ICANN

Moderator: Nathalie Peregrine
August 27, 2015
9:00 am CT

Fabien Betremieux: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. Welcome to the third meeting of the - of our Speculative Security Framework Drafting Team on Wednesday, 27 August 2015.

My name is Fabien Betremieux. I (unintelligible) division of ICANN. A quick reminder before we jump into our agenda and discussion today please mute your line if you're not speaking.

The meeting is recorded and will be transcribed. For the purpose of the transcript please state your name when you speak.

And finally that anytime you would like to get into the queue to speak please do so using the wave your hand feature in Adobe Connect Room. Thank you very much.

For our call today we've shared an agenda. We will quickly go over a summary of our previous calls. Then we'll talk about a date on the Drafting Team membership and then an update on the Drafting Team leadership.

And finally we'll allow as much time as possible for the substantive discussion on our framework drafting.

Unless there are any question, or comments or suggestions regarding the agenda I will start with Item Number 1.

So as a summary of our two previous calls you may recall that we've discussed the background objective and working method of this initiative. In particular around a draft charter proposal we circulated as a conversation starter.

And so again if you would like to use this document please feel free to go on our community wiki workspace for which we've shared a link in the meeting announcement.

And we also spent some time discussing the planning of our regular meeting including considering the challenges we have with the time zones that are represented in the drafting team.

And so far we have settled for Thursdays at 14 UTC. And that's temporary until the group decides otherwise.

Regarding the substance and the framework you may recall we've circulated a draft outline of the framework which included some of the feedback we've received during our preliminary consultation.

We've reviewed the document and it's led to a discussion of a number of subjects in particular some high level principles, some overarching concern and some specific topics.

I'm not going to delve into each of those that were discussed. If anybody would like me to do so I can do that but I think what we're trying to do is allow as much time as possible for the drafting team to discuss the substance so I will hold off for now.

If anybody would like me to go into the details please let me know raise your hand or make a comment in the chat otherwise I will move on down our agenda.

So I'm not seeing any hands raised or nor any comments in the chat so agenda Item Number 2 membership of the drafting team.

So the membership is now stable at 44 members. We have 30 representatives from registries, nine from the GAC and public safety working group and five from registrants. You can also find details about the membership on our community wiki workspace.

So unless there is any question or comment I will move on to our Item Number 3 on the agenda update on the drafting team's leadership.

You may recall that a new should have been involved in votes for nominees to be co-chairs for each of the segments in the community represented in this drafting team.

We now have co-chairs confirmed. We have Yasmine Omer for the registry, we have John Flaherty and (Ezi Jo Sally) for the GAC WCT Working Group members of the drafting team and we have Theo Geurts for the registrants.

They are - they have all been confirmed. So they now stand ready I believe to aid the effort on behalf of the group.

And before we move on to the substantive discussion on the framework I will stop here and opened the floor to the co-chair if they would like to say a few words.

In particular I understand that John and Yasmine may have some proposal to present and discuss. So let me stop here and leave the floor to you John, Yasmine or Theo.

John Flaherty: Thanks Fabien. Do you want me to start with the proposal on the format of conference calls and the suggestion of a mailing list before the discussion on the paper?

Fabien Betremieux: Yes please go ahead. I think that would be appropriate.

John Flaherty: So we've been talking amongst co-chairs for two to three days around the frequency of calls and the impact on appropriate discussion across widely different time zones.

It is proposed to have less frequent calls keeping the Thursday and but maybe calls when appropriate every two to three weeks.

And it's seen as be more productive as a proposal and to have an approach where we do a mailing list. And once we start to flesh out a particular part of the drafting paper or there's any issues independent of the time zone we can do that on email.

And I think that will be more productive and more efficient three weeks into this working group in this development process. So that's the collective feeling that the rough consensus of the co-chairs.

That would mean after today something like the 9 September would be the next call. I know that might conflict Fabien with some ICANN business so with a little bit of flexibility somewhere within that week mid-September would be the next call where potentially we can discuss our specs from the mailing list i.e. the content of mitigation and detection and reporting of new gTLD brand and providers.

Is there anybody in conflict or in support of that? And I'll just look to see if anybody's hand has been raised on the text on the Adobe Connect?

Anybody got any opinions on that? Yes I've got the 9 September not being a good idea, Fabien do you want to say what your diary class is for that?

Fabien Betremieux: So yes and I see that we also have Jeff Neuman that raised his hand so we'll get to Jeff in a second.

To answer your question John there is the GDD Industry Summit which is an event that will mobilize a lot of registries and registrars on the ninth and around the ninth.

So we may we may need to consider a meeting would be the following week but we can certainly further discuss this. Should - and Jeff would you like to comment?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I think hey good morning or afternoon everyone or evening. I guess my question is, you know, what are the deliverable dates that we're trying to hit and what are the deliverables themselves?

I seem to recall that when the subject got brought up in Buenos Aires I think this came out of a board request initially provide some guidance to maybe it was even the GAC advice that the board was responding to.

So in thinking about how often we need to meet it may help to just find out what the deliverables are and when they've been either promised or when it's been discussed that these will be turned over I think that'll make the discussion a little bit easier to have.

John Flaherty: Okay Jeff. So looking at the draft charter hear the deliverables and timelines the next key one is 4 September. And that's the initial draft framework for consultation with relevant communities.

So from a Public Safety Working Group and a GAC perspective within that time we'll be discussing the paperwork that we're going to submit.

If everybody else is on the same timeline and deliverable that would make sense for the ninth maybe the tenth just before or after that call to take place for feedback.

And there are a few more milestones leading up until January 29, 2016 on the paper. And does everybody have that? Does everybody have the framework drafting team charter or I don't know if Fabien if you can get that on the screen maybe? Oh there you go.

Fabien Betremieux: Yes I did load it in the Adobe Connect yes.

Jeff Neuman: So sorry this is Jeff again. And I'm looking at it - oh wait I was able to scroll through it. I can't scroll through it now. Oh there we go.

What initial draft framework for consultation - shouldn't we be having a discussion before that goes out to the relevant communities instead of having a discussion after it goes out?

John Flaherty: So Jeff what do you mean? The way I'm looking at this is we've got to have a discussion within our community to produce an initial draft.

We are arranging a meeting from my side of the fence it's going to be in Washington, you know, with I think the majority of people dialing in. So we're going to be reviewing our own draft independently.

I think at the same time before during and after the mailing list proposal we'll allow you to see that. And we can fine tune that with help from the different communities as it goes for an overall working document leading to maybe a mid-September call where everybody's read that and we've got more content to discuss. Does that make sense or...

Jeff Neuman: No. I - maybe it's me and I know Yasmine's in the queue but I thought this was supposed to be kind of the bottom up group working on a draft then sending that out to - too then sending that out to the communities for comment.

I wasn't aware that it seems to me that this is basically a top down draft that people are preparing but it affects us as registry operators. So I'm very confused as to what's going on.

Fabien Betremieux: Maybe Krista did you join in the queue to respond to Jeff's question?

Krista Papac: I think - yes thanks Fabien. This is Krista Papac ICANN staff. I think John when you're talking about the relevant communities you're talking about your own stakeholders.

So if I'm hearing you correctly and maybe this is where the confusion is coming in you and several other folks are here as representatives of the GAC but as you provide your input to this drafting team you're going to consult with your own stakeholders to say this is the input we want to provide this is what we think it should say.

I think that's what you're saying. And Jeff you're working on representing the registry side. You may want to go back and talk to the other registries about the things you guys are proposing.

I think that that's what John is talking about rather then what comes later where we - when we have a final draft that would put out to the entire ICANN community for comment and input. So John correct me if I'm misunderstanding you but I hope that helped clarify what you're saying?

John Flaherty: Yes that's correct, just writing it as well. Yes.

Fabien Betremieux: Jeff does that clarify - is that enough clarification for you?

Jeff Neuman: Well I think I would say in a different way. I would think that each group should go back to their own communities to find out what the concerns are as opposed to drafting a framework or calling it a framework each side should go back to get the concerns and then we meet as a group to write a framework an initial framework that takes into consideration all the concerns that have been presented by the relevant communities.

I think otherwise it sends kind of the wrong message of that this group of GAC representatives is going to go out and draft a framework and then throw it over the edge for us to comment on making kind of the registries feel like they're on the defensive which I know is not the intention but I could tell you just from past activities that's what will happen.

So I would word it in such a way of let each community go back get the concerns from the community so that they understand what to bring to the group.

We have a call after that. And if that's September 9 that's or around there that's fine in each side can say okay we met with the registries, here is their concerns, you guys say we met with the GAC representatives here is their concerns, let's together produce an initial framework that we can then put out for comment by the relevant communities.

I think presenting it in that kind of way may be easier for all of us to kind of get this to the next step.

Fabien Betremieux: Maybe Yasmine would you like to comment? You may want to chip in, in this discussion?

Yasmine Omer: Yes thanks Fabien. Can you hear me?

Fabien Betremieux: Yes very well. Thank you.

Yasmine Omer: Excellent. Yes my understanding is certainly that from of Jeff's the I guess the question that I have and it's coming from a concern about the timeline is what the rush is to get this initial framework out for public well out for consultations on 4 September.

I actually don't feel that, that is realistic at all. This is (unintelligible) as being an exercise led by one community puts forward a draft that we all have to that we would all have to comment on.

I believe it's well certainly what I understood the intention to be that this is to be a collaborative exercise.

That being the case I would anticipate that every community who was as Jeff said raised concerns and then put together a document with ICANN's assistance.

And my understanding is that ICANN will be providing resources in the form of a technical write up possibly to put together the key - to put together the initial draft into account the concerns of the relevant communities.

So based on that I just don't see how we can meet 4 September deadline at all. And I - that to me that raises the question as to why we feel this needs to be rushed.

I would much prefer to get this right then rush it. And if we are going to get it right we need consulting with other communities and doing this through a (ground) up process and that will take time.

And I have I guess a question for John regarding the - and I - we can come back to this later it just I'll just ask now that I have them mic I guess about the proposal to shift to discussing this in - through email.

I'm not opposed to it. But I'd just like to hear from John what the rationale there is and what concerns he has so we can work together to address those concerns.

And final question sorry again for John is there for those of us who aren't really aware can we where can we get some information as to what the (unintelligible) and mandated with the Public Safety Working Group and how you intend on that meeting with being within this draft framework discussion? Thanks bye.

John Flaherty: Yes. So I think the way I've been attacking this looking at the way I've interpreted the deliverables and the timeline is, is that we're near to 4 September now. And we've had some missed calls and we've not had any really productive calls.

And it was to get some content going following already a lot of work that ICANN had done and the communities have contributed to.

One example would be the registry registrars best practice paper on domain name abuse. I think there's been others there and there's been some wider reading on this.

And there's a lot of concerns in there as well what community outreach has already being done. And for me I'm - I think we've been much more productive in a session if we start putting our thoughts on a mailing list.

And maybe in the way that the IETF works where you can contribution, you can update, maybe a collaborative document rather than an independent community one.

And then we'd have something more to talk about be it a common concern, a risk, a liability issue and a cost issue. And for a more or less frequent call maybe on a two to three week basis.

So initially I'm just trying to keep within the draft paper timeline. So it's 4 September and the meeting that PSWG agreed I think it's the 10 September in Washington I needed to have something to present when dialing into that meeting with an idea of what the registry registrars expectation is back from PSWG input.

So going on core issues I've probably got as per the guiding principles of this charter I've got I think four or five what I would call different solutions to discuss.

I'd kind of like it will be difficult for 4 September to do this. I'd like to put those across on the mailing list for feedback ready for mid-September in a future call.

So it was literally just trying to not run this project off track. And I didn't think the conference call I thought one week was too much and a lot of people have been on holiday as well myself included.

And so it was just to meet ICANN deadlines really. I don't know what the bend and flex is in extending those deadlines but I do agree that if there's more outreach to be done to certain communities one of mine is the CERT community. They were pretty slow to respond to this.

And, you know, is that something that we can move forward? Does that affect the end date? At the end of Jan or can we juggle the other deadlines within that?

So Fabien I don't know if that makes - I don't know if there's any flexibility in terms of the agenda or we're going to stick to that?

Fabien Betremieux: John to answer your question I don't think we absolutely want this to stay to be set in stone. So if the group decides that there needs to be changes in those days I think we should certainly discuss it and consider it there's no objection in principle.

John Flaherty: Okay. Yasmine, can you just say what your second question was again? What - were you asking the - what the PSWG will bring to the table? I just missed the last bit of your question your second question.

Yasmine Omer: Sure John. It was just about the describe (unintelligible) the PSWG and how the work of this drafting team fits into what the PSWG is currently doing?

John Flaherty: Okay. Is Bobby Flaim on the call?

Bobby Flaim: Yes I'm here. Can you hear me?

John Flaherty: Yes. Do you want to overview that...

Bobby Flaim: Sure, sure.

John Flaherty: ...(unintelligible).

Bobby Flaim: No absolutely. The PSWG is just the sub working group of the GAC. So what we do is we are kind of I wouldn't call us subject matter experts it's just that we have been tasked or created to work on issues that affect public safety.

So we encompass law enforcement both civil and criminal also consumer protection groups as well. And of course this is an international representative of the GAC.

So we were just formally created at the beginning of the year at Singapore. And we had our first meeting at the last meeting in Buenos Aires.

So this all goes back concerning the GAC safeguards to Beijing 2013 so this is what the genesis of, you know, the GAC safeguards 2013.

And then these are one of the issues affecting public safety that the GAC had determined the Public Safety Working Group would do.

We also do have what we call terms of reference. They were just approved in Buenos Aires as well. So if that is something that would be beneficial for you to have we can also provide that to you as well.

The other thing I was just going to say if I'm still on is I think John's idea to have it kind of work as a mailing list like they do at the IETF might be productive.

I think since this is because this is going on for 2-1/2 years I don't think it should be rushed but I think time is of the essence, you know, as we go forward considering there's going to be more gTLDs, more domain names being signed up. So I think if having a mailing list and the document to work from which would make it a more efficient and quicker process that might be helpful.

Fabien Betremieux: Thank you Bobby this is Fabien speaking. And I wanted to emphasize as well that from an ICANN perspective the deadline and this timeline which is

aggressive but we also would like this framework to be an evolutionary document.

So we're thinking that the output of this process would be the first installment of the security framework which would get revised in the future as appropriate.

So maybe not everything could make it in the first installment and whatever cannot make it could make it in the subsequent one.

So I just wanted to remind the group of that as one of the - of our overarching objectives with this work.

John Flaherty: This is John speaking just I think just one more thing are we happy for a mailing list to go through each co-chair or are we talking about everyone who's got an opinion revise and update on the draft and commenting on that mail is everybody going to get access to that mailing list or do you route via the co-chairs?

Fabien Betremieux: John I'd be interested to hear what your thoughts are and Yasmine as well if you could share your vision with...

John Flaherty: I think ideally and maybe for the co-chairs the problems that we've got is we've all got day jobs. And we might not be that efficient sometimes in managing submissions.

The flipside to that may be that lots of people contributing means it gets a little bit messy. So maybe want think about a little bit more for me if there's any other opinions?

Yasmine Omer: Yes Fabien this is Yasmine. Yes I - guys I think it should be everyone on the list for discussion purposes. This is going to take - so I just want to emphasize again that this is going to take time.

And by all means the co-chairs would ensure that they're representing the views of the various - for me in my case the various registries.

And I guess we also have to recognize that it goes in being the co-chairs to the registries I also need to obtain the input of other registry operators that aren't on this drafting team. So it's a really limited so to speak and I wouldn't want I certainly wouldn't want to limit the discussion with the chairs.

And Fabien sorry I think you may have missed my question regarding the timeline and why there appears to be a rush to get this done by 4 September.

Fabien Betremieux: So Yasmine to your -- and this is Fabien speaking -- to your specific question on 4 September deadline I think our intention here was that prior to the GDD Summit there would be some notion of an initial draft that could be potentially discussed between registries and registrars on that side of the committee as well as in parallel on the GAC side of the committee.

So this was the pension. Again I don't think that the 4th of September in itself should been seen us from our perspective a hardcore deadline.

But we - this is our intent. And we would like - we were using this to help us drive the work and the delivery of the framework.

Yasmine does that answer your question?

Yasmine Omer: That does. That does Fabien. The - that being the case can we come up - aim a revised timeline take into account the (unintelligible) that need to all be - the consultation that needs to be conducted?

Fabien Betremieux: We can certainly update the timeline. And I'd be interested to hear what your thoughts are on what should be our target.

Yasmine Omer: Okay sounds good. I can get back to you on that. I should probably talk to some folks of mine and yes, get back to you on that.

Fabien Betremieux: Okay thank you. I see we have Jeff in the queue. Jeff would you like to add?

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks. First thing is just kind of administrative. Thanks for posting the link to the workspace.

If Fabien if you can just make sure some of the links I'm trying to click on in the staff paper just they were going to a file not found or if we could post each of those documents separately like the abuse paper I think Bobby talked about in 2011 if you could just post that separately that would help.

The second thing is I just want to - something Bobby said that we've been at this for 2-1/2 years. I just I want to know what's behind that.

I mean from our perspective the registries and registrars we were just asked, you know, recently to form this group and which we're doing. And I'm not sure what's been going on for 2-1/2 years and apologize if it's taken too long.

But I just don't want to send out to the community a message that we - the registries have been delaying this for 2-1/2 years.

We're very interested in working on this and working on clarifying Spec 11 and making sure we're all on the same page.

So I just - I'd hate for the message to go out that we've been kind of delaying this for 2-1/2 years when I'm not sure where that comes from. Thanks.

Bobby Flaim: No this is Bobby. It wasn't that registries were delaying at 2-1/2 years. It's just that the original GAC advice came out 2-1/2 years ago.

So that's what it was just, you know, it came out in 2013 and then it went through a few iterations the GAC in going back and forth to ICANN.

And I think ICANN I think the first meeting may have been in February of this year. (Chris) and Fabien can correct me. I know something came out in January where they were soliciting comments.

So really this work in particular on Spec 11 in this group started in January. But it wasn't necessarily where the registries were expected input. It was just to give you a chronological I guess where the Genesis was.

But no it wasn't where the registries where expected to do something 2-1/2 years ago. That's just where the GAC advice on this started.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thanks Bobby. Well look you have the commitment of the people on this call to work on and to, you know, do it as efficiently as possible.

I'm not saying that that timeline that's in there is necessarily doable but you certainly have our commitment to work with you and to work with the group now. So thanks.

Bobby Flaim: Okay great. Thanks Jeff.

Fabien Betremieux: Thank you Jeff and Bobby. Yasmine, do you have your hand raised?

Yasmine Omer: Yes. Thanks Fabien.

The discussion - well that latest discussion regarding the (unintelligible) clarifying (unintelligible) realizes to me the need to be (unintelligible) clarify this (unintelligible) of this (unintelligible) on this final work.

I know that (unintelligible).

Fabien Betremieux: Yasmine? Yasmine can you hear me?

Yasmine Omer: I can. I can.

Fabien Betremieux: We have a lot of background noise. Can you all please make sure you meet your lines? I don't know if there is an issue on your side Yasmine but it's kind of hard to understand you at this point.

Yasmine Omer: Okay. Can you hear me now?

Fabien Betremieux: Yes much better, much better. But actually we're having...

Yasmine Omer: There it goes again, yes. I'm not sure what's going on.

Fabien Betremieux: It seems that we may have some noise in Adobe Connect Room so I'm -

sorry I'm looking into it. I think we should be good now. Yasmine would you

like to try again?

Yasmine Omer: I can...

((Crosstalk))

Fabien Betremieux: Sorry about that.

Yasmine Omer: (Yes) (unintelligible). That sounds much better.

So yes for the discussion that we just had the (unintelligible) the names for us

to agree on stuff the, you know I - feel yes - I hope that - I - well I may - do

understand that some folks may think that we may be going a little backward

here in discussing the disclose and the approach.

But I think moving forward we really need to be on the same page. We all

need to be on the same page with respect to what this document is and what it

isn't and what's in and what's out.

To me for example this isn't a clarification of the contractual obligation.

The contractual obligations at least for a registry would like to conducting a

technical analysis and reporting, maintaining reports and providing those

reports to ICANN.

The - I don't - as a registry there's no obligation regarding how to respond in

the manner in which I should respond to identify for two of these risks.

So this isn't - I think we'll need to be quite careful in emphasizing that this isn't a - this isn't clarification to a contractual obligation because it's not a clarification to a contractual obligation.

It can't - it shouldn't be used by the ICANN Compliance Team to generate some sort of presumption of compliance because it doesn't have a corresponding contractual obligations.

So that is just to me one example of where we need to be aligned in terms of what is called abuse and what is - what's out in what's in.

So as I said I'm sorry if that sounds like we're going back to basics but I really do feel that that's important to have alignment on people we go down three different paths.

Fabien Betremieux: Yasmine if you (started) speaking I just want to point to - and I'm going to re-synchronize the document that is loaded in the Adobe Connect which is our draft charter proposal. So we're seeking a document to so show Section 2 of that document which raised objective of framework and proposed drafting principles.

I think we're suggesting some scoping in this section. And I think we're trying to make clear in these that this is a framework as a set of best practices that are voluntary and it should disconnected from contractual obligation.

I think we've mentioned in the second call or might have been the first one the fact that in parallel to this there is - there will be a discussion with registries on providing some clarification to the current (unintelligible) Section 3B in the registry agreement as an advisory.

So we're having the two streams of work in parallel. And here we're in the framework drafting team we're really focusing the effort on a framework set of best practices that are - as we are trying to describe in this section of the draft sorry, the charter that are geared towards response to security threats.

And I think the discussion of the scoping is welcome. And we hope that it would be based on what we've already provided.

Because we think that this - what we've provided we think is a high level view of the scoping. If you - if the group thinks that this should be resigned we certainly welcome any suggestions and discussion in that area.

Does that contribute to your discussion and concerns Yasmine?

Okay excellent.

Can I suggest unless anybody would like to comment or ask a question that we move on to the Item Number 4 of our agenda which is more substantial discussion on the framework itself?

And I see that (Elaine) has a question so let me read this out loud. Did I misunderstand when you say ICANN staff is working on a parallel clarification?

(Elaine) this is - so in our meeting in Buenos Aires we've presented our approach going forward based on our preliminary consultation.

And we explained that we are indeed conducting two different efforts. One is a discussion between ICANN and the registries on the clarification of the

current provision in the registry agreements with Certification 11 Section 3B. And we are envisioning this is an advisory that we would work on with you.

And in parallel we are working on this framework with the framework drafting team. So we are seeing these as two separate assets that are connected in parallel.

Yasmine I see that you have a question and let me read it out loud that will presumably go out for public comment, yes. Just so let me ask you what you refer to. You want to go ahead Yasmine?

Yasmine Omer: Thanks Fabien. So yes this is in relation to the advisory that to announce that you would be drafting with respect to how the technical analysis is to be.

The technical analysis referenced in Section 3B is that (unintelligible) to be conducted.

My - from memory I think you said that it would be ready in the next couple weeks. So I'm wondering whether it would be ready for us to discuss a draft if it would be ready for us to discuss during the GDD Summit?

And also I - I'm assuming that this will go out for public comment or be presented to the registries for input at some point?

Fabien Betremieux: And yes thank you for your question Yasmine. I think we - if you agree we'd like to take the discussion off-line.

We're certainly interested to keep discussing with you in response to your question (unintelligible). But since it's - we see that as out of scope of our discussion today on the framework I'd rather we focus on the framework

today and we can certainly take the discussion off-line in view of the (unintelligible) pressure.

Okay I see that you agree with that.

So let me propose that we move on so that we get back to our agenda.

Our last agenda item is as I said the discussion of the substance of the framework.

And I believe John has identified a set of core issues that he'd like to start discussing with the drafting team. John is that (unintelligible)? Would you like to go ahead?

John Flaherty: Yes no problem. So I'm going to try to not go into too much detail.

This really is an overview of how I would like to start a discussion by our mailing the staff.

And in terms of best practice approaches to abuse and initial PSWG and CAC work has potentially come up with some multiple solutions to protecting domain name space.

We've currently outreached to partners, looked to pass success in this field and we're quite close with the CERT community as well, the best practice.

We took on board in the last two meetings registry and registrar concerns around cost and liability to suspension, issues on the draft around periodic analysis, what technical analysis is, what the definition of abuse is.

And a generic overview I'd like to start the framework off with some ideas really around - and some of the bigger registries from researching your sites may already have these practices in place and associated policies.

I'll go through them in the order that I've researched to them. A free feed (unintelligible) and also a statistical reporting service provided by an industry partner who also potentially can provide a registry type sink holing service and for notification procedures and suspension registry lock hold type procedures.

The company in question now is Shadow Server who we've worked well certainly from law enforcement within the past.

They don't charge for these services and they have very good visibility for domain name space. They're intrigued by this paper and proposal. And they're well connected to the community and especially ICANN.

And there's some minor issues they've got which I'll probably leave for the mailing list.

But looking at the guiding principles of this charter and one size doesn't fit all nonbinding practices there may be different needs for different size registries and looking at the different risk profile that every TLD brand or provider I think Shadow Server is worth some consultation on the mailing list through this spoke feed.

Comment on the mailing list may surround balancing technical analysis with periodic analysis.

The first is the need to reduce mitigation over time and industry self-regulation. So maybe a definition of how often you can do this whether or not we can automate the process and how much benefit you can get from a free feed per registry -- that kind of discussion really.

There is also some research we've done that points to pay for services. (Architella) I was reading and Name Century is a product that springs to mind which claims to be your Spec 11 abuse monitoring and reporting requirement where they'll take that service off view and provide that and associated reporting for you. And that's another option.

I've got no idea on the cost of that or on the company and whether or not I should show favoritism in general to any company. But it's what I'm seeing currently online as possible draft proposals.

And the one I probably like registry and registrar feedback on is your existing threat mitigations, your existing abuse policies that you have in place potentially that work.

Neustar seems to pride itself on its threat mitigation process and the managed management of its new gTLDs.

If the industry, you know, and I'll be blatant, it's your industry, it's your cost, it's your liability and it's your success and to distinguish your brands is clean that's definitely an option and to make best practice subject to cost and size and existing registry products.

So it's really a blend of different solutions that cater for cost, automation and then what already works really and without going into any more detail and (unintelligible) second.

I also had some comments to make on the mailing list about long-term mitigation. The framework looks to be about a detection and reporting model. It's quite reactive and certainly what cybercrime is a lot of the time.

And we've also got some ideas to be proactive and look at mitigation in a different light to prevent domain name abuse in the first instance.

I'm looking at issues that may or may not be able to be achieved by registry or could be marketed by a registry in terms of reducing spam, things like demark and email authentication.

And in a way maybe it's (ship a router) with some security sections to a residential customer for broadband access and may be a domain name and in terms of shipping and comes with its own security by default settings as well.

Perhaps you already provide that and you know a lot more than me about that as well.

So it's kind of a short, medium and long term proposal that we've got. And hopefully at the beginning of the next week I can give you a little bit more detail on each of those proposals and we can start two way communication and comment. Thank you.

Fabien Betremieux: Thank you John. Would anybody like to comment on what John has listed as potential areas of discussion over the next few weeks on a mailing list?

Jeff would you like to go ahead please?

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks. I'm not sure I have any comments on it because it's just being raised to our attention for the first time.

But obviously to the extent you can post all of that on the mailing list that will give us something to respond to. It's - I'm not sure we can get to substance right now on here because this is the first time we're hearing about it. But if you can post it we'll certainly respond.

Fabien Betremieux: Thank you Jeff. I think that was your intention eventually John correct?

John Flaherty: Yes it was just - it was really just for the first mover really just to start the discussion.

There's definitely I think Yasmine's got some good points raised there. And, you know, there's no need to address rush. But at the same time I think we've got to get it simmering maybe and engage people either on the call or against those proposals, you know, for why the negotiation with each community.

So hopefully Monday Tuesday they're going to be draft and they probably need praising criticism in equal measure and we'd really appreciate the feedback.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks. And this is Jeff again. Just also if you have any kind of data on the types of practices that you're seeing in the new gTLDs as far as the spamming all the kind of security risks that you see that would help to if you guys have collected that. Thanks.

John Flaherty: Okay. No problem.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Jim Galvin: This is Jim with a question please.

Fabien Betremieux: Please go ahead Jim.

Jim Galvin: So Jim Galvin. I seem to have lost my Adobe connection here. I apologize. But I just noticed you were listing, you know, anti-abuse services. But I didn't hear your mention Afilias.

            And, you know, we certainly have had anti-abuse services since 2008. We've been doing it I think longer really then on anyone. We were the first. Just wondered if there was a reason why that wasn't included in your list?

Fabien Betremieux: Absolutely Jim, sorry. I'm just now itemizing it. I can imagine. I think you've already empowered as a registrar or registry to have an AP, you know, privacy policies and abuse.

            And I think from Greg Aaron I think with Afilias we've seen over the years some real expertise and support for law enforcement needs on that.

            So I certainly wasn't leaving you out by intention.

Jim Galvin: No problem. Thank you.

Fabien Betremieux: Thank you Jim and thank you John.

            Are there any other questions or comments? If not then I might - can I suggest that we speak a few minutes about in our last three minutes of this call about the main takeaway points and actions that we will need to take?

I don't see any objections to that. I don't see any hands raised. So let me take an attempt at the main takeaways. I think we're - we can gather from this meeting.

So in terms of next steps I understand that there is a rough consensus that we can take the discussion to the mailing list and that we will agree on the subsequent call when there has been some interaction.

I understand that Yasmine is suggesting that we revise the 4th of September target we currently have for an initial draft.

And finally I think there's a discussion that we had with the co-chairs on exactly how we manage the interaction over the mailing list including potentially considering a collaborative document as opposed to a different draft.

So please let me know if there is any additional main takeaways you think we should state at this point?

And I will suggest that we organize the meeting with the co-chairs to organize the next steps of the interaction with the mailing list in the next email - sorry the next call as well.

So let me leave the floor for any comments and takeaways and next steps.

Does anybody have any final thoughts, final comments?

All right I see that John - sorry Jeff is saying that we look forward to seeing the PSWG's proposal.

So unless there are any comments or questions I suggest we adjourn the call for today. And we will get back to the drafting team through the mailing list in the next few days with next steps.

Thank you very much everyone for joining our meeting. And we certainly appreciate your time and we look forward to speaking with you again. Thank you very much.

END