ICANN
Transcription
Thick Whois PDP Working Group
Tuesday 3 September 2013 at 14:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Thick Whois PDP Working Group on the Tuesday 3 September 2013 at 14:00 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-thick-whois-20130903-en.mp3

On page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#sep

Attendees:
Volker Greimann - RrSG
Alan Greenberg – ALAC
Steve Metalitz - IPC
Mikey O'Connor – ISPCP
Frederic Guillemaut – RrSG
Avri Doria – NCSG
Tim Ruiz – RrSG
Amr Elsadr - NCSG

Apologies:
Susan Prosser - RrSG
Marie-Laure Lemineur – NPOC
 Marc Anderson – RySG
Carolyn Hoover – RySG
Don Blumenthal – RySG

ICANN staff:
Marika Konings
Lars Hoffmann
Berry Cobb
Julia Charvolen

Coordinator: This conference call is now being recorded.

Julia Charvolen: Thank you (Tim), good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone,

and welcome to the thick WHOIS working group call on Tuesday 3 of

September 2013.

On the call today we have Roy Balleste, Avri Doria, Alan Greenberg, Volker Greimamn, Mikey O'Connor and Tim Ruiz. We also have Amr Elsadr who has just joined the Adobe Connect. We have apologies from Susan Prosser, Marie Laure Lemineur, Don Blumenthal and Caroline Hoover and from staff we have Berry Cobb, Marika Konings who will be joining us soon and myself Julia Charvolen.

May I please remind all parties to please state their names before speaking for transcript purposes, thank you very much and over to you Mikey.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan we also have apologies from Steve Metalitz.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Julia Charvolen: Thank you very much.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. Okay, welcome all, it's Mikey. To our usual deal where we take a look at the agenda which is pretty straight forward, we're just going to keep working on these comments.

I think we're getting pretty close to the end and so we'll just take a look at that and take a moment for people to update their statements of interest.

Roy Balleste: Mikey, this is Roy.

Mikey O'Connor: Hi Roy.

Roy Balleste: Hello, sorry I have been away, school began and that got me delayed. But I wanted to take this opportunity to update my statement of interest. I made a minor change to reflect the register my name under the domain.org.

And that I have raised around interest from that point of view. So nothing major but just wanted to make it for the record.

Mikey O'Connor: Terrific, join the crowd of folks who have done that and thanks for the update, anything else? Okay, off we go. Berry has kindly put the updated version of the public comment tool and I think I'm just going to sync it to 22 for a minute to show you a quick update that we did from last week where we had a pretty extensive conversation about the authoritativeness section.

And Mark - can't remember if Marc was in the list of apologies but he did send an apology, then I think I'm going to take us past - let's see, where are we? Hopefully I'm not winding you.

I'm going to take you to 25 which is where we had a pretty substantive discussion of some of the comments in the privacy and data protection section. I just want to draw your eye to the draft that Berry prepared and also tip my hat to Berry for capturing that.

I think what we'll do is we'll bash through all of these and come up with a consolidated draft and then beat up the draft and update the report and do sort of a major edit rather than try and repeat them week to week.

If anybody has strong feelings about anything in here by all means chime in but I wasn't planning to spend time on this today. So Berry remind me, do we start at - it looks like 31, staff comment, does that strike you as the right place to...

Berry Cobb: Yes sir, yeah the highlighted yellow one.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, okay, so I'll sync us to that. This is a comment from staff, is Marika on yet? Marika are you there?

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika, I'm here, sorry for being late.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh no worries, I just wanted to make sure that you were here because if you weren't I was going to skip it, but you're here so I won't. So I'll let you take a minute to read this and then I'll do the dramatic reading into the transcript.

All right, so this one reads as follows, in the data and motion section of this privacy and data protection IRR report the reports reads thick WHOIS models introduce the necessity for data transfer which requires additional security measures beyond what are needed for information that remains in the single system.

That's a - and then the quote ends, that's from our existing report. In the comment from the staff is how about the existing shared registry system, SRS, presumably this is a secure channel regardless of the type of data being transferred.

And Marika do you want to just elaborate a little on that, kind of fill in the context and then we'll take this one out.

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika, I would love to elaborate but actually I don't really know much about the shared - I'm actually hoping that someone on the call will know what she means and whether it would be something that could be considered or whether it's not really suited for the purpose we're discussing here.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay, thanks Marika. Volker, you know about the SRS, why don't you go next?

Volker Greimann: Yeah, I don't really understand what this comment is getting at because apparently we are using the term shared registry system differently than ICANN does.

For us it's system where multiple registries are using one platform. It's not a transfer system between the registrar and the registry which we're looking at when we're looking at data transfers for thick WHOIS data.

So I think this comment needs more clarification to be even considered.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Volker, Tim?

Tim Ruiz: Yeah, kind of made a note there in the chat but I'm just wondering if maybe this may or may not be a possibility but it seems to me that it's really like an implementation kind of note or issue.

So I'm - whether it's possible or not I'm not sure if that's something we really need to get into and maybe our response here is just that you know noted, you know and that is something that could be discussed further during implementation or something along that lines.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, okay. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah I had a hard time understanding this also, and what I ended up - the way I ended up interpreting it is they were saying that the word introduces is wrong, that is there's already data in motion that we have technology to do it.

But I'm really not 100% sure what they were getting at.

Mikey O'Connor: Marika, go ahead. Oh Tim. Let me get to Marika and then Tim.

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika, I'm happy to go back and check with the caller who made that suggestion to see if there's anything further and see what he actually intended, but on the other hand I think Tim's suggestion also makes perfect sense, well noted.

And maybe this is something that can be further considered as part of the implementation to see if that is something that would address the concern that was raised in the report, that security matters may be needed or required.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay, Tim.

Tim Ruiz: Never mind.

Mikey O'Connor: You know I think what I got out of this is I think all these ideas are good and maybe what we do is we say well, at least at this stage barring any clarification from the person who suggested this, that we note it.

We also note some discrepancy between our definition of SRS and thick WHOIS and then also note Alan's possible interpretation that maybe their focus here is on our use of the word introduce.

And to that end one thing we could do is change the word introduce to the word require, so then it would read thick WHOIS models require the necessity for data transfer.

Not sure I'm right on that, Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. My recollection and it's dim at this point is most of the staff changes were not really changing overall intent but were clarifying wording or mentioning something we missed.

It may have more context if we look at it in the paragraph of where it was and how it was changing that particular paragraph. I don't have the documents on hand but my recollection is most of them were not really changing what we were saying but were helping to clarify the report or be - or make it more accurate.

And I may be remembering it completely wrong.

Mikey O'Connor: No, I think you're right. I think the final bit to this is for Marika - to take Marika up on her offer to head back to that person and find out a little bit more about what their reaction was and why they had it in there.

Maybe we'll touch on this one again. That's probably the best way to leave it is let's touch it one more time after Marika's had a chance to talk to the person. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika, I'm happy as well to look back at the original comment in the report itself because I actually interpreted it as a more implementation related note as we note in there that section, we say basically that you know additional security measures may be needed or appropriate.

I interpret the comment as meaning for that reason maybe looking at the shared registry system, maybe one of those additional security measures that could be explored already an existing one that would fit that bill.

But as I said I'll check back and see if there's anything more to report on that and I've taken note of the feedback you've all provided too so we can at least capture that already and the public comment review tool.

Mikey O'Connor: Well and if in fact that's what likely going on then that would be - that would drop us pretty neatly into Tim's implementation detail so thanks very much, duly noted, great idea, something along those lines.

Alan is that a new hand?

Alan Greenberg: sorry, old one, down.

Mikey O'Connor: No worries. My eye is as usual tracking too many things. Okay, so then move along, operate my dang mouse, to oh. Now I see why people were asking about the numbering.

Because when I look at Steve Metalitz's note numbering collides. Okay so the way I should read Steve's note, he's talking about 39, but that's really 40 on this list, right Berry? Berry is typing.

Berry Cobb: Yeah this is Berry, that's correct. I had added or wrote in there for Pat Kane's comments so that incremented everything by one.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, which row was that? Did I skip that?

Berry Cobb: That's when we started the call, Row 22 in regards to Mark Anderson's action item and the comment from Pat Kane that the Durban meeting about...

Mikey O'Connor: Got it, all right, so we don't need to revisit that it's just jumped our numbers. Okay, so we are actually working I think then on number 40, I'll sync us to that and take a moment to read it.

Okay, this is from IHG and it says while we agree that the transition of the current thin gTLD registries must be carefully prepared and implemented we urge that the transition occur sooner rather than later.

And then I'll channel Steve here, Steve was unable to join us on the call but sent along some comments by email.

So Steve wrote while I personally agree with this comment, then parenthetically says I believe the transition should have happened yesterday exclamation point, if others do not share that view then I am fine with our response as a group by saying duly noted.

Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: I would strongly support putting some words in and I don't know exactly where that are in the same tone as what Steve is saying. We sadly have seen examples where the quote staff implementation drags on for years.

And we really don't want that to happen in this case so although yes this must be done carefully we want to make sure it gets done and gets done with the utmost practical speed.

And I think we need to say something like that.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay, anybody else got any strong objections to sort of following the track that Alan has laid out for us here? I agree with that, certainly Steve appears to. Volker, go ahead.

Volker Greimann: Yeah, I agree, however I do think it should be done right so we shouldn't ask the implementation to be rushed just to achieve a faster goal. It should be done with due consideration of all the factors that are involved in this transition.

And after that is done then the implementation should occur as fast as possible, yes, but before there's still work to be done that needs to be done carefully.

Mikey O'Connor: I don't think you'd get any disagreement from anybody. Oh Alan, go ahead, sorry.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah I think that coincides exactly with what I said. I'm more worried about the delays not being on the amount of time given by staff to the registry to change but the amount of time it takes the registry - the staff to pump out the plan.

In the light of all the things that are going on with new gTLDs and the new RAA, this has the tone of something which could be put on the back burner and ignored. I don't want that to happen.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah so I think what we're all...

Alan Greenberg: We need to be really clear that from a staff point of view, I mean yes, the staff should not set an unreasonably long deadline for the registries to do the physical implementation.

That's - you know that's obvious, or maybe it isn't obvious and we need to say it. And we need to be prudent at all stages but we don't want any delays because someone views this as being low priority.

Mikey O'Connor: I think we've got pretty much consensus on that view. I'm kind of liking IHG language as language that we could maybe find an appropriate spot to observe in the report.

Sort of amplify this. Oh Amr, go ahead, sorry.

Amr Elsadr: Hi this is Amr, I don't disagree at all with what Alan or Volker have both said but before putting a comment in response to the comment by IHG I would like to understand why there is the concern that staff might sort of push this back or consider an implementation issue of low priority. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: I have a one word answer, experience.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, well let's expand on that a little bit. Alan was the chair of the (Pednar) working group which I and several of us are done and you want to tell that story or are you tired of telling it and you want me to tell it?

Alan Greenberg: I don't even remember the timeline but we made a number of recommendations none of which were particularly onerous either to interpret because we went into pretty specific detail about the implementation.

Not trusting others to understand what we meant and it then took I don't remember, Marika may have a timeline somewhere a year and a half for staff to get back with the actual implementation and then another nine months or so for it to get approved by the board.

It drug on for years and in light of other things going on I just feel in my bones this one has the tone that something that may go into an abyss and take a long time to come out.

Mikey O'Connor: I won't amplify that at all.

Alan Greenberg: If I'm wrong our words do not cost us a lot and do no harm.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah and Amr, as a participant in that process but not the leader I will tell you true it was amazing how long that took and how minor the changes were that we were asking for.

So that's the reaction. And I entirely share Alan's view. Okay I think we're pretty much agreed on that one. Any final thoughts on that? Tim was saying sounds like a job for superman and superwoman, Berry and Marika to wordsmith for us.

I'm with Tim on that but I think they've got the gist of it. Okay, next one is 41, and IHG agrees that the cost of - did I - oh I see what's going on, never mind.

So 41 and 42 are linked together in Steve's analysis so maybe I'll try and do these together. The first one, 41, IHG agrees that the cost of transitioning from thick to thin, thin to thick, that threw me off, no, there's a typo in the comment.

Let me start over, IHG agrees that the cost of transitioning from thin to thick WHOIS will be minimal and believe that those costs are far outweighed by the numerous benefits of requiring thick WHOIS for all gTLD registries.

And they also go on to say we agree that the transition of dot org from thin to thick would serve as a model for implementation. We would support the formation of a team of experts from the parties will be most affected by the - oh that's - these are different.

Let's do them one at a time. Let's stop with 41, see if there are any comments on that. Steve's comment was thanks very much for your support, Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, all it's saying is it agrees with our analysis so I thank you for your agreeing is appropriate. I do point out that the first word of the second sentence of the comment is a typo and not a Freudian slip.

Mikey O'Connor: Smart aleck, he's referring to think instead of thin for the transcript. Smart aleck. Anything else folks? Going once, going twice on this, I don't think it's terribly controversial.

On to 42, the old 41, we agree - this is again from IHG - we agree that the transition of dot org from thin to thick, same typo could serve as a model for implementation.

We would support the formation of the team of experts for the parties that will be most affected by the transition to work with ICANN staff on the transition process and look forward to - for reviewing and commenting on any such implementation plan in the near future.

And again this is similarly responded to by Steve Metalitz saying that I thank you for your support note would be appropriate which seems appropriate to me as well.

Any refinements to this?

Alan Greenberg: And we'll make sure the call for the implementation team goes out to you.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I think that's right. I think that the implementation team on this one is going to be one that we're going to want to do some heavy lifting on it, which reminds me just a note to Marika, just on a different working group.

But it dawns on me that the IRTP implementation team has been strangely silent and if you wouldn't mind just checking in with those folks to see where we're at on that.

It's completely off topic, sorry, but just reminded me of it.

Marika Konings: Will do.

Mikey O'Connor: Forty three, Steve lumps all of these together in his note. He takes 43 through 46 and I think I'm going to read his note first so that we can then sort of see whether we think he's right.

Steve says all of these comments raised parenthetically in one way or another the question of whether the transition should be deferred until all other initiatives now underway are resolved.

The working group response given in the third column of Item 43 is probably an adequate way to respond to all of these. I defer to others about whether the view that transition to any new system will be more efficient and smooth, the status quo involves only one architecture rather than two is just an assumption.

Is that response is phrased working group assumes or actually something on which we can take affirmative position. To me it sounds quite reasonable that this would be the case and I would support taking the stronger view on this.

So let's take a look at our current response and sync you on to 44 which is where that response which Steve was talking about is.

Working group noted that at the same time it would not be reasonable or wise to freeze any existing WHOIS related activities as it is not clear yet what the outcome or timeline for any new protocol and/or model may be.

Furthermore the working group assumes that in the case of the transition to a new protocol or model the transition process will be easier if all registries are using the same model.

I think this is where Steve is zeroing us in on whether we want to get stronger on that assumption or leave it sort of like that.

Now let me drag us back to the actual comments that we're talking about, 43 which was back in the day 42 is from the 3M AWG working group in IPC. I don't know what that stands for.

Does anybody know what that acronym means? Anyway, and then IP it says we understand there may be other changes to WHOIS such as those under development in the IETF in ICANN's EWT.

Moving to thick WHOIS is an important step that ICANN can take now with real benefits and without interfering with those other changes. With your permission I'll just drag us - way to go Marika.

Messaging malware and mobile anti-abuse working group, I'll drag us on to the new 44 formerly 43. Patrick Vanderwall says it's questionable to still

invest time and resources in trying to fix the protocol and model, both of which will go through substantial changes in the near future.

Protocol side port 43 is obsolete, unsatisfying for all parties. Words will address many of the shortcomings of the port 43 RIS, this includes the required standardization through JSON formatted responses for automation and the queries as well as the support for non-ASCII data.

Further the possibility to implement differentiated access will allow presumably people to address many of the concerns regarding privacy and compliance and finally - I think I am going to lump these all together.

Patrick's next comment is given that the factors highlighted in these comments will induce significant costs in implementation it would seem reasonable to freeze all changes to the WHOIS services until both the technical and legal entities clear up.

However starting right away the discussions on future directory service would certainly speed up the adoption and deployment in the future stage.

And then the new 46 which is the old 45 is from Mark Monitor, IPC (Validious) business constituency, it says we believe that migrating all TLDs to thick WHOIS model as soon as practical will lay the groundwork for a smooth transition process if a common thick WHOIS model could be replaced by the aggregated registration data services, ARDS currently proposed by ICANN's expert working group.

So I'm taking a little liberty with you, feel free to push back on this by lumping all these together but this is basically the discussion of should we stay or should we go now to quote an old rock and roll tune.

And make the - there's a queue, and I'll go to there and then we'll see where we wind up. Tim?

Tim Ruiz: Yeah I think lumping them together is - I'm okay with that, or not. To me I think they all really tie together but if others feel strongly we have reason for having individual comments on all these.

I guess we can but my feeling is that you know to - that we shouldn't freeze or recommend that anything be frozen.

I - in fact I think that, you know, our recommendation that all Registries should be thick could actually help some of these other efforts because now they can - they don't have to wonder, "Do - are we going to have two different models to have to work with in whatever we recommend be done?"

They'll know now, "Well there's just one model, the thick model that we have to be concerned with." And then I think that's good reason why, you know, it's very likely then that getting everyone thick will be a very important thing before all these other initiatives start to be implemented.

Then of course there is the possibility that along the way in these other initiatives that there might become a very good reason why it isn't worth it or that it's not valuable to be all thick before one of these initiatives goes forward.

Or let's see if that happens and then if they are concerned with that and make that recommendation and we haven't all gone thick yet, then that can be revisited.

But I strongly feel that we should not recommend anything be frozen, and that from our view right now going all thick is the best way to move forward and easier for these other initiatives to be completed and to be implemented. So if we want to take a stronger stand on that I'd have no objection to it.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Tim. I'd like to flag this one for Marika and Berry because that first part of Tim's comment is new and I - I'd like to capture that in the Comments section for us to maybe insert in the report.

I hadn't thought about the fact that by taking the thin versus thick variable out of the considerations for those other groups that we might make their work easier.

And I think that's a great idea to at least put in our draft and review as a group. Thanks Tim. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. With regard to that last point it's already there somewhere because I remember I was the one who raised it a long, long time ago that having everyone thin will make the next transition easier, so it's already there somewhere. I don't have a clue where.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay you meant thick. When you just spoke you didn't...

Alan Greenberg: Whatever, from what to what.

Mikey O'Connor: Go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: With regard to strengthening the statement that I just made, that it will make things easier which is what Steve was referring to, I wouldn't want to strengthen it a lot.

There's still going to be one more comment period or two before this gets approved by the GNSO and approved by the Board. And making a very strong statement about something which can be nothing more than a hypothesis for us, you know, is just a - providing something to chip at and I'm not sure there's a lot of merit in it.

You know, our recommendation stands and we have plenty of reason for doing it, and pushing a lot more on an issue which we cannot really have any substantive proof on may not help us a lot, so I'd be cautious about that.

On the question which is now 44 or the comment which is 44, as I read it his whole thing is saying we shouldn't be making changes to the protocol and the model for a whole bunch of reasons.

I didn't think we were. We are never, ever talking about changing the protocol and we're not changing the model. We're simply saying everyone adopt the same one that exists in the vast majority of TLDs.

And we're certainly not talking about the protocol. There's - no one's going to argue with the fact the protocol's crap right now and doesn't satisfy all of our needs.

And we carefully stayed away from that so I think we need to respond in kind, you know, pointing that out.

Mikey O'Connor: That's a good point. Let's capture that in our draft.

Alan Greenberg: It was in the AG draft that was already - that was taken out at some point at some meeting that I wasn't at, but there were already words to that effect somewhere.

Mikey O'Connor: Well that's interesting. I didn't realize that - that's weird that yours came - and I wonder if it came up somewhere else in this.

Alan Greenberg: Maybe. I wasn't at the meeting so I don't know how it happened, but I know I remember saying that once.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh well, we should run back and find it. But anyway I think we should highlight that.

Alan Greenberg: Easy enough to reproduce.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes for sure. Marika. Oh your hand's...

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Just to clarify what - and I think this is one of the comments that we did already review earlier on noting that Alan had maybe suggested a response and this basically captured what the Working Groups discussed subsequently, so basically replaced Alan's suggested language.

I'm happy to look back at what Alan originally suggested and add anything that we discussed today.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I don't think it's any more complex than pointing out we're not changing - we're not recommending changing the protocol.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I think that's right and I think that's an important distinction to make. And then, you know, just to drive the final nail into this part of the discussion, I'll remind the Working Group of the conversation I had with Steve Crocker in which he was emphatic that we should not delay because of those other efforts.

And so we don't need that in the report but just a reminder. Any other on these? The, you know, it sounds like we're in pretty good shape on this. We'll leave it pretty much untouched with the addition of Alan's comment about the protocol.

All right. So then - oh my goodness. We're at the end except for the new 47. The new 47 is very similar to the conversation we just had and is the comments from the BC, the Business Constituency, and MarkMonitor.

It says, "The BC encourages that those Registries operating a thick," - this think typo is pretty consistently through this. I don't know how that got in there.

Anyway, "The BC encourages those Registries operating a thin WHOIS to migrate to a thick WHOIS as a matter of urgency." I'm not sure that they really meant it that way.

I think it's really more along the lines of what Volker and Alan and others were saying earlier in this call, that we probably do want to emphasize that this transition be done as a matter of urgency but that, you know, that it be done in an orderly and high quality way.

And then Steve's comment - as summarized this comment is a bit ambiguous. It is talking about how fast the transition should happen once a consensus policy for quote all thick is in place.

Then see the previous conversation. If it is urging the current thin Registries to start the transition now even before a consensus policy is in place, while I personally agree I'm not sure it's really our role to urge this and so I would be okay with noted.

And I think that that's sort of where I land. I think that the way this was summarized perhaps overreaches just a little bit. Tim, go ahead.

Tim Ruiz: Yes. Yes I'm - I'd be okay with noted. I just wouldn't want to give the impression that, you know, we agree in any way that, you know, the transition should take place, you know, ad hoc or sort of on their own because I don't think - I would strongly discourage that.

I'm not sure it's even possible without a policy but - so I'd be okay with noted. But, you know, I'd also be okay if we made some comment that, you know,

that we - but we're no way encouraging that, you know, this process take place before, you know, there's a plan in place.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes or a policy. I mean, I think...

Tim Ruiz: Right. Right.

Mikey O'Connor: I think it may just be a summarization problem. Marika and Berry, you may want to go back to the original comment and see what's going on there. I - and I think that if it's - that they're just expressing the support for the idea that we talked about earlier in the call that this be done urgently and well, then we're fine.

But if they're talking about jumping ahead of policy and plan that we're not going to support that. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I didn't read that - I don't recall what the exact comment said. But I didn't read the summary certainly as implying they should jump the gun. There's plenty of empirical evidence that the Registry in question is not going to make changes unilaterally until ICANN says they should for a whole bunch of reasons.

And the Board could still reject our recommendations and say, "Leave it as it is." So I think it would be imprudent for them to put a lot of effort into it until there is a policy.

To what extent they start thinking about it while Staff is actually implementing the policy, whatever that ends up meaning, is an internal matter and I don't think we - we're in a position to provide guidance.

So I think we can either say noted or depending on exactly what it said, you know, we believe this must be done as quickly as practical but with care and leave it at that.

I, you know, I think we may be reading more into it than is there but if it's really there we do need to counter that part.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. So I think a couple of things come out of this one. Marika and Berry, if you could go back to the original and check that transcription, it sounds like we sort of got a choice.

If they were actually saying that Registries should jump the gun then we need to counter it. If in fact the transcription of their point was a mistake then we can just note it.

Alan Greenberg: Registries are fully capable of jumping the gun if they want to, but it's not up to us to...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. And - well I don't think they can. I think Tim's point is right. I think as a Registry they'd be on pretty thin ice to go ahead and do that without that policy in place.

Alan Greenberg: They've had several years to do that if they were going to do it.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Well there we are. We're at the end. I think that's enough for today. I feel no urge to keep us on any longer. I will however take a moment to just - to throw the mic open to any and all who have either summary comments or other thoughts.

But otherwise I think what we'll do is we'll draw the line under this part of the work and move our sights towards the next part, which is summarizing these, driving that into the draft report, getting documents prepared that we as a Working Group can review very carefully and try and get to consensus on. Marika you're up.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I just wanted to get one action item off my list. I quickly reviewed the BC comments and they actually mean - I'll just read what it actually said.

"As a matter of timing the BC encourages Dot Com, Dot Jobs and Dot Net to migrate to a thick WHOIS system immediately upon ICANN Board approval of a new consensus policy regarding thick WHOIS in order to avail a Registrant and consumers of WHOIS data to these benefits without delay."

So I think it's basically in line with what the Working Group said, you know, as soon as approved and an implementation's already in place and not the reverse of having it as an urgent manner without, I mean, have a CR implementation back behind that.

They summarized it basically like that in their exact - just on their background where they have one sentence that, "Further the BC encourages those Registries operating a thin WHOIS to migrate to a thick WHOIS as a matter of urgency," and that's what we took for the public comment review tool.

But in their detailed comments I think it further explained that it meant - it's intended to be as, you know, following Board approvals.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Okay so let's get that refinement into this comment tool and then we can just go to doing an audit on that. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I'll just note that although I'm occasionally surprised on these things, I don't think we've left a lot for Staff to do. We've been pretty specific and this is not, you know, we have one recommendation or maybe two now.

But I don't think this is going to be all that onerous for Staff to pass on to the Registries to implement.

Mikey O'Connor: No I think that's right. Okay so on Tim's comment on the last little bit about this, is that clears that up and so I think we've got a plan in this one too. Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I - it's more a question with regards to the next steps because of course I have some homework now looking through the comments, and looking at the recommended actions that the Working Group designated and making some updates to other parts of the report.

And so my question would be do we need a call next week, or would it be appropriate for me to try to get an updated version or a first draft of the final report to you by - around the time of the call next week so you can have then another week to look at that, or would you like to use the call then for me to run through any change I've made?

What do you think is the best approach in taking it now to the next level basically?

Mikey O'Connor: My immediate reaction and then I'll go to the queue is since the ball is now sort of in your hands, you're the best judge of the amount of time that you need to do what's next.

And so it's - if it's your feeling that it would be helpful to have a little more time to get that draft done, I would certainly be fine with skipping a call next week.

I'd rather give you the time and the breathing room to get that done. Well, you know, we have plenty of time before Buenos Aires to get this finished but I'll check with others and see.

I'm getting some agrees and I've got a little bit of a queue. Amr and then Alan. Amr go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Hi this is Amr. I'm sorry but I think I was offline when we - when the Working Group started reviewing the comments. And I have an issue with the updated recommendation on one of the earlier comments.

Would it - would you rather if I pick this up on the list or do we discuss it on a call?

Mikey O'Connor: I'm fine circling back. I mean, this is the time - this is the right time to do it and we have about ten minutes. Let me just get to Alan and then we'll circle back.

Amr Elsadr: Sure.

Alan Greenberg: I have no problem. In fact I would prefer it if we're going to make a change let's do it before Marika works on the final draft. I'll make my - the comment I was going to make is very short.

Marika already gave an indication because she said, "If I can get this back to - I'll get this back to you in - for - by next week's meeting." She was already telling us she thinks it's going to take a little bit of time to do well, so I agree to skip the meeting.

And by the way yes it's quite a bit of time before Buenos Aires, but we don't have to wait until then to present this and get this wrapped up. If we're lucky we can get a Board approval before Buenos Aires.

Mikey O'Connor: There's an impressive target. All right.

Alan Greenberg: The Board's working impressively fast these days.

Mikey O'Connor: I thought they had a comment.

Alan Greenberg: Well they may and if the review periods slow it down then so be it but...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I don't think we can get that. Okay so Amr I think it's over to you. Which one on the current version are you talking about?

Amr Elsadr: I think the current version is probably the same as the version I'm looking at. So I'm looking at Row 12 on the ICANN Staff comments regarding response consistency.

Mikey O'Connor: Hang on while I drive myself up there.

Amr Elsadr: All right. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: And then I'm going to hit the Sync button and drag the rest of them there. Okay let's see. I'm going to have to read this for a minute. Okay so let me replay the bidding as I understand it Amr, and then you can put your comment in.

The Staff made a comment that said essentially that there are some contractual timing issues, but they need to be looked at in terms of the Response Consistency section.

And we had quite a lot to say about that, but then our response was to update our recommendation to essentially acknowledge that response consistency is already in the RAA, the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, and that we might want to use that as a model and some other things. So with that take it away.

Amr Elsadr: Yes thanks Mikey. This is Amr. My comment on this is relating the updated recommendation specifically on the specification in the RAA. That - from my understanding of this part of the RAA it's based on the report by the ROD Working Group.

And having a - an updated recommendation based on this right now I think might be premature at least for this Working Group, because my

understanding is that there are a few other PDPs that are coming into play that might address these issues more carefully.

And so I was wondering do those include the translation and transliteration PDP in which there's a charter being drafted for that that is supposed to answer the question of whether it will be desirable to sort of have a consistent display of data, whether using language or a script and as well as some other details on who should bear the burden of doing this?

And my understanding is that there's going to also be another PDP coming up which will address what items in the registration data should be translated or displayed in a consistent fashion.

So my concern here is that this might not necessarily be within the scope of this Working Group but might fall to the scope of other ones. And we might be jumping the gun just a little bit by making an updated recommendation on this. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Oh a substantial queue has built. I always defer to Marika first and then on to Tim and Alan. Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Just to clarify that that PDP is only tasked or is expected to do any task to specifically look at translated and transliterated contact data. It's not looking at the broader caution of which WHOIS data needs to be displayed or how it should be displayed.

It's specifically looking at that aspect and asking the question if there would be a requirement to translate or transliterate contact data, who should bear the burden and how should that be done?

So it's really looking at a very specific aspect of that, not that broader issue which I think the Working Group's trying to address with this recommendation to make sure that display and labeling is done in a similar fashion.

Amr Elsadr: But aren't - sorry. This is Amr.

Mikey O'Connor: Sorry.

Amr Elsadr: Can I just comment quickly on Marika's response?

Mikey O'Connor: Sure. Sure go ahead.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Tell you what Amr. Why don't we wait? Let's run through the queue.

Amr Elsadr: All right, sure. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: I have a feeling that there's a miscommunication here and I want to hear what the other folks say and then let's see if we can kind of tie this off. So just hang on for a second Amr. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I thought - oh I'm sorry. Well I thought Tim was first but I guess not. My recollection is this section is not on the content or even, you know, the form that is it in a native language.

We're talking about 7-bit ASCII WHOIS here so creating that 7-bit ASCII - what gets filled into the fields may be determined by translation/transliteration.

This I believe was an issue about formatting. The RAA specifically says, "All - in the future when it kicks in all Registrars must present data in the same way, in the same format, the same, you know, order and with the colon in the right place and the same title."

And the new Registry Agreement and other Registry Agreements that are being signed in this timeframe all say, "And you got to do it too." And they refer to the format in the RAA.

The issue that I think Staff is identifying here is that the Dot Com Agreement in particular was just signed without that provision in it. And they're cautioning us that we make sure that that we're in sync with other things.

I think that's what they were cautioning but the issue of what information is there is not what we're looking at. I think it's just the physical formatting and, you know, we decided that since they're going to rewrite it anyway let's make sure it's done the proper way.

It's almost a no brainer that they would. Why would they invent a new format? But we were just covering that. That's my recollection of it anyway.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Alan. Tim?

Tim Ruiz: Right. I think that's a key issue that if it's not in the thin Registry Agreements then the only way to change that is through consensus policy. So we need to have this specifically in our recommendations or it won't become part of the consensus policy that can actually make that change.

I think too though that, you know, in regards to Amr's concerns that that, you know, in any subsequent policy that becomes approved will modify, you know, can modify previous policy.

So if something does come up down the road in one of these other Working Groups that would perhaps modify our recommendation, well that's the way things go.

I mean, that's how this all works so that could be very possible. This isn't, you know, set in stone forever and can never be changed. Another consensus

policy can change things if it deems it necessary, you know, the community deems it necessary.

So I don't think we - given that I don't think we really need to change anything here. I mean, and at most if we did that we might recognize that, you know, we make this recommendation with the understanding that subsequent, you know, policy work may modify this or something of that nature if that makes Amr feel better.

But I think just knowing that these things can change as needed down the road, I don't think we really need to make any change here to this recommendation.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay Amr, now carry on. Sorry to cut you off like that.

Amr Elsadr: Yes. That is - no it's all right. Thank you. Thanks everybody. I have to admit I haven't - I didn't really participate very actively on this section. And the reason why I've brought this up is because the link in our initial report led me to a section of the RAA that seems to deal specifically with internationalized registration data.

And that's really what sort of popped this question into my head on whether we should be addressing this right now or not. I might be mistaken but thanks for the clarifications.

But if folks would just take a look at the - or where the link leads to and maybe something needs to be cleared up. Maybe my understanding of this is not exactly correct. Thanks.

Alan Greenberg: Or maybe the link is wrong.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes that's what I'm thinking is that - so we - I think you found an error in the report that we need to fix because it shouldn't point at internationalized registration data.

It should talk - it should point at the Consistent Display section. Volker you know this RAA backwards and forwards. Can you take a tiny little action item to help Marika find the right spot in the RAA and make sure that the link is right, because I don't think anybody would disagree with you Amr that this is not about - this isn't about internationalized data at all and it shouldn't be.

And so I'd put that in the good catch category. Okay it is now three minutes after the hour so it's time to stop. We will skip next week's call to give Marika a little more time to do all the drafting and so on, and with that we'll call it a day.

Thanks folks. I think we're moving right along. I do note that Steve is saying we might be able to hit a key deadline if we could be done by September 30.

That would be terrific but - so let's kind of keep that in mind, although I think that's probably a bit beyond our reach. Thanks folks. See you in two weeks.

Marika Konings: Thanks. Bye.

Woman: Bye.

END