

ICANN

**Moderator: Terri Agnew
August 5, 2015
9:00 am CT**

Fabien Betremieux: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. Welcome to the second meeting of our Spec 11 Security Framework Drafting Team on Wednesday August 5, 2015.

My name is Fabien Betremieux. I'm a Senior Registry Services and Engagement Manager with the CDD Division at ICANN.

Just a reminder before we jump into our agenda and discussion today, please mute your lines if you're not speaking. The meeting will be recorded and will be transcribed. For the purposes of the transcript, please state your name when you speak. And if at any time during our meeting, you'd like to get into the queue, please do so by using the raise-your-hand feature in the Adobe Connect room.

So on our agenda today as a starter, I would just like to give a very quick summary of our previous call for people that may not have been able to participate or catch up on the recording. We - in our first meeting we took some time to walk through - to walk the team through some of the background, the objective of this effort, as well as the proposed working

method that we suggested in a draft charter we circulated for the group's consideration and discussion.

So in particular, we'd like to remind you that this draft charter was meant to be a conversation starter and it is open for any edits or comments you'd like to make on it.

And we also took a little bit of time during our first call last week to start discussing - initiating discussion, some substantive discussion on the framework. And I will provide a summary of the point that was discussed when we get to this item of our agenda.

Before I keep going on our agenda, where we'll be talking about - I'll give an update on the team membership, we'll talk briefly about co-chairs nominations and elections, the scheduling of our meeting as well, and we'll finally get to the substance to our framework drafting. Would anybody like to make any comment on this agenda or would like to add a point - a specific point of discussion? Okay, I'm not seeing any hands raised nor hearing anybody, so I will keep going.

Our objective today really is to address the few administrative matters and hopefully close them as soon as possible so that we can make way for a maximum amount of discussion on the substantive questions of drafting articulated framework.

So in terms of drafting team membership, that's item number two on our agenda today, I just wanted to give you an update that we now have a nomination for a registrar co-chair, and that's Theo Geurts. Theo, please let me know if my pronunciation is wrong. For registries we have two nominations, Al Bolivar from Verisign, and (Wes Nomer) from (Sly

Services). And for the GAC segment of our group, we have the nomination of Jon Flaherty with Ezequiel Salis as a second co-chair.

We circulated an e-mail to each of the subgroups of our team to hopefully assist you with the election process, and hopefully that was helpful. And I think it's pretty useful to gather any updates in terms of -- sorry -- each of the groups may have on this process. Would anybody like to share any status or questions or specific needs with this process with any of those segments that we have, the GAC, registrars, and registries?

I'm stopping here to give you an opportunity to potentially provide and update or ask a question or voice a concern with this process. Okay, I'm not seeing any hands raised nor hearing anybody speaking. So I just want to remind you that for the GAC segment of our group we invited a new participant today. I meant to mention it our - in the update on the drafting team members but I may have skipped that. I apologize about that.

So since we have one new member for the GAC Public Safety Working Group segment of our team, who's a participant from ThaiCERT, Artthawit Hung -- I hope it pronounced it correctly -- make sure that in your conversation you're included in the election process as well.

And for registries, we've added four members since our last call: Frieda Tallon, Hugh Dixon, and Alister Winfield for Sky. And Ashish Luthra for Afilias. So please also make sure as I - in the emails that I sent to this group that you include them in your discussions.

I see that Yasmin you have your hand raised. Please, do you want to go ahead?

Yasmin Omer: Thanks, Fabien. So this is -- excuse me -- in response to your question about the well the administrative issues regarding the election of the co-chair. There was some discussion amongst the registries regarding the at least how they would nominate the co-chairs, and there was a question raised, I don't know, I think (Rueben) raised the about the wider Registry Stakeholder Group voting on who the co-chair would be. (Unintelligible) the direction I don't think there's been a decision that's been made between the two co-chairs.

I think we, well I think the registries finally agreed that it would be up to the working group to decide - that the registries that are the working could decide not necessarily the wider Registry Stakeholder Group, but I could be mistaken there. However, yes I'm sorry, I'm not able to provide you with any progress at to our nomination of a co-chair at this point in time.

Fabien Betremieux: Thank you, Yasmin, for your update. I just wanted to make sure I understood you correctly, because I couldn't hear very well what you said. So if I understood correctly, you're saying that there is discussion ongoing and that you're the orientation is that the registries represented in the drafting team will be voting among themselves to elect the co-chair, but there hasn't been any progress in the election. Is that right?

Yasmin Omer: Fabien, yes, that's right. And that's as far as I recall. So any other registries that recall differently, please raise this now.

Fabien Betremieux: Okay thank you very much, Yasmin. Would anybody else like to jump in on this subject? I'm not hearing anybody nor seeing any raised. So please let us know. You can reach me via e-mail or get in touch with me and let me know if you have any specific needs to support your election process. Any specific question, we'd be happy to address and assist.

You know, I think from...

(David Conrad): Fabien?

Fabien Betremieux: Yes?

(David Conrad): This is (David Conrad). I was wondering if it would be - if we'd have sort of the possibility of having the elections done before the next meeting, just in the interest of time.

Yasmin Omer: I think we can -- sorry, this is Yasmin Omer on the registry side -- I think we can arrange that.

(David Conrad): Great thank you.

Fabien Betremieux: Would this schedule work also for the registrar membership and the GAC membership? Theo, for the registrars, do you think that this is workable? Has there been a discussion ongoing on how the election will be organized?

Theo Geurts: Yes. Sorry, yes. This is Theo for the record. I was trying to find the mute button on my VoIP telephone. The current status has been put forward by - I've been seconded by Michele, and from what I understood is that (Mark) didn't second me yet but it seems that everybody for the register group is okay with me being co-chair. Thank you.

Fabien Betremieux: Okay thank you. So we'll be looking forward to your confirmation that you are indeed the co-chair and we would very welcome this news.

And as far as the GAC membership is concerned, I see that we have (Nick) and maybe (Gwenth) with us that may be able to provide an update on the

process on the GAC side. I see that (Nick) is typing in the chat so we'll just wait for his input before we move on.

And why (Nick) is typing in the chat, Yasmin, to your question whether this is - we're targeting the election of these co-chairs as opposed to an overall chair, yes I think by the end - by next meeting it would be great have at least the co-chairs and then potentially have the co-chairs decide how they would like to proceed further. But I think that having the co-chairs would be very helpful by next meeting.

So (Nick) - okay so I understand that on the GAC side you have agreement, so I hope that you can confirm before the next meeting who is going to - who will be your co-chairs indeed, and we can at least start our third meeting with the co-chairs confirmed.

Thank you all for your discussion of this point of our agenda. So moving onto point number four of our agenda, which is about the scheduling of our next meeting. You might have seen a - our e-mail yesterday, so let's - it was about I'd say 15 hours ago. Let me show you what we've proposed - so here is the proposal. I'm loading the proposal in our - in the Adobe Connect.

So we - the group has to decide on two elements: a time of meeting and a day of the week when the meeting will happen, and we would use those choices as our schedule going forward so that we have a predictable repeatable schedule. And so with respect to timing of the meeting, we've suggested that there be a consideration of two models: a fixed-time model and rotating-time model.

The idea of a fixed-time model would be use only one time each week, and for instance a suggestion is 14:00 UTC today. The advantage of that model is that it would potentially allow maximum participation because it would prevent

imposing absolutely impossible hours on (unintelligible). But the downside is that odd hours would not be shared and would fall mainly onto participants from perhaps either on the U.S. west coast or in Asia Pacific.

So the other model is a rotating model where we'd have - we suggested three times: 4:00 UTC, 14:00 UTC, and 22:00 UTC, with the advantage of sharing the burden of all the impossible hours as the expense of an optimum participation. So we've also suggested - we provided a tool that I'm going to show very quickly here to help you measure the impact of each of these choices.

So very quickly, this table shows you for each UTC time the corresponding time in the relevant time zone, and for each time zone you have an idea of the number of drafting team members in each of the time zones. And so the impact is calculated in column B and C, so for each UTC time, you have a look at what is the impact on participants, how many are in impossible hours and the red zones and how many are in the right hours, the yellow zone.

Theo, would you like to speak?

Theo Geurts: Yes, Fabien. This is Theo for the record. Just a couple of comments here. In my opinion, or my experience, when it comes to the rotating timeframe, that is usually helpful when you have a low attendance or you want to have more eyes on the material that is being discussed. Sometimes you enter these IRTs or working groups and there's barely anybody on because the timeframe that's being set that's been fixed is not workable for a lot of people. So that is a pro for the rotating one.

However, I would personally suggest we go for the fixed one, primarily for the reason that it's easier to set up. It's going to be easier for you. You're also

going to ensure that you are not making - not have any conflicts with other working groups. I mean currently this one is apparently conflicting with IEG, who is (unintelligible). I suspect that Michele Neylon is on that call right now. So.

And we have a fairly strong group here attendance-wise, so I would slightly go for the fixed one. But I'll leave it up to everybody to supply their input. Thank you.

Fabien Betremieux: Thank you very much, Theo. And this is exactly the type of input we would like to hear from you. And in order to do that, we also suggest in our e-mail that you use a doodle poll we created to just give us a sense of your preferences. So preferences on both of these models: fixed or rotating model, whether the times we suggested are a good idea or whether for each of those models, you'd like to propose other times. And also we're using the doodle poll to also get your input on the days of the week.

And for your point of conflict with other community meetings, Theo, this is hopefully an instrument that will help you identify those conflicts and try to avoid those. So thank you again, Theo, for your input. To the entire group, please let us know what you think. The extract of the doodle poll was from a few hours ago, so it may have updated in the meantime. But please tell us what you think and hopefully our target is to have all your input by Thursday close of business in your time zone that on Friday we can communicate to the group what is the final - what could be the final schedule.

Are there any other questions or comments on this topic? I hear none. I don't see any hands raised. So I will come back to our agenda. We are now done with the administrative part of our discussion today and we have about 40 minutes to delve into the discussion of the framework drafting. So let me just

kick it off with a mention of the various discussion points that were raised in the last meeting as a reminder for everybody.

So there were a few concerns expressed. One was about the cost of implementing the framework. And the discussion there was about the notion that this framework is going to be a non-binding set of best practices, so in the design of those best practices, cost is going to be a factor but we did also note that the design of this framework is for assisting all involved parties to come up with a set of best practices and it's not meant to become a non-binding (unintelligible).

There was also concern voiced about the timeline. And here for our timeline that we presented for the conclusion of this effort. And here we had a discussion about the fact that hopefully the preexisting body of knowledge can be leveraged to build the framework. And also we want to remind you that the objective of this framework is to be an evolutionary document.

So the first version of this framework will not be the final version. We would come back at this framework regularly as needed to keep you in synch with the reality of work and practices.

There were a few suggestions made. One was that the liability of registries in particular be considered in the building of the framework, because it is identified as a limiting factor to what registries can do and would do. Jon Flaherty from the U.K. suggested that he could share some content just for consultation in the U.K., which apparently has built or is doing the research on concerns of liability as well as cost.

And finally, (Reuben) suggested that registries with policies that have it should be reviewed by the group or could be reviewed by the group to be integrated into the framework.

And finally there was a discussion of the mitigation model in the framework and in particular with respect to the connection between actions taken by registries and relevant law enforcement agencies in a context where multiple jurisdictions may be relevant. So the connection between registry measures and law enforcement agencies would certainly be a topic that will be further discussed.

I'm done with the summary of the discussion of last week on the topic. I would like to now open up the discussion. May I suggest that we could take the polling approach but that's for the group to decide and participants to decide. We could have a discussion of overarching principles. I think there were a few concerns that were voiced already that are fairly overarching, so maybe our first approach could be to discussing such principles and we pull out our draft outline which included some of those that we gathered from the preliminary consultation.

Then we could also discuss existing bodies of work, bodies of knowledge, that could be considered by the group for collection of practices and aggregation into the framework. And finally we could also discuss our draft outline section by section if people would like.

So let me load our draft outline, and please take the floor if you'd like to address any of these topics suggested or the framework in general. So I have loaded the outline. Before I un-synch the presentation of the document so everyone can navigate through the document, I just wanted to go to the section I mentioned about the principles.

So here in section two, objectives and principles of the framework -- sorry -- we talk about references that should be made in such a section, definitions that should be considered, and also input we received from the preliminary consultation. And let me just hear this, those three principles that we've heard in the consultation.

One of the objectives would be to reduce time to harm, a litigation objective. Standardization and harmonization of practices should not be an objective. There should be no insight in small measures. Measures should be aligned with the objective and the risk profile (unintelligible). Illustration should be presented in multiple solutions to choose from. And we talked a bit about this in last meeting, a recommendation that registries and stabilities are limited due to the fact that they don't have an access to registrants or cannot have a view altogether.

John, I see your hand raised. Please go ahead.

John Matson: Hi, this is John Matson with Architelos. I also represent (Minus Machine). Fabien, on the one-size-fits-all, my thought is to consider defining that a little bit more. Because when you talk best practices, it's really hard to define best practices across my type of registries would have.

So if we're to try to consider maybe rather than saying one size fits all but acknowledging tiers and trying to define tiers, maybe such as open and global, geo or city, large brand or small brand, or something that allows for an operational distinction. And then we could define the categories of the best practices, whether it's detection, litigation, et cetera.

Those would then vary across whichever tier was following. As a pragmatic example when we're talking law enforcement, I can see that law enforcement relationships and such practices might be very different for a geo or regional TLD that may have a specific association versus a global that has to balance many. But that - so that's a suggestion on the principle rather than just the one-size-fits-all, try to define it a little more specifically so that we can actually best practice it.

Fabien Betremieux: Thank you very much, John. Would anybody like to react, respond to this suggestion with their agreement in the membership present today on such an approach? Is that agreement with such an approach? Yasmin, would you like to please go ahead?

Yasmin Omer: Thanks, Fabien. My - so my concern in identifying certain categories and being prescriptive with respect to those categories is that we've got the- well I guess the process by which we identify the categories and then the application to those categories. And whether there's agreement as to what principles should apply to which categories, there are, you know, we don't have finite categories.

And ultimately I think what we need to bear in mind is that the, you know, whilst there will be some common understanding of what bad behavior is, ultimately this all depends on the registry operator's policies and understanding that this framework isn't technically binding on registry operators, I don't want to create a framework that restricts the registry operators' freedom important policies.

So if we are to - if we are able to come to some sort of agreement of what the universal bad behavior is and draft - and, you know, and be able to draft suggested responses based on that, then so be it. But I'm very, very cautious of

going down the path of identifying certain categories of TLDs and responses that should be taken with respect to those categories.

So I guess the principle that I'd like to emphasize is that the framework needs to be - it needs to be universal. So it needs to be a principle to brands, it needs to be a principles to generics, and to well all TLDs regardless of what their policies are. Otherwise I think we're compromising the registry operator's ability to create its own policies.

I think that may be a controversial notion, so I guess I put that to the group for discussion.

Fabien Betremieux: Thank you, Yasmin. And may I suggest also that in consideration of these views, we also integrate the notion of potential risk profile. I see the notion that came out in the preliminary consultation, so if not categories, could risk profile be an interesting consideration? I'm just throwing that out there for your discussion. Would anybody like to follow up on this discussion? Theo, please go ahead. Theo?

Theo Geurts: Thank you, Fabien. This is Theo for the record. I sort of feel that what Yasmin just put out there that's not actually the way to go. I think if we're going to have categories or we're going to do risk analysis, I think we're going overcomplicate the matter. And with the rigorous timeline that we have, I'm not sure if we would even hit the deadlines that we discussed last week. So I would be very cautious there. Thank you.

Fabien Betremieux: Thank you, Theo. Would anybody else like to jump in on this subject? So John, would it be appropriate that you potentially share an idea of what your vision is, or an example of what (unintelligible) maybe the example for the conservation of the group and further discussion of this point?

John Matson: Sure. (Unintelligible) Fabien.

Fabien Betremieux: Thank you. I think it would be quite helpful. Are there any other principles that members would like to suggest or discuss? Should I (unintelligible) putting the chat or can I (unintelligible) for (unintelligible)?

So I understand that this not suggesting that this discussion could go on the e-mail and that that's absolutely fine and welcome for sure. So if there's no additional description of high level principles we could potentially move on to discussing existing bodies of work that should be considered and how that could be achieved in the group.

So in terms of existing bodies of work, we start last week and we suggest, you know, at the end of our document that the group considers the work of the registry (use) policy working group that permits a final report in late 2010 and we have a chapter that's pretty much in line with the scope of our groups we are in.

Also we talked about - we referred to a discussion paper and the creation of (unintelligible) to help with (unintelligible) of domain names from September of 2011 that (unintelligible) consider. We've also talked last week about - as I mentioned earlier - registry resources and then consider - we talked about a new take on (unintelligible) that has been maybe ongoing or has been completed that could bring some elements here as well.

Would anybody else like to suggest other bodies of work or knowledge that should be considered? I am not seeing any hands raised nor hearing anybody. So maybe let's move on to the discussion of how - I see - yes (unintelligible), would you like to go ahead?

Yasmin Omer: Thanks Fabien. Theo you may be in a position to provide better input here but I hear that the registrars may be working on a document regarding how they deal with takedown requests and how they deal with certain instances of domain name abuse and that should be coming in the near future.

I would really like to hear from registrars. And I'd really like to get input from registrars when it comes to this (unintelligible). I don't know if it was the original communicate that we led to this framework or the (NGTC) response to it, but there seemed to be an indication that the registrars would be heavily involved in the funding that's gone into this. That's not to say that the registries won't be involved.

I mean ultimately the - well there is a level of involvement (unintelligible) the application of policies that I'd really like to get some input from the registrars in this regard.

Fabien Betremieux: Thank you Yasmin. Theo, would you like to provide some input?

Theo Geurts: Yes Fabien thank you. In regards to what Yasmin just put out, I'm not actually sure what you're referring to. I do know that we are working on a - some sort of framework when it comes to our obligation to investigate when there are complaints or abuse notices. But that is primarily the case - the issue when we receive like DMCA notices.

And we want to have a formal or a more sort of a template being set up in how this kind of abuse is being reported to us. That's the only thing that I think is going on at the moment. But I'm not 100% sure if you're referring to that but I could bring it back to the list to see if there's another initiative going on.

But to my knowledge, that's the only one going on there that we are working now with ICANN compliance right now. Thank you.

Fabien Betremieux: Thank you Theo. Does anybody have any thoughts? Yasmin would you like to speak again or is this an old hand?

Yasmin Omer: Sorry Fabien, that's an old hand.

Fabien Betremieux: Thanks. So already have quite a mix of appointments to consider. So may I suggest that we move on to discuss how this could be matured and included to the discussion of the framework? Would anybody particularly familiar with one of the bodies of work be willing to provide a summary to the group of what we can bring to the framework?

I'm thinking in particular that we may have a few members that may have participated to some extent to the (unintelligible) working group (unintelligible). So just a suggestion, if people are familiar with specific elements, bodies of knowledge pre-existing, it could be useful for them to share their view on them and how they could fit in our framework for the benefit of the group. So (unintelligible) allow to go to - to (weight) their - to share their knowledge.

Okay, I'm not hearing - I'm not seeing any hands raised or hearing anybody. I was thinking that for registries following the discussion that we had last week and the suggestion that (unintelligible) be considered, may I suggest that registries who are willing share an overview of their policies and how some of their packages could make it into our framework, the best practices of our framework?

So I think this could be under in our conversation or e-mail. Obviously as we're (unintelligible) by this (unintelligible). (Elaine) would you like to go ahead please? Oh sorry, no you're showing me. So she is going in and getting in through the Adobe Connect.

Okay so if nobody else would like to discuss overarching principle or existing bodies of knowledge that the framework should consider and how this could be done, then what we could do is take some time to review our (drop-out) line section by section and by discussion of each of these sections that's appropriate.

If anybody has any other suggestions for the remainder of our (unintelligible) go ahead right now. Let me know. Otherwise I will rethink our document and I will go down it section by section.

So again a reminder the dropout line was meant to be a conversation starter. Feel free to not be tied to it in any way. It's really to invite your thinking and participation. So Section 1 we suggested that the framework has obviously the introduction and some background.

We resketched the origin of this initiative and in addition to this background concerning (unintelligible) to refer to previous work that has been done in this area, as I mentioned earlier, due to the registration of the (unintelligible) working group or the discussion paper that came later on the creation of non-binding best practices.

Please stop me if anybody has comments, suggestions for introduction and background. I'm stopping here a second. I'm not hearing anybody. I'm not seeing any hands raised so we're moving on.

Section 2 of our document - or of our draft outline - has a suggestion for a section in a framework to clarify objectives and principle. We talked a bit about the objectives last week. We talked earlier in this call about some principles that (unintelligible) laid out. So I think we've already discussed this a bit maybe.

Here we were suggesting that there is a conservation of definitions that might be useful. In the primary consultation there was a discussion of (taxonomy) although there was also a discussion that pictures - this (group of pictures) was laid out in Spec 11. It's called to cover - which I recall correctly, malware, submalware, (unintelligible) and I may be missing one but again (unintelligible) Section 3 has a definition of the (unintelligible).

That might be a subject for discussion. So let me stop here for anybody who'd like to (unintelligible) this section, a suggestion as a section for the framework. Actually (Elaine) is typing in the chat so I will just hold off until I can read into it.

So while (Elaine) is typing in the chat we were talking about Section 2. We were talking about defining the current language in (unintelligible). (Unintelligible) example of review, correct? You know, I think (Elaine) a waiver would be appropriate with whatever the member is (unintelligible) think would be appropriate.

There will be - (Unintelligible) has made you aware of providing some guidelines around the current language of Spec 11. But I don't think we need to delve any further into the definition of (unintelligible) as it stands in the language right now.

The framework there is room for discussion of the (unintelligible). I think there are certain (unintelligible) definitions that can be removed for any relevant abuse. So again I think we should call on the group to determine what they think would be appropriate to include here in terms of the (commission) and examples overview.

So we have a line open so please make sure your lines are muted. Otherwise we will hear background. So while (Elaine) is typing we suggested also that - remind me the discussion we have a section that considers (unintelligible) assumptions and risk model for this framework. So we refer here to the discussion of the evolutionary nature of threats to the taxonomy discussion that we had in the primary consultation.

There was a suggestion to include some in the scope which can be considered as a gateway of news. And again here there was a compilation of suggestions that the compilation of risk profile be taken into account. Risk profile (unintelligible) TLD and so this goes back to our discussion earlier as a potential element to categorize - if not categorize at least survey the type of TLDs that are out there.

Any comments, suggestions with respect with control section addressing assumptions in terms of threats landscape and a risk model? I'm not hearing anyone or seeing hands raised.

We then suggested in our direct offline that there be consideration of a monitoring and detection model or (unintelligible) model and a detection model. Here in terms of input that we received from the primary consultation, there was quite a bit of discussion of how frequently these threats should be conducted, depending on the various factors -- the risk profiles, TLDs, the

type of threat, likelihood of harm, and the frequency of use evolution of that frequency over time.

So these were discussing as well in terms of (unintelligible) and (unintelligible) at least to check. So there was (unintelligible) a lot of discussion as well around the use of (unintelligible) for reputational data sheets and how these can be integrated in a (unintelligible) or detection model.

And finally there was a discussion of a series of other parameter or possible mechanisms such as, you know, reports or (unintelligible) on how to process. There are - nobody approaches to (unintelligible) that may be considered, etcetera. So those are suggestions I received in this area. Would anybody like to share any comments or questions in the section on possible (unintelligible) and detection models? Theo would you like to help?

Theo Geurts: Yes Fabien. This is (unintelligible) for the record, thank you. When I was looking at a section, it sort of occurred to me that we definitely need to discuss it. But it also looked like one of us looking in those canary accounts, got a slight understanding that could mean. It'll probably be sort of like a account that is - what is a canary account Fabien? Let me put it out there. Thank you.

Fabien Betremieux: Thank you Theo for making this to staff that's on the call. I will provide a much more elaborate explanation of what that meant. I'm not seeing - do we have anybody on staff who could answer this question precisely?

Okay, not hearing anybody so Theo let me make sure that we get back to you on this question and to the list as well so that, you know, we have precise information - naturally - precise and accurate information to share. So probably for maybe (unintelligible) answer your question on the staff.

Are there any other questions, comments on (unintelligible) model and the (second) model? Okay so we're moving on to Section 6.

So we have Section 5, sorry, where we suggested that there be a reporting model outside the framework and that would deal with the retention of data and reports including data (unintelligible) where we request the guidance from the (NGTC), potential (unintelligible) model.

We received input from the (unintelligible) compensation in this area. In terms of the use of the data, the challenges of collecting the data and using it and the type of data that should be included in a potential reporting model. Are there any comments, questions on this section? Theo, please go ahead.

Theo Geurts: Yes Fabien thank you. This is Theo for the record. Yes I was looking at those reporting of the percentages of fraudulent and criminal domain names per registrar. And frankly I'm not very happy with such language. I mean usually when such figures are published they tend to be interpreted rather negative and we sometimes get hit by a wave of criminals.

And then we would have a certain high percentage that month and the next month we would have to clean it up. But usually when you start to publish such reports somewhere - you cannot always be 100% sure what's going on there just because you reported X amount of hijacked domains or malicious activity.

It's not really telling you that much about the registrar itself. I mean the reporting should be done on a quarterly basis. And if that goes on a registrar level, it just sounds like bad PR for us. So just throwing it out there. Thank you. I hope everybody understood my concern there. Gladly to clarify it if it's not understood. Thank you.

Fabien Betremieux: Thanks Theo for your discussion of this point and to clean it up I think, you know, again this is starting to be discussed and not meant to be in position on the team (unintelligible) the framework. So I think, you know, these types of concerns are what we've heard in the preliminary consultation. So we kind of hear compiled type of feedback we got and it's often contradictory.

So, you know, we welcome these discussions and suggestions in the area. Theo your hand is still raised. Is that a new hand, old hand?

Theo Geurts: It was a really old hand.

Fabien Betremieux: Thank you. (Crystal) would you like to go ahead please? (Crystal) can you hear me? Would you like to speak? Are you muted maybe? Okay we might be experience - we might be experiencing an issue with (Crystal)'s line. Okay thank you for dialing in and we'll come back to your question or comment (Crystal) when you're (unintelligible).

We suggested also that the framework contain an integration model. Obviously there was some discussion of this last week as I referred to it earlier in my discussion summary. We also have an open question that we - that was asked by (Elaine) and the (unintelligible) familiar within the (unintelligible) co-education on this point as soon as possible.

And here - so let me stop here, whether there is any suggestions, comments, questions with respect to the suggestion that the framework contain the integration models. Okay I'm not hearing anybody, not seeing any hands raised. I see also that our time is almost up. So I'm still watching for (Crystal) to join in and potentially make her comment or ask a question.

In the meantime, please let me remind you that we would very much your input on our (unintelligible) schedule. I'm informed that you now have (Crystal) on the audio. (Crystal) if you can hear me would you like to speak?

(Crystal) can you hear me? Okay so we still seem to be challenged there. So I was saying that since our time is up...

(Crystal): Thanks Fabien. Can you hear me now?

Fabien Betremieux: Oh I can hear you. Please go ahead. We're at the top of the hour.

(Crystal): Sorry. So my question is about the last bullet for reporting - reporting should be done on a quarterly basis. I guess my question is what is ICANN's - I know that conversation is what are we doing about this to be making it public? What does ICANN foresee doing with this data if it's not public? If we just give it to you as obligated under Spec 11 as requested from ICANN, what's the purpose?

Is there a goal that ICANN has about once it collects all this data from registries and registrars? I guess I'm trying to figure out why would we want you guys to have it on a quarterly versus monthly versus yearly? It would influence how I feel that how often we give you the data, dependent on what the plan is to do with the data.

Fabien Betremieux: Thank you (Crystal). I do remember your addressing these - (unintelligible) your comments in the primary question. I would think that there may be two tracks in answering your question, a mirror questions, one that may be related to what currently should be done with Spec 11 and again here we'll have this discussion in the building of our advisory which will include outlines in how to - in (unintelligible).

Here in framework I think between maybe separated in the conversation here in the framework reporting model that to the benefit of parties involved in the (unintelligible) and for any purpose that I discussed within the (unintelligible) seems appropriate. So I hope that answers your question at (unintelligible) (Crystal).

Thank you very much (Crystal). I see that (Nick) has (unintelligible). So I see that our time's up, so let me again remind you that we're really expecting the maximum input we can get on the scheduling of our next meeting. And hopefully we get your input by tomorrow, Thursday and (unintelligible) your kind of with your data you'll be able to propose a (standard) going forward.

And also hopefully by next meeting we will have all the co-chairs concerned and we'll be able to handle the leadership of this discussion through the co-chairs.

So again let me just here stop and open up for any final comments or questions before we end our meeting today. Thank you (Elaine) for your reminder that the (unintelligible) and integration of comments from the community (unintelligible) of consensus based position of any stakeholder groups. Thank you for that reminder (unintelligible).

So thank you all again for joining this morning, this evening or in your day. We really appreciate your time and we will be looking forward for any input you may have (unintelligible) discussion. (Unintelligible) will be looking forward to going to our meeting schedule. And we're looking to having co-chairs next week.

Thank you again. Thank you for your time and have a nice end of your day or evening. Bye.

Man: Have a good one.

Man: Bye-bye.

END