And at one point there was a proposal from the former Chairman that we would not complete the Working Group Charter. And we would indicate why in each of the sections.

             And so as placeholders (he) put each and every one of these notes in place saying we didn't do this because we couldn't come to consensus on what the definition was. We didn't have the data. We didn't, you know, there are people who objected to the need and the like.

Woman: (Yeah).

(Dave):   One of the things that this - the notes do is they sort of (direct) the legacy of how the Working Group performed as opposed to what the Working Group produced. And it might be worthwhile if, you know, either (I) or (Marica) or (Liv) could go back and at least pull together the thread that this - that these came from so that you might be able to see, you know, see and appreciate what I'm talking about.

Avri: Right and I understand that. But also - and that could be useful although it might be a lot of work. One of the things though that I'm just looking at it (is) sort of taking a black box approach to it. And sort of saying first of all look at the following.

Look at the 5-8 and 5-9 and 5-10. There hasn't been a lot of work done on it. There's - on 5-8 there's a support statement but no agreement. For 5-9 there's a support statement and no agreement. For 5-10 there's nothing.

(Dave):   Well (Rob) has 5 - (Rob) has the assignment of writing 5-10.

Avri: Right - okay.

(Dave):   So that leaves 5-9 as something that, you know, we still have to address.

Avri: And 5-8.

(Dave):   Five, I'm sorry, 5-8.

Avri: Five-eight and 5-9 both have statements that have support and such. So if we have someone that's willing to make a contribution to those then possibly this goes away. But what might be useful here is the same thing we've done to the other one that basically says something to the effect of the Working Group offers these initial answers but more work is required.

You know, now four of these were already mentioned before. So, you know, so I know...

Man: Yeah I think that would be fair (as a section) of where we are today. But I just don't want us to - I don't want us to be carrying forward something that doesn't really reflect what we've accomplished.

Avri: Right and I think...

Man: That's my only concern.

Avri: ...we've gotten rid of almost all so far that did not answer. And this is the last one of them. But at the moment I'm sort of loathe to pull out until we do have answers.

Man: Okay.

Avri: But I think that it's reasonable to do the same thing to it that we're doing to the others once we add some answers which is, you know, the Working Group provided these initial answers. You know, more work is required kind of statement.

Man: Part of what happened there I think actually is that people sort of signed up for various chunks. And I'm not sure anyone ever signed up for those chunks.

Avri: Okay. Now I'm told we have somebody signed up for 5-10 and 5-8 and 5-9. I'm not sure. As I say they have a support statement which is perhaps as much as we can do.

Man: Well the chunks that are unsigned up for currently are 5-8 and 5-9?

Avri: Yep at least as far as I know (I mean).

Man: Is it too late to add anything to 5.7? Hello?

Avri: Five point seven - too late.

Man: Under 944 where we talk about loud Internet community - could we add something like registrar - registry - sorry, with verification or registration processes that have registration verification? I think some of us talked about this privately and (it) actually made the list. (It's something that there's) no consensus on.

Avri: We'd have to see what level support there was for it. I'm not sure from what I've been able to tell the group that it's something that you'd be able to get agreement on. But you could probably certainly get enough people together to have support for (it).

            And certainly, you know, I think what I was saying last time is that anything that anybody in the group feels needs to be added as an alternative view can certainly be added. You know, and I think the only thing that remains of the issue is what degree of agreement and support can you get for a statement. And how far down a rate hole does the question take us?

            But if it's something that you can write up and there's general agreement on the list, then, you know, either as an agreement statement or support statement, I don't see why not. (But as I say) I want to avoid long-term rat holes that don't get us closer to finishing. But I don't want to avoid putting in something that people agree on.

And I want to make sure that all the alternative views are representative. Does that make sense as an answer?

Man: Oh yes.

Avri: Okay. So okay so we have to look at 948 - 955. So I would mark these somehow. Perhaps just put it in color that when we need to wordsmith this one to reflect what turns up in 5-8/5-10. And I expect it'll be a statement such as -- as I said before -- the Working Group provides the following initial answers.

You know, further work or something but we'll see what we get in those. And if people want to contribute something then we'll be able to review it. Okay - that make sense? Almost two hours now. So let's leave this one open.

In terms of the stuff that's there, any issue on accepting 961 through 68 - the support statement? And then 973 through 980 - any issue on accepting the support statement there?

Man: I have concerns about both of those for the reasons that we've talked about...

Woman: Yeah.

Man: ...previously.

Avri: Because the question is deferring answering. As I say if somebody contributes something new to it, then why don't we just leave this section alone until we see what people contribute next time?

Man: Works for me.

Avri: Okay.

Man: Is someone - has someone taken the lead on each of these: 5-8, 5-9
            and 5-10?

Man: I've got 5-10, (Bob).

Woman: Who is that please?

Man: This is (Rod Rasmussen). I've got 5-10.

Avri: Okay anybody want 5-8 or 5-9?

Man: I think that 5-8 and 5-9 I can - I'll take the lead on just drafting up some
            language that basically says that we are not to the point of making
            recommendations on these points.

Avri: Okay so basically you're going to sort of reword what's in there under
            the support.

Man: That's right.

Avri: Okay.

Man: (And) the bottom line is without knowing what limitations, guidelines or
            restrictions possible we can't really analyze what the impact is.

Avri: Okay so yeah - see how those fit and see how they change the tenor of the thing.

Man: (Right).

Avri: And we'll come back to this the next time.

Man: I may also send in sort of a table showing some possibilities and potential impacts (so folks) can just get an idea.

Avri: Okay - (be good). Okay constituency statements and other viewpoints - so (they), I guess, two constituency statements. That's all there.

(Marie):   This is (Marie) again. Just a comment as we discussed...

Avri: Yes.

(Marie):   ...in the last call. I reached out to the - several members who submitted the statements. And I did receive feedback from individual registrar constituency members. And they are fine with this. But there was objection from the registry constituency to removing this section.

            I think (Eva) you were copied in that email, I think, as well.

Woman   Okay so they objected to removing the (unintelligible) issue (it has written).

(Marie):   Yeah. They prefer to keep the summary (in to be redeemed)...

Avri: Okay so you actually removed it as opposed to just lining through it at the moment.

(Marie):   Yeah where you see it on the right-hand side the text was deleted. I didn't - I didn't strike it out. I can change that back though probably.

Avri: Yeah okay. I would prefer on any of the deletions that it - and I know it's kind of hokey. But I mean because I, for example, I don't see the text that you deleted because I use OpenOffice not Office. So I don't see the text that was actually deleted.

(Marie):   Okay.

Woman: All I see is (the marks) that it was deleted.

Woman: Really? So that's - okay.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Huh?

Man: You don't get the (fly outs) over on the right margin?

Avri: I do but I don't have all the text in them.

Man: Okay.

Woman: Sure.

Avri: I just have a mark that it was deleted but not all the text that was deleted.

Woman: So Avri we need to check and see if we can switch it so that it does display just the -- I know what you mean -- the lines through text.

Woman: Right.

Woman: Yeah I think it's - I need to change it in the settings.

Woman: Right.

Woman: I think (you) can opt for that and then - I just didn't do it for this one.

Avri: And another way to do it is to just go in and just put, you know, as an attribute of the text that it's lined through. And then later you just actually delete it. So that it's not really deleted. It's just marked as lined through and everybody knows that means (deleted).

Woman: Right but that's an extra editing step if we could...

((Crosstalk))

(Aubrey: You're right. It's an extra editing step.

Woman: Yeah.

Avri: Whatever works - as I said...

Woman: No but...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...I don't...

Woman: ...it's important to know...

Avri: I don't pay for Office. I use OpenOffice.

Woman: Absolutely and other people will to. And so it's important that we know
                that in our settings (delete) (unintelligible).

Avri: Okay so I see some - I see the mark that it's deleted but I do not see
                the (mass of) deletions. How do other people feel about that? I know
                that I was the one that was most uncomfortable with it. But if everyone
                else is comfortable with it - and what I was most worried about is that
                the people who wrote the text were happy with the synthesis of the
                text.

Woman: I did already get some comments as well from the registry constituency
                on some minor tweaks that they would like to see to the text. But I think
                overall they were okay with it.

Avri: Okay and (has)...

Woman: I don't know if (Greg) is on the call. (Perhaps) he's in a better position
                to explain.

Avri: Okay and do you see have they responded?

Woman: No not yet.

Avri: Okay.

Woman: I sent a message out only yesterday so...

Avri: As I said my main issue on any (synthesis) is the person being
                (synthesized) agrees with the (synthesis). So otherwise I'm concerned.
                Having written many, many syntheses I'm always concerned that I'm
                actually capturing what they say.

Man: Avri this is (Paul).

Avri: Yes.

(Paul):   For the registrars we (unintelligible) as you see, you know, individual
                member...

Avri: Right.

(Paul):   ...statements. And even that was just kind of a bear getting people -
                (hurting cats) in this case. I would just ask, you know, the reason we
                said let's just go back to the statement - not have the summary but
                direct people to an Appendix was just because, you know, I would
                need to go back and poll those people who signed off to make sure if.

                If we're going back to that I'm going to need a little time to do that, you
                know. And I thought in the interest of time it was better just to direct
                people to the annex, see the actual statement, read it in black and
                white. And that's that.

Avri: Now there's an alternative. And I don't know how this would work for the registries. And that's that the synthesis of the registries be appended right before their comments.

Or the other way to do it is, you know, two constituencies and then you can have synthesis of registry constituency; synthesis of - you (don't have to use the word) synthesis but, you know, of NCUC and not have the others.

So (unintelligible). I'm just uncomfortable with a synthesis that's not approved by people. What do other people think - sort of have registries would like it synthesized. Anyone else have an opinion?

Man: This is (James). And I support what (Paul) was saying that - and I think what you're intimating as well Avri. I just think it's dangerous to summarize or synthesize constituency statements.

Man: This is...

Woman: This is (Marica). It seems like we do have some time left to decide on this because, you know, we're not finalizing the report yet. So maybe we can wait until we receive the feedback from the NCUC.

And maybe the registrars have some time as well to check with the people that submitted the statement whether they're fine with the synthesis or not. And basically then decide whether - what should be left in or not - just a suggestion.

Man: This is (Greg). My concern was that since there are appendices at the back they don't get read. And the constituencies are major stakeholders in the process. And so I don't - I wanted attention brought to those statements somehow. Otherwise I don't know if they'll get read.

And I think that a lot, you know, a lot of people who may be looking through the report may be looking for a top line summary. I think it would be useful.

Man: So (Greg) your concern is that they're not sufficiently conspicuous. So if we highlighted them or moved them to a different section but didn't attempt to summarize what they were saying or give meaning or interpretation to the constituency statements, that you think the - you would be okay with that? Or I'm just trying to understand exactly what your concern is.

(Greg): Well I guess my question back to you is I think a - I think summaries - top line summaries of them are possible. And if we do have some time maybe that it's worth trying to do.

Like I said I don't think anybody like an ICANN Board Member of (GNSO) Council Member is going to read the entire report word for word. And the summary could be useful.

Man: There's still a summary piece that's getting put together for the front of the report right?

Avri: Yeah, I mean for those people who won't read most of the report, they'll never get to Section 8 - I mean, 6 or whatever it is. They'll just

read a front page and conclusions and such. I think anybody that's made it to this section will probably make it to the appendices.

But, you know, I think probably, you know, (Marica) might be making sense in terms of let's see what NCUC says and get their edits on it. And then if it's possible to check with the registrars that put in statements to get their viewpoints on it. And then we can come back and review it since we really do seem to be split on the issue. And it's true that we still have time.

Man: And Avri to that point how much time would we want to try to have this for our face-to-face in Cairo or...

Avri: Well you mean the decision on this?

Man: Yeah trying to reach out to registrar (residents).

Avri: I think actually this is an important issue but not a thing that needs a lot of discussion. I think at a point (it will come back) either that they've all agreed with it and they've all approved it. And so by and large let's include it or not. But we won't be getting into the wording of it much.

Right I think getting it by the end of the meeting is good enough, you know, or by our next meeting after the meeting is good enough.

Man: Okay I'll get on that.

Avri: Right I mean I'm hoping that we can sort of finish this within one or two weeks after Cairo. And so and that's kind of what I'm hoping that we're

going to get there. But we may need a bit more time than that. So I
don't know yet.

Man: Is it possible to defer putting those two constituency statements in this
             document? Wait until the public comment period is over at which time
             (we) probably would have all six constituency statements assuming all
             six respond.

Avri: Yeah...

Man: Because conceivably those two, you know, the registrars and registries
             might even want to change their constituency statement based on, you
             know, a more recent update of the document.

((Crosstalk))

Avri: Okay let's come back to this one once we have more information from
             NCUC and others and the individual registrar constituency members.
             And we also have an IP interest. I don't think it's - yeah - I - yeah
             actually let's come back to it.

             I think if they're all fine with what it says and they really want their stuff
             in the document, then we may decide. But I think if any of them are
             uncomfortable with it being summarized, then we may just want to put
             that in the end. And then if any of them (or) actually wanted it included
             with their statement then that becomes possible.

             We're almost at two hours now so I'm probably thinking we should
             stop. Where we are now is challenges. Now challenges has been here

a long time as far as I can tell. It - and I want to make sure that at some point that that's fine with people.

As I say it's historical text that's - we haven't discussed here at least not since I've been doing the Chairing. We do have a 1-1048/1049 placeholder (unintelligible) on a request document. The real place that we have a lot of new stuff that needs to be accepted -- and we'll probably do it on our next talk through -- are the interim conclusions which are all possibly acceptable.

They were talked about a little last time but they were also at the end of the meeting. Actually I'll just ask now. Are there any objections to accepting Section 8 - the Interim Conclusions or does that need more discussion?

Man: Did we kind of jump over seven entirely at this point or...

Avri: We jumped over seven entirely at this point because there's no changes marked in it.

Man: My concern is in part it really sort of reflects the same sentiment that was reflected in a lot of the notes.

Avri: Yeah.

Man: So if the notes are essentially being adjusted I think seven should probably be reconciled with the adjustments to the notes.

Avri: Yeah and I essentially agree with that and so - and basically said that's why we need to come back to it.

Man: Okay sorry.

Avri: Basically it's older text that we haven't looked at. But I think we do need to look at it. So I suggest that people take a look at it. And then we can talk about it again later. But there's nothing there to accept or not accept at the moment. So...

Man: Understand.

Avri: ...I'm jumping.

Man: (Right).

Avri: But, yeah, basically mentioned that we do have to come back to it. On eight which is stuff that came out of the voting and was (interim conditions), it was all agreement. Is there any issue on accepting 1078 through 1085? Any issue on accepting 1089 through 1096?

Man: Ten eight-seven should be, I think, 8.1 rather than 7.1.

Avri: Good call. Any issue on 1098 through 1102?

Man: (This) 1082 through 1085 what studies, first of all, is this talking about? (Study), I guess...

Avri: I think it's during the Working Group's study period. I think it's during the term of the working group. I guess you all have been studying (as flux) during this period. I assume that's the period it meant.

((Crosstalk))

...continued to evolve during the period that this Working Group has been studying the issue.

Man: Okay.

Man: So it's sort of a self-pitying statement, though, I mean there's never going to be a totally static problem that you had a perfect opportunity to analyze. I mean it just sort of is what it is.

Man: Exactly.

Avri: Okay so in other words...

Man: Ten eight-two through 1085 just seems to be a commentary that's not necessary - not helpful.

Avri: Okay anyone object to marking that for deletion? Okay mark it for deletion and we'll come back to it next time to make sure it stays deleted. Okay any other issues under conclusions? We have the 1098 through 1102. Okay (we'll) - we had 1104 through 1114.

Man: I've got to admit the 1089 that paragraph seems awfully difficult. Reading it I find myself having a hard time with it. I'm wondering if it could be rephrased or wordsmithed.

Avri: Yeah well I think the wordsmithing step is something that's coming; unless you have a suggestion that's coming from much of the document. I think there's lots of awkward sentences.

Man: I think as long as it can be flagged I'm happy...

Avri: Okay.

Man: ...just to have somebody wordsmith it.

Avri: Well then I'll leave it. You want basically that whole paragraph or just that whole first - second sentence?

Man: Well I think 1089 through 1096 I mean if it's a conclusion you want to have it be pretty clear in conclusion.

Avri: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

                  So leave this one then marked for work. Any issue with - in other words, you know, just don't accept it yet - 1098 through 1102? (Can we) accept that one? Or do we want to take more time on the conclusion later? Am I rushing through it unreasonably?

Man: I think we should put it to later along with the challenges and what do we really...

Avri: Okay.

Man: ...(the text again).

Avri: As I say possible next step we haven't talked about yet. And that's something that I want to get into in the face-to-face.

    Okay then I thank you. I think that's it for today then.

Man: (Thanks Aubrey).

Avri: (That's our) two hours. I appreciate it. I think that we've got a document that's got some holes and some work being done on it. But it's getting there.

Man: So what's our next step? Just...

Avri: Our next step is we have the face-to-face. (Marica) is going to put out another copy - another revision. We have a next step where one of the things I want to talk about is next steps.

    We're waiting for about six different paragraphs to come in which we need to talk about. We need to talk about challenges. We need to talk about conclusions.

    And we need to make sure that there's no other issues that anyone feels need further discussion before we put this out as a Interim Report to the Council and figure out where we go from there.

    Among the other things we'll need to do is the Council will then need to read this, discuss it, decide whether it's going out for constituency review immediately or doing something else first and figuring out what the Working Group does next.

The Council will be asked to review the Charter based upon any recommendations that come out of this group on how they should review the Charter if they should review the Charter. And then the Working Group needs to go through the process of, you know, reelecting a Chair.

So but the next thing is, I think, to talk about the next steps in more detail, face-to-face. And also perhaps talk sometime about challenges and interim conclusions. Those are two things that I'll put on the agenda for the face-to-face. We only have an hour though.

Man: And what's the date on that?

Avri: Wednesday next - whatever date that is.

Woman: The 5th of November.

Man: Cool.

Man: Can the time zone info be sent to the list because it's hard...

Avri: Yeah.

Woman: I'll send that out (George).

Avri: And then plan on a Friday meeting on the 14th. The 21st I will have difficulty doing a meeting because I will be flying back from (IETF) that week - that day. So I won't be around for a meeting on the Friday the 21st or the 28th or the week after that. But anyhow we'll have to talk

about that because I go into an (IGF) two weeks at the end of the month with me out of commission.

So we'll talk more at the next meeting and on the list about how we do scheduling after this.

Woman: You may just want to cancel the 28th.

Avri: Well, that's just it.

Man: Thanksgiving weekend.

Avri: We'll have to talk about this later because in my life the 21st, the 28th and December - and December 5th...

Man: Maybe we could do another (doodle)...

Avri: ...are all out because I basically spend the next three weeks - well I actually probably have time the week of the 16th through the 21st because I'm flying on the 21st. But then Thanksgiving week and the week after I'm in Hyderabad for the IGF working as Secretariat. And I won't have time to breathe.

Man: Do we have a meeting this Friday?

Avri: This Friday?

Man: Yeah.

Avri: No.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Avri: This Friday many of us are traveling.

Man: Good - thanks.

Avri: I'm definitely traveling. That's why we had the meeting on Monday.

Man: Okay thanks.

Avri: Okay so be in touch on the list. Try to clarify things and talk to people on Wednesday. And anybody that's flying to Cairo - good travels.

Man: See you there.

            See you.

Man: Thank you.

Avri: Okay thank you all.

Man: (Travels).

Avri: Yep. Bye-bye.

Man: (Thanks Aubrey).

                        END