ICANN
Transcription
Thick Whois PDP Working Group
Tuesday 04 December 2012 at 15:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Thick Whois PDP Working Group on the Tuesday 04 December 2012 at 15:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-thick-whois-20121204-en.mp3

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

Attendees:
Marc Anderson – RySG
Titi Akinsanmi – At Large
Roy Balleste – NCUC
Iliya Bazlyankov – RrSG
Don Blumenthal – RySG
Ray Fassett – RySG
Christopher George – IPC
Alan Greenberg – At Large
Volker Greimann – RrSG
Frederic Guillemaut – RrSG
Caroline Hoover – RySG
Marie-Laure Lemineur - NPOC
Steve Metalitz – IPC
Jeff Neumann – RySG
Mikey O'Connor – ISPCP
Susan Prosser – RrSG
Tim Ruiz – RrSG
Jill Titzer – RrSG
Rick Wesson - RrSG

Apologies:
Wilson Abigaba – RrSG
Avri Doria – NCSG
Amr Elsadr – NCSG
Ope Oodusan – At Large
Normann Ritchie – RySG
Carlton Samuels – At Large
Marika Konings

ICANN staff:
Berry Cobb
Julia Charvolen

Coordinator: Okay go ahead. We're now recording.

Julia Charvolen: Thank you. Good morning good afternoon good evening. This is Thick Whois PDP Working Group call on Tuesday 4th December.

On the call today we have Marc Anderson, Titi Akinsanmi, Roy Balleste, Iliya Bazlyankov, Don Blumenthal, Ray Fassett, Christopher George, Alan Greenberg, Voelker Greimann, Frederic Guillemaut, Marie-Laure Lemineur, Steve Metalitz, Jeff Neuman, Mikey O'Connor, Susan Prosser, Tim Ruiz, Rick Wesson.

We apologies from Ope Oodusan, Avri Doria, Carlton Samuels, Norm Ritchie, Amr Elsadr, Wilson Abigaba and as well Marika Konings.

From staff we have Berry Cobb and myself Julia Charvolen. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Julia. Welcome all. A few people are sort of trickling in so we may want to take note of people who have arrived that you didn't do in the roll call just in the chat so that people know that they're on.

Taking a look at the agenda we've got sort of two things to work on finishing off that outreach message to the ACs and SOs remembering that what we're trying to accomplish was to make it a little bit more welcoming and a little bit more enthusiastic about the idea that these don't necessarily have to be consensus statements. These are really - that we're really interested in information gathering. So we're going to talk a bit about that.

We've got our little survey back and also a bit of conversation on the chat or on the email list about sort of clumping things together.

And I think that's where the bulk of the call will probably be because I think we've been making some pretty good progress there.

Anything that people would like to change or add to that agenda before and then we'll slide into the statement of interest stuff?

Okay. Anybody you can see the working group members on the screen in front of you. I think we've been through the one more last chance process at least twice so I think this is our final list.

So if you're on the call and you don't see yourself on this list that would probably something to take note of.

And just do the standard pause to see if anybody has a change in a statement of interest that they want to tell us about.

Okay Berry says that we are all present and accounted for from most statements of interest. That's great.

I think Berry if you could push up the revised version of the outreach gizmo that'll be our next topic.

And again just to remind people what we were really trying to do is give the ACs and SOs just a little bit more flexibility than our first draft offered both in terms of time and in terms of sort of level of consensus and information and stuff.

So I think I'm just going to roll us through this together. I know that for many of us myself included the only time we actually look at these things is either right before these calls are on the call. And so I think it won't take us long but I think it's useful to just remind ourselves what we were doing.

What you can see that is that Marika has added - I'm assuming Marika did this or is this your work Berry? I should probably attribute the work to those that did it.

Berry Cobb: All Marika.

Mikey O'Connor: All Marika, yes that Marika.

Berry Cobb: You knew that.

Mikey O'Connor: She's amazing. Okay so we're just offering a little bit more time if people need it. And then in the second paragraph if there's changes sort of highlighting our information gathering focus here.

What we do here in the process part is give people a hint that says if you don't tell us otherwise we'll think that this is your position.

But if you tell us otherwise we want to hear about it because, you know, again this is emphasizing that sort of information gathering focus that we've got.

One of the other things we talked about last week was the need for facts. You know, it's all very well and good for all of us to opine about what we think but it would be nice to have some facts to underpin our conversation.

And I was glad to see this amplification in their so that's what that's all about. Let's see I think that might be it. Yes that's it.

So for those of us who attributed to that or for those of us who missed the call last time this is a good time to chime in. I see a queue building.

Alan can go first but others who had thoughts if you think that your thoughts are accurately reflected here great. Otherwise let's get a little course correction going. Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I'm going to bring up something I've brought up before and I'm not the only one. And that is it would be exceedingly useful if we had a recap from people involved in the PIR conversion before doing this.

I mean I personally and ALAC have some strong opinions on this. But they're really we believe our theory that it would be really nice to perhaps change those before we formally present our opinions based on reality. And...

Mikey O'Connor: Let me put my friend Don Blumenthal on the spot.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: I see that he's on the call.

Alan Greenberg: You know, because it's fine to have what all of us think is going to happen. It would be really nice to have some real experience which just may change some of our opinions.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: I don't know whether they will or not.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes that's a good idea. Don are you there?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. And I'll ask the question if Don can answer. And Don had said that a lot of the people who were around are gone now.

David Maher is still around and he - although I'm sure he wasn't involved in implementation he may well have been involved in the decision to do it and the policy behind it. So he's certainly one resource we can draw on who may have some input. Thank you.

Tim Ruiz: Yes what we're missing from the report that he sent that we need is that not - there wasn't sufficient evidently...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yes let me...

Mikey O'Connor: Just for the transcript that was Tim Ruiz. Tim let me swing around you after we hear from Don.

Don Blumenthal: Okay. Yes...

Mikey O'Connor: Sorry.

Don Blumenthal: (Unintelligible). I did speak with David and he very much demurred on the topic. You know, for the most part as I said in my message the people, there is nobody at PIR really knew he was involved in the process.

                  They're trying - one of the people there is trying to get me contact information to the people who were.

                  I've been in touch with (Sadik) -- I won't even try his last name -- over in affiliates was the one that gave me that report and also dropped a message to (Rom Mohan) to see who else might have been involved at the time.

                  The decision to go was fundamentally a business one. And that's the reason I'm suggesting David is staying out of the way.

Mikey O'Connor: How about Greg Aaron?

Don Blumenthal: No Greg was not involved.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh he wasn't?

Don Blumenthal: No. We're talking like ten years ago. I'm not sure Greg was even there then.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. All right...

Don Blumenthal: I will...

Mikey O'Connor: ...now...

Don Blumenthal: ...pull this stuff together as, you know, this has been a reminder I need to get back the push for the answers they're promising.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I think that, you know, I tend to agree with Alan that if we could get a briefing pretty soon it would help a lot. But I don't want to slow down a whole bunch waiting for either.

Rick Wesson: Mikey Rick (unintelligible) would like to get in the queue as well.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay I've got - I'll tell you what, Tim was right in on this particular thing I think. And (Rick) if you're on the same topic why don't I put Tim in-between you and Rick? And Steve are you on this topic or can we bump you backwards a notch while we finish this one off?

Steve Metalitz: You can bump me back. This is Steve.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. So Tim you're next.

Tim Ruiz: Yes I guess I was just trying to understand what we're - what we - what Alan or others might be looking for specifically that wasn't in the report that that's been provided already.

You know, and even, you know, there's a table in there of number of failed test and retests.

There's a lot of empirical data. So just curious what, you know, was being what was expected otherwise?

And then just that another - something that I think could be just as valuable beyond this report would be trying to talk to a sample of registrars who went through this process.

And I think that could be as valuable if not, you know, even more telling then, you know, additional information from.org.

But I guess my main question was just what are we looking for beyond what's in the report that's provided already?

Mikey O'Connor: Alan do you want to take a crack at that?

Alan Greenberg: Yes I will quickly. I must admit I did not read the report Word for Word but it struck me as that it was largely the technical implementation and at - in parallel to the conversion to EPP.

And I don't think those questions were really central to the ones we're asking. If you look at the list, the laundry list of questions we have in our charter that doesn't seem to be the issue.

I don't think anyone's questioning the technical ability to do this. Really we're looking at impact on users, you know, philosophy -- that kind of thing.

And yes certainly input from registrars who were involved is just as relevant as input from the registry. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Alan. I think (unintelligible) (Rick Clay). (Rick) you were next I think.

(Rick Clay):   So (Rick Clay) speaking. I was a domain name registrar at the time of this transition and also wanted to point out that .us transitioned from a very small light thin registry to a thick Whois.

And there were much more interesting issues with .us transition then with pir.org which was pretty smooth from our perspective.

And so you might want to see if there's folks (Rodney Joffe) would be one from Neustar that or maybe Jeff that could comment about the .us transition topic.

Mikey O'Connor: So anybody else want to talk about the essentially Alan's request that we get a briefing before we go out to the constituencies? I want to sort of type this thread off and then get back to the queue.

I've got a thought about this so I'm getting ready to blurt it out but I'd be curious to hear what other people have to say before I do that.

Don Blumenthal: Yes. This is Don Blumenthal, want to get back into this. What would be helpful is a list of questions -- something like that.

To be honest I think the concept debriefing is just not going to happen. There just aren't enough people around who were involved to do something like that.

But I can take the issues if folks are interested and tried to farm them out to the PIR affiliates and the two people who have gone on to part so far unknown.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay here's my thought and maybe what we need to do is we need to amp up the language in this document just - in fact I should give you back the language - the document. I'm sorry I lost track of that. You now can read the whole thing for yourselves.

I think that maybe what we need to do is really back off on the opinion of the stakeholder group or advisory body part of this and say look this is a fact gathering and opinion gathering and initial position gathering cycle.

And it might even make sense to wait a little bit on this, you know, the work plan came from me so I can tell you why it's at the front I was driving really hard for an aggressive schedule.

But maybe the thing to do is work on sort of our clumping stuff and our teams. And one of the deliverables of that could be a list of questions about the topics that could then feedback to Don and to maybe some of the folks at .us and the registrars and, you know, anybody else and sort of take this preliminary broad information gathering cycle back a few notches in the work plan rather than push so hard at the front.

Is that maybe the thing is that maybe I pushed something too far in the front of the work plan and we just need to slide it back a little bit?

Berry always gets preference being our fearless staff leader today. Go ahead Berry.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Mikey. This is Berry. I was just going to recommend if you'll notice under the topic section for the SG&C input template, you know, we have response consistency stability et cetera. And when I take a look at the SOAC version it has definitions for each one of those topics.

I'd recommend that we kind of merge those together so that there's a definition behind the topics for the SG&C. And if everybody agrees I'll make that update.

Mikey O'Connor: I think now is a good time to go to Steve since he's disagreeing and I think probably wants to come in and do a little course correction. Steve go ahead, your turn.

Steve Metalitz: Yes thank you. This is Steve Metalitz. I guess first I very much agree with what Berry said. That's why I got in the queue in the first place was to suggest that.

Mikey O'Connor: Cool.

Steve Metalitz: But second in terms of your suggestion to - I'm concerned that it would delay the process which we don't need.

I've never been quite clear on why we go out and ask the stakeholder groups for their views at this point since they had many opportunities to weigh in on this question before and they will have further opportunities again.

So I'm not quite sure why we - what we're trying to accomplish. But I wouldn't want to see us do some work and then send out to the SGs and wait around for them to respond.

I think if we can get something out to them and ask them for any further input we should just do it now and factor that into the draft that we're doing because I think if we wait we're going to delay the process.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I am a keen supporter of that notion. So Ray are you in on this sort of timing thing? If you are go ahead.

Ray Fassett: Sure I'll weigh in on that real quick. I don't - obviously there's no rules to this so I mean we could go out for initial comments and there's nothing stopping us from going back later for more clarification...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Ray Fassett: ...or doing things in parallel as well. So I don't see any harm necessarily with going out to the SGs or Cs at this point in time. I don't think there is a - I think we've qualified what we're looking for pretty well, provided some scope.

And actually the reason I raised my hand is - was to Berry's comment is I think it works in reverse order as well.

In the SOAC letter we just basically opened up by saying we want your, you know, we encourage you to provide your opinion but then we provide no scope.

So for example in the SG constituency template we're actually asking for specific subject matter. But it seems wide open in the SOAC. Shouldn't we be consistent?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I agree with that. I'd forgotten that we have two parallel documents going out and we should bring those into consistency for sure.

I think we do - part of what's going on here is that we do have a requirement in the PDP to go out at some point. That's the reason it's in there.

And I'm starting to lean back towards let's get this turn of the crank done quick. We're getting a fair amount of support for that idea in the chat. Tim is agreeing with that.

So Alan I think it was a good shot but given the fact that Don is having a really hard time tracking down live bodies that actually have memories of this and the desire not to slow things down I think we're going to carry on with this the way we originally intended.

Sorry I had to pause to squirt a cat with a squirt gun.

Unless and there you are in the queue so you get last word and then I think what we're going to do is touch up this draft just a little bit to make the topics consistent.

And Tim is saying in the chat, you know, we can certainly go on in parallel which is the plan for sure and if you want to close this off on this one this is your chance Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I have absolutely no objection. I recognize I raised the issue but, you know, I'm all for going forward ahead.

And if we have to rethink because with some tidbit comes up along the way so be it. You know, I was going to point out as you just did that there's a requirement to consult the ACs as those.

I'm trying to find it and I can't right now. But my recollection is it actually isn't a requirement to do near the beginning of the process I think. I can't find it.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, no it's in there. If Marika was there she could rattle it off chapter and verse. Berry can you do it from memory or...

Alan Greenberg: I think it's in the PDP manual not in the bylaws which is...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes that's right, it's in the PDP. It's not in the bylaws.

Alan Greenberg: But in any case yes let's not delay at this point and if something turns up that changes our mind then so be it. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. All right I think we - let me see if I can recap this and then throw action items to Berry.

I think everybody liked the idea of making the documents a little bit more consistent and putting the definitions behind the topics where they're needed in this one.

We might just want to amplify. I don't know I mean this language is close enough. Maybe we can just take it back to our respective groups and say look we're very much in an information gathering stage.

If you want to express either multiple opinions or minority views we're very interested in that. And that is captured in this draft. Are we close enough with this to roll with it?

Anybody who feels like we're - if we basically changed this to add the definitions anybody feeling great heartburn? I'm not seeing any huge reaction.

And I'm seeing some good stuff in the chat about resources that we might be able to track down. (Rick) and Jeff are both chiming in. Jeff Neuman are both charming in saying - rattling off some names.

Maybe what I'll do is I'll take the burden of tracking these folks off of Don since Don's job is not to track people down outside of PIR and hand that job off to Berry and/or Marika see if we can rattle some of these folks loose.

And it's probably a good idea for us to come up with the questions before we wheel all these people in. I think it's probably a good idea. This is in keeping with comments like Tim's so let's try and do some of this stuff in parallel.

Berry are you willing to take that action either for you or for Marika?

Berry Cobb: I will take note of it for Marika and...

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. I didn't know how crowded her time had gotten. I'm hoping I'm not giving actions to a person who actually doesn't have any cycles to spare but we'll cope with that when we come to it.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Okay anything else on this document? This was a good discussion. I wasn't expecting quite this much but I think it was good to do it?

Berry Cobb: Mikey this is Berry. Just to recap that was in terms of trying to bring in experts for a review of a Thick Whois migration.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. I think that what you're seeing in the chat is that it - just replay the bidding. Alan was saying it would be very nice to have a briefing from people who've been through it before.

I think we've refined that to say perhaps based on questions that we have once we've done a little bit of research and then in the chat what you're seeing is a boatload of people being suggested by various folks that could be in this expert pool.

And so it would be nice is to assemble such a pool and ask them if they'd be willing to be part of it and let them know at some point down the line we're going to schedule a call with them on it and we'll give them questions ahead of time to do a briefing with us (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Rick Wesson: Mikey, requesting (Rick) to join the queue.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes go ahead. Jump right in.

Rick Wesson: I think that what you'll find from trying to talk to the expert panel that you had suggested is that there really isn't much to find, that if there were real issues that they were addressed and that the transition in both cases was fairly successful.

I think we've seen smaller ccTLDs transition to a Thick Whois without any major problems and that technically and policy-wise that all of the capabilities to transition are there and that it wasn't - it was a big event at the time and that's because there's I guess lots of little things because you have many participants in this process that get dropped on the floor and have to get picked up.

But in the end years later it - looking back it always very successful and we've move forward through this transition a few times and other times in not ICANN GTLDs but ccTLDs.

And so you might actually get further by looking at the successes than trying to accumulate a panel that went through this process they clearly was successful. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes and I think that where this fits is that in a way if you look at the Verizon - VeriSign. I've got broadband on my mind today, sorry.

If you look at the VeriSign position they're saying look we're fine with the idea of doing Thick Whois but we want this reviewed and vetted by the community.

And I think that what Alan is raising I think it's a good point and we've raised it in this document is that we want to do this based on fact.

And so we're essentially in a sense a research body. And to the extent that we can assemble a group of people that we can ask questions of and they can give us facts back to document what you just said Rick I think that's really helpful. And it strengthens the recommendation that we eventually make.

So I think that what you're saying is compatible with this idea of getting a group of smart folks together that we can periodically touch and say well what about this, what about that?

I do agree that it's - it seems fine to me to have ccTLD experts as well as gTLD experts.

I think in many cases the CCs may be a better resource just because they've done a transition more often.

So I think that the big take away at least for me is that either inside our group or outside of it we need to assemble a group of smart folks who we can ask these questions of.

And I want to give that job away. I don't want to stick Don with that job.

Okay. I'm going to let Tim either type or speak either way and I think we'll call this one done. Jeff is typing.

Yes Tim is saying I think that not just ccTLDs that converted but even if they been thick all along their experience is both positive and negative (unintelligible), you know, et cetera.

And Jeff is already reaching out to Michael Young. And I agree Michael Young is a great resource if he'd be willing to help us out.

Maybe we can even rope came into being part of the working group. That might be even better. But...

Man: That's what I'm working on.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm going to leave - I want to leave that rolling chat for you to capture and hand off to Marika. And with that I think we're going to - unless I heard somebody on the phone. Was that Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes I was just going to say that I'm working on getting Michael to be here.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I think it will be fantastic if Michael could join us because he's a very strong technical guy and has a lot of history and experience. He can help with I think that.

Jeff Neuman: He's the director of product at (affiliates) at the time of the transition. And he and I had several conversations a couple years back on it. So if he's willing to come in he's probably the best person to discuss that.

Mikey O'Connor: Cool. Well I'll leave the reaching out to you and the job of assembling this gang to Berry/Marika.

All right off we go into the results from our survey which is on the screen. And at this point I think I have control of it.

So first of all let me say thanks to all of you who participated. And I'm reading this for the first time too so because this was assembled sort of late yesterday by Marika and Barry so I think we'll just go through this together.

I have an idea about authoritativeness but I think I'll come back to that in a bit.

So we've got folks that have signed up, a nice strong group. And we haven't got any information sources, that's okay.

Stabilities got a nice strong group, data escrow looks like we've got we're a little light on synchronization. But on the other hand we've got pretty strong candidates. We might want to encourage a few folks to join that one.

Response consistency again a great gang, plenty of folks on accessibility. Oh and some possible data. I was noticing we're a little light on data source there.

Plenty of interest on the privacy and data protection one and data source. So I think we've been successful here just rolling through. This looks like we've got great teams I'm delighted to report.

And I think what we'll do is will just publish this and anybody who wants to join a team feel free to do so.

And this is all fluid anyway so thanks a million for the signing up. And we do need some more data source. But that's okay. The teams can work on that and besides we're probably going to clump some of this together I bet in our next topic.

Ray go ahead.

Ray Fassett: Oh thanks Mikey. I just wanted to say I would sign up for the authoritativeness one. And is there one for the competition and registry services?

Mikey O'Connor: I thought that was in there. Let's roll slowly backwards. Yes there it is, Number 8.

Ray Fassett: Number 8 yes.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Ray Fassett: Yes. So I would sign up for one and eight.

Mikey O'Connor: All right so Berry I'm going to give you that one to dutifully record. Anybody else want to sign up? I mean it's easy to do on the phone here? I was just trying to keep it from being overwhelming but if anybody else wants to join the gangs that's terrific either on the phone or in the chat or by email or whatever?

So thanks. That's great, all right.

And now what I think I want to do unless there's any - oh and we've got Don, (Mark), Voelker, who responded to the survey and they aren't in this first version so we're going to have even stronger teams.

So this is great. I think this is panning out very nicely and I thank you all.

Let's do some clumping. I'm going to need to be reminded of what the conversation was on the list but let me share my screen and hopefully it won't crash Adobe Connect again for me.

I've got my little mind map and what I thought we could do is so can people read that? Is that big enough? Shout out if not, looks okay to me.

Man: It could be even bigger. There's a lot of white space on my screen.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh well I've got things to fill that white space with don't worry about that. Because when I start expanding these things the screen will modify. I mostly worried about text size. If you can read the words that's the key.

I want to try one idea out on poll. And so I'm going to start with the authoritativeness one which didn't land in a clump. And part of the reason it didn't is because it's really two things in one topic.

If you look at the last part of the description the working group should consider the term authoritative in both the technical and policy meanings of the word.

And my idea is that maybe what we ought to do is split this into two parts of those first clumps. That clump one, the technical one that has stability, data escrow, synchronization, migration in it should also have an authoritativeness piece and clump two should as well.

And I'm just wondering if that creates giant heartburn in people's minds? Tim go ahead.

Tim Ruiz: Yes and just one of the concerns that I had and maybe it's just something we can look at as we consider these two things separately, you know, technical authoritativeness versus how that - in regarding the policy just that, you know, would that - I think we need to consider whether having them separate creates some sort of a potential conflict.

In other words if one party is considered authoritative from a technical standpoint and another party is considered authoritative from a policy standpoint, you know, what kind of conflicts might that create? It's just something I think we need to consider in there as we look at this issue.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I agree. I think what I was hoping anyway is that if we went through the technical discussion and sort of put some sharp edges on what mean in the technical sense that that might be the policy sense and clarify it. But I'm not positive about that.

For sure at the end we want to make sure that these things reconcile. And I think that enough people are interested in this topic from one perspective or the other that the risk of that not being synced up at the end is pretty low because I think people are going to go wait a minute, we've got a problem here that we need to fix.

But I agree with you Tim that's...

Rick Wesson: Mikey Rick Wesson would like to get in the queue please?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes go ahead Rick.

Rick Wesson: Having authoritative fractured seems somewhat oxymoronic to have a word or to be fighting over (unintelligible) of authoritative points in my mind that you've chosen the wrong word.

                 And so having two sections that if you're trying to describe the technical root of the Whois as being authoritative and the policy that supports that technical infrastructure that you really don't have two definitions of authoritative. It's really your description of the implementation of that policy. Is that...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes and to replay the bidding we struggled a fair amount about this in the Drafting Team. And this is just the words we and the Drafting Team came up with.

                 So I don't know I mean one way we could do it is there's lot of interest in this in the sign-ups. Maybe we throw this puzzler to the Authoritativeness Team and let them grapple with it rather than solving it ourselves. How about that for an approach?

                 I'm fine (that). I was - this is just an idea that came to me having sort of lived through the Drafting Team thing. And I thought well maybe we do have two kind of things there.

Rick Wesson: If you take a moment to look at how authoritative which is a very important word when it comes to the DNS of which the Whois is referencing authoritative is very clear about how it's used and what it means.

And I would suggest that you inherit the way that the language is used in the DNS. Because the Whois is a reference to the DNS and inherits many of the same hierarchies and technology because it is - I mean it is the protocol that resolves other attributes about domain names. And domain names are the point that we are discussing within the DNS framework.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay I'm also reading your note in the chat. So would you suggest that we do two words, one of which being authoritative and the other being I don't know (unintelligible) at this point to split these or leave them as one thing and let the group sort of wrestle with all that? Do you have a preference there?

Rick Wesson: I am suggesting that they are one thing and that having two things that are both labeled as authoritative is problematic. And so it should really be one bucket.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. I will withdraw my notion and I will...

Jeff Neuman: Hey Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Go ahead Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks. I actually so I sort of agree with Rick but I sort of agree with you that they are too unfortunately in the technical world Rick is absolutely correct authoritative is pretty straightforward and clear.

And but I think from a policy perspective when you talk about the contact information of the registrant, the admin contact, the technical contact I think those are things that we unfortunately now label as authoritative.

I actually do believe that we should have separate terms although I do believe that the thick WHOIS registry should be quote authoritative both from a policy and a technical perspective.

So in the end I agree with Rick that it's one bucket and they both should be the same but I know others don't necessarily agree with me.

And so I think we're going to have to work through that process. And I think the easiest way to do that is by coming up, I don't know what the terms are but coming up with using authoritative for the technical sense and coming up with something else to mean who does law enforcement treat as the actual registrant if there was ever a dispute or who does who do IT owners consider to be the actual registrant in case of a - in case there is a discrepancy between the registry record and the registrar record?

Man: And I think as Jeff points out that there is value in harmonizing the terminology that we use. For a record within the Whois that deals with a party I like to use the term responsible party to note who is responsible for that element in a Whois record.

And so you have an authority who's publishing itself. But you have responsible parties inside of that information that is what we call a WHOIS record.

And so I think that or, you know, rather than trying to go down that on the call but defining the language that you're going to use going forward is very important as we've spent years wrestling with definitions and trying to build some common ground in that I think is very important.

Mikey O'Connor: I love that responsible party notion. But I am convinced that what we do is we put smart people in that authoritativeness bucket to figure this out.

I don't want to split them anymore so I'll back out of that. We may wind up as two different terms maybe even the two that are being suggested. But I don't want to split the group anymore. I think I'm going to back up on that.

Now there was a conversation on the list about other stuff. And those of you I remember that Tim posted a thing, I can remember that folks posted but I was busy battling fracks and miners that day so I confess I didn't pay a lot of attention.

So for those of you who had ideas about clumping and combining if you could replay the bidding on that for us that would be great. Oh good, Tim is in the queue. Take it away.

Tim Ruiz: Yes the two that I suggested - and I didn't have this clumping chart at the time. I was looking at the survey itself where it had for example its accessibility and response consistency were listed separate.

So when I read the descriptions it sounded like they were both part of the same thing or, you know, very, very similar.

But now looking at the clumping chart it says accessibility and it has I believe well now it's all changing.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes sorry I was just throwing those definitions out for you.

Tim Ruiz: Yes it had accessibility and then I thought response consistency was in there as like a subtopic of it which works. But now I see it's now - they're separate under...

Mikey O'Connor: Well I'm...

Tim Ruiz: ...legal policy. But anyway...

Mikey O'Connor: I'm.

Tim Ruiz: ...it just seemed like they were very similar. But if you're going to break them up this way under one overall heading maybe that works.

The other one was - the other two were stability and data escrow. And again I think it was the same yes, like stability and data escrow and synchronization of migration are all under technical so maybe they're already clumped.

But those were the four that I looked at. And just based on the descriptions in the survey it seemed accessibility and response consistency could be clumped and stability and data escrow could be clumped. But maybe that's what you're already doing here.

Mikey O'Connor: Just to sort of give you a little - to replay from last time I started doing this little mine map outline to begin to form some clumps.

And, you know, this has got all the usual overdraft caveat to it. But I am very keen on the idea of fewer subgroups rather than more just because the fewer there are the fewer things we had to manage and get through.

So I'm wondering what other people's reaction would be to further clumping the two that Tim suggested. Let me show you what I would do.

I don't know what to call it so we'll just call it for - just call it something silly for now. And put it first.

And then do the same silly thing here and put these two together like that. Because the more things we can put together the fewer - let me clear up some of this clutter so that it makes more sense.

Now we're down - if we did that then we basically got one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine puzzles to get through.

And one way to do this is to get even more aggressive and say all right we've got one team that's, you know, we can take all the people that signed up for

those three that are listed behind the technical clump and say okay if you signed up for any of those you're in the technical gang.

And then we would be down to four clumps which would be even better. Now I think this one's clumping a lot of hard stuff into one so that might be pushing a little bit too hard.

But what if we - since we're not going to do all of these at the same time and it probably makes sense to do them sort of in this order what if we put two teams together to go off one working on the authoritativeness puzzle and another on the technical puzzle? Am I clumping too aggressively by doing that? Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: I thought the whole purpose of this was so we could do them parallel?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes it is, it's just whether to do...

Alan Greenberg: Yes I'm a little bit...

Mikey O'Connor: ...two in parallel or four in parallel. That's...

Alan Greenberg: I'm a little concerned after you've gone to the trouble of asking us all to say what our interests are clumping them without looking at whether the same people are involved.

Because you may well be merging two things together half of which are of great interest to some people and half of which are of no interest thereby essentially invalidating the whole survey process we just went through.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh well I know.

Alan Greenberg: We're only volunteers. We don't count.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes right, right validating my goodness, gracious. Well that's true I suppose. Well, you know, and it would be useful to see sort of who fell into which area and see what that is.

And I haven't - it's easy for me to staple all the people into this, take a look and see but not yet. I'd be inclined to run with Tim's suggestion unless I find that groups really don't overlap much at all.

But maybe the thing to do especially given that we're one minute away from the top of the hour is to take an action on this one to take the results of the survey and anybody else who wants to sign up for anything and smash them together and take a look at them and see how this looks.

But I will warn you that if I can push us to clump I will because I think the fewer subgroups we got the easier it is for us to get through this work in a reasonably fast way. Berry I think you get last word on the call.

Berry Cobb: Yes Mikey a small dependency to your action. Let Marika send you the latest version of the survey results and the few assignments that we got on the call here today so you have the most comprehensive picture.

Mikey O'Connor: Perfect. That would be great. I think our next call is not one of the unusual time calls. I'm correct on that? Alan is next week and ALAC meeting?

Alan Greenberg: No. Last week...

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. So our final agenda item is next steps in next meeting. Next steps have been flying out through the whole call. I won't go through those again but the next meeting will be next week at this time all the same stuff.

Thanks a million for everybody who's helping and we'll talk to you in a week. That's it for me. Julia you can stop the recording and we'll call it a day.

Man: Nice.

Man: Thanks Mikey.

Man: Thanks Mikey.

Woman: Thank you...

END