ICANN
Transcription
Thick Whois PDP Working Group meeting
Tuesday 05 March 2013 at 15:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of THICK WHOIS PDP Working Group call on the Tuesday 05 March 2013 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-20130305en.mp3
On page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#mar

Attendees:
Iliya Bazlyankov – RrSG
Marc Anderson – RySG
Roy Balleste – NCUC
Don Blumenthal - RySG
Avri Doria - NCSG
Amr Elsadr – NCSG
Alan Greenberg – ALAC
Frederic Guillemaut – RrSG
Steve Metalitz – IPC
Mikey O'Connor – ISPCP
Susan Prosser – RrSG
Tim Ruiz - RrSG
Jill Titzer – RrSG
Steve Metalitz - IPC

Apologies:
Carolyn Hoover - RySG

ICANN staff:
Marika Konings
Berry Cobb
Lars Hoffmann
Glen de Saint Géry

Glen de Saint Gery: (Ricardo)?

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

Glen de Saint Gery: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the Thick WHOIS call on the 5th of March. And on the call we have Mikey O'Connor, Iliya Bazlyankov, Roy Balleste, Jill Titzer, Marc Anderson, Don Blumenthal, Alan Greenberg, Tim Ruiz, Susan Prosser.

And for Staff we have Marika Konings, Berry Cobb, Lars Hoffman and myself, Glen de Saint Gery. And in the AC room we have - I don't think there's anybody that is in the AC room - Steve Metalitz.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I'm expecting Steve to join us pretty soon.

Glen de Saint Gery: Yes. Steve is in the AC room but not yet on the call. So may I just ask you please to say your name before you speak for transcription purposes? And then Mikey over to you. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Glen. It's always a thrill to have Glen running our calls. It's been a long time for me anyway. It's great to have you on with us today.

Glen de Saint Gery: Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: We'll just do the usual and take the pause to look at the agenda and update Statements of Interest. The agenda's on the right there. It's kind of our usual agenda.

Take a look at - the subteams have a bit of a conversation about Beijing. And then the main event I think today will be to take a look at this document that Marika and I worked on over the week and circulated to the list, get your reactions to that and maybe if we get through all that start diving in on some of the issues that are listed there that don't have subteams working on them and we'll start working on those issues as a group.

Anything that people would like to add or change to that and/or Statements of Interest? I don't see anybody's hand up so we'll jump right in. I don't see Susan Kawaguchi on so we'll see if she joins later.

Alan since your name starts with A do you want to give us a little update on your subgroup?

Alan Greenberg: I don't - well we haven't done anything. We have the summary, which Marika has imported into her summary summary. And at this point I don't think we have any specific actions that we need to be - need to take.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay that sounds good. Maybe what...

Alan Greenberg: At least no one on my group has pointed out any and I can't think of any at this point.

Mikey O'Connor: All right, so we'll sort of run through that summary as a group in its turn and confirm it with the whole group and carry on from there. Thanks. Steve?

Steve Metalitz: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: Do you want to give us - sorry. Go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: You were asking about the authoritativeness subgroup?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, just a little update on that.

Steve Metalitz: There's been a little activity on the list and at this point the people who were speaking up are of the view that it's not really necessary for this Working Group to address.

It may not be necessary for the Working Group to address the authoritativeness issue because, A, it has not proven to be a problem in the

existing Thick Registries; and B, there's a sense that inevitably the authoritativeness issue is resolved in favor of the Registry database.

So I'm - I know that a couple of commenters did not have that view and I've been encouraging their representatives to speak up but without success so far. So I guess what we may do next is just try to - I don't know if - I think we were supposed to discuss last time what format - in what method the subgroup should report back to the full group. Do you want a written statement or just is it...?

Mikey O'Connor: Well...

Steve Metalitz: ...a format we should follow but I think we're almost at that point with our subgroup.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. I think that's right and Marika and I kind of preempted you on that with this document that's on the screen in front of you, and started sort of trying to extract from the subgroup list and conversation on the main list a summary that is embedded in this document.

So it may be that the thing to do for subgroup members - and I see Marika's hand up so I'll hand off to her in just a second. But it may be that the subgroup folks may want to take a look at the summary that's in this document and make sure that it's correct.

And if it is then we'll call it done from a subgroup standpoint, and we'll go through the process of reviewing all of these as a whole group together to sort of finish them off.

Does that work for you Steve and Alan? You're our two subgroup leader types on the call today. Does that make sense or is there...?

Steve Metalitz: Don is on the call too. Yes that's fine with me.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh Don I'm sorry. I'm sorry.

Steve Metalitz: He has the rat's nest subgroup so...

Mikey O'Connor: He's got the complicated one. That's true. Well let me go to Marika first and then to Don and then back to everybody. Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. So basically just to note as well that I think at the start of the subteams we did develop a template for possible responses by the subteams, and I'll post a link to that in the chat because, you know, even though I think what we're - we've tried to do with the documents on the screen is more to, you know, summarize some of the comments and try to identify, you know, common positions to also identify some of the issues that have been raised.

It doesn't necessarily, you know, define the issue and talk in more detail about it, which is all information we will need to include in the issue report. So I think there, you know, if subteams have the time and are able to maybe use the template to provide some more of the context around the issue, which we can then use for the initial report, I think that would be really helpful.

You know, but otherwise of course, you know, Staff will also be in a position to provide a first draft or a base as well of the information that's in the issue report as well as the charter to discard that process.

So in fact I've posted the link there so if subteams think that's helpful they may want to look at that and use those questions as a guide. And then again in drafting the comments what we try to do, and we'll go into that as well in Item 3, is that we've tried to identify some questions in reviewing the comments or issues that had been raised in relation to specific issues that may help guide your discussion of those and try to identify possible, you know, remedies or recommendations if deemed appropriate or necessary.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Marika. Don, want to talk to us about your subteam?

Don Blumenthal: Okay. I'll get over my hurt at being skipped there.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm sorry. Oh dear. Go ahead.

Don Blumenthal: Okay. Right now I'm working on integrating those kind of synopsis of comments kind of like the thing that Marika sent out last week, taking that which I had prepared and then putting it into the template that just came out towards the end of last week and then distributing that hopefully this afternoon to the subteam.

We are going to talk tomorrow on the phone and just spend the hour addressing the responses of the commenters. We've got the advantage of - every group that really addressed privacy issues is also represented on the subteam.

And everybody who - and all of those representatives have agreed to address any questions that come up concerning the comments. So I think we're in really good shape to really dive into the commenter issues and then I guess the next step - well the next step might be to have a second session addressing the commenter issues.

I'm not sure we'll get through them all tomorrow but we're sailing ahead and, you know, and as you suggested just trying to not get too tangled up in the rat's nest as we go along.

I'll add when we talk about commenters we're also going to be addressing the NCUC document that came in directly to the subteam.

Mikey O'Connor: Good. Okay. All right that sounds great. Sort of back to my first try and I think Marika has the right of it - I'd forgotten about that template that she developed.

Steve and Alan and Don, does that template work for you as a - well I guess two questions. One is does the template work, and then the second question is do you have the time or resources to complete it or would you prefer to edit a draft that was created by Staff?

And I'll put both of those back to the three of you and just let you chime in with thoughts on that.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. It's not clear I have the time. If I get to it first they can edit mine. If they get to it first I'll edit theirs.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. I was sort of thinking...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: I was thinking that people may not have the time to do a draft, and so if I were in your shoes I might tend to lean towards the Staff first try that people can edit. But I don't want to put words in your mouth.

Alan Greenberg: I've just looked at it. I don't think it's particularly onerous but in - irregardless of who does it but I will look at it. They will look at it. We'll see who gets to it first.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Don, Steve, any thought?

Don Blumenthal: Well I think, I mean, if we weren't going to be moving ahead for a couple of weeks I'd be more than happy to wait. But I think at this point we'll just go ahead and take tomorrow's call and what I prepared and see how much of it we can fill in on our own and be happy to have help but...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I think yours is sort of a...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. I guess I wasn't presuming on the sequence there. And for Steve and Alan, you know, they're sort of at an endpoint of a discussion whereas you're still in the midst.

And so I think we have to sort of wait for your discussion to go a little bit further, right, before we start.

Don Blumenthal: Well I - we can always just declare, I mean, we've got a few members of the subteam who can just say right now there's no new issues here that haven't been - that haven't come up before so we got...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. I think in the case of your group one of the things that we're really trying to get to is trying to at least start charting a path to resolving the issues that have been raised and/or developing ways that we can mitigate some of the risks that have been identified. So I don't want to declare victory on that one just yet. It seems premature.

Don Blumenthal: I want to but it's not feasible so we'll press forward.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Yes. I think that one...

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve. I'm happy to look at a draft from Staff. I'm not sure the template fits the way our discussion's been going because there's a strong sentiment from some of our subgroup members that this really isn't even an issue but - that the Working Group needs to address.

But I'm happy to, you know, you've got access to the discussion on the list so I'd be happy to review or have the subgroup review a draft from Staff.

Mikey O'Connor: Why don't we split the difference here and say - and ask Marika and Lars whether it would be all right if - for the two subgroups that are a bit further along if you all could develop a draft that's clearly a draft that the subgroup has broad authority to edit?

I'm just very aware of the time constraints that all of the people in the Working Group have, and I think it would be helpful to them. And then sort of take Steve's comment in to the initial draft that - and, you know, there's a case being made that the authoritativeness issue really is outside the scope of this particular Working Group that'll be resolved elsewhere and go ahead and develop a draft. Is that a fair request to you Marika and Lars, or does that push too hard?

Marika Konings: Well this is Marika. I think you're describing the issue. I think we have, you know, the issue report itself and as well the charter while we've aligned that. But I think at least part of the recommendation - I think it would be really helpful if there at the subteams, you know, as they have worked on this are able to, you know, draw their conclusions.

Of course we can try to interpret it but I think the subteams were partly created to come up with that and submit that to the Working Group for approval or review.

So, you know, we can definitely take back that work now to our side but I thought the initial objective was that the subteams actually take that part of the work and really have a community driven write up and then applies to more collate that into a initial report.

But if you want to do it the other way around, you know, we'll happily - we'll look into that and then try to do that. But I think it would probably be more of a - an integrated effort and trying to build the initial report, bringing all the

pieces together instead of maybe doing pieces here and there, and trying to do it in a more coherent way that'd probably...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I think that where we're getting a little bit stuck, and maybe what we do is we take this bit offline and finish it off later so that other folks on the call don't get bored and distracted by us.

But I think where we're at is that the subgroup leaders are sort of saying in a couple of cases, "Look, we're feeling like we're done. We've arrived at some conclusions or at least tentatively and now, you know, we need some help refining that into a draft that fits."

But, you know, we've got sort of a chicken and egg problem here. So why don't we take that...

Steve Metalitz: And Mikey...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, go ahead Steve.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve. I'm happy either way. I mean, I hear what Marika is saying and I'd be happy to take the first cut at it for our subgroup and at least by this time next week have something to her for her to work with if that's...

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Well I, you know, I - Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Mikey this is Alan. Yes. On this question I don't - as I said I don't mind doing it. It's going to be terse. The answers aren't going to be a lot larger than the - longer than the questions.

Mikey O'Connor: That's okay.

Alan Greenberg: And as long as you're willing to accept that then there's no real problem.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: I think...

Mikey O'Connor: I think terse is fine.

Alan Greenberg: Yes I did have my hand up a while ago when you were talking to Don however.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Sorry.

Alan Greenberg: And yes I agree with Don that we're not done in that subgroup, but as soon as we start separating the issues that are associated with WHOIS and not associated with Thick WHOIS I think we'll be a lot farther along.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I think that's right.

Don Blumenthal: Agreed. Yes. Don.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I agree. Avri?

Alan Greenberg: I understand that there is, you know, this fear that Thick makes it worse but we need to have demonstrations and examples. And the only thing that we've had so far which doesn't seem to be relevant is the case of Russian escrow.

Mikey O'Connor: Well I - yes. And I don't really want to get into the subteams discussion here so...

Alan Greenberg: No, no, no. I'm just saying for the group as a whole that, you know, we - once we separate the issues out hopefully we can come to closure.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. I think I'm going to hand off to Avri and then I think we'll try and tie this one off and leave it in the subgroup for a bit. But Avri, go ahead. Avri may be getting off mute.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Sorry.

Mikey O'Connor: There we go.

Avri Doria: I put my hand down and I...

Mikey O'Connor: Sorry.

Avri Doria: And I'd remuted myself. I totally disagree with Alan that we are confounding the two issues but you're right. It has to go back to the subteam but, you know, this constant claim that there is no specific Thick WHOIS issue I believe refuses to look at the facts. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I think this one is a knotty one and I do strongly encourage the subteam to really dive into this, because I think if we can get through that one the rest of the issues that we've got to deal with are relatively comparatively less complicated.

    But that one is complicated and I think it needs a good solid fair look from the subgroup. And I think at that point I'm going to draw a line under that discussion.

    So what I hear is Alan and Steve are going to give us relatively more or less terse responses to Marika's template for their subgroups by next week's call. We'll in a minute in the next chunk of this agenda sort of work through this document that Marika and - I have to say mostly Marika put together and that I've got fingerprints on and see how we do.

Alan Greenberg: Mikey I will not be on the call though next week.

Mikey O'Connor: Can you maybe designate a second and still try to get your homework done by next week's call?

Alan Greenberg: The homework will be done. I'm just pointing out I won't be here.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. That's good.

Alan Greenberg: Heading for an airport at that point.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh lucky you.

Alan Greenberg: Not really.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Anything else on this topic? Susan Kawaguchi on the call yet? No. I - so I think the one action item maybe for Lars is Lars could you give Susan a tap and just alert her that, you know, we'd like to check in on her subgroup and see sort of where things are at, and see whether it's reasonable to expect a similar summary from her or somebody on the subgroup by next week's call? I think that's the only thing.

Marika Konings: Mikey I'll take care of that.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Is Lars on the call today?

Marika Konings: Yes he's listening in.

Lars Hoffman: I am.

Marika Konings: But it's actually Berry and myself that have remained Staff support persons for this Working Group but...

Lars Hoffman: I'm just...

Mikey O'Connor: Oh. Okay. I've gotten too used to relying on you already Lars so that's always a good sign in a way. Don, go ahead.

Don Blumenthal: Okay I just wanted to - I've got to jump off in a couple of minutes. So I just wondered if I could ask what we have in mind for Beijing. I see a note in the agenda about the expert's group and was curious what that's all about, because I do know that a number of them don't travel to ICANN meetings.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes let's do a preview although I'm going to probably have to throw it to Marika just because, you know, we're sort of going to make some decisions about that.

But Marika you want to give us - quick synopsis of where our thinking's at at the moment?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. So basically at the last meeting we discussed how to start interactions with the other expert group. We did initially reach out to them and, you know, asked them if they would be interested and available to, you know, possibly answer some questions that we may have.

And I think most of them - they come back saying that they will be happy to help as, you know, time would allow them and their expertise would allow them.

But at this stage I think we're at some of the process as well as defining questions some groups have already identified a couple of questions. I think others still probably need to think about a number of questions they may want to put forward.

So I think what we discussed at the last meeting was to actually try to see if we could set up a mailing list that would bring together all the experts and then through Staff coordinate the questions from the Working Group to the

expert groups, and it could actually debate them or discuss them on their mailing list and provide a response to the Working Group that the Working Group then could review.

So we're actually in the process of setting up that mailing list and the idea would be I think that it's just going to be the experts on there and Staff and will, you know, serve as the communication channel.

I think it's going to be a publicly archived mailing list as our standard practice is so - unless people agree that should be done differently. And Mikey I know we discussed this option of having it subscribe only, but I've spoken to Glen and we actually need a little bit more time to get it into the works and it would take more time to actually set it up.

So if you're okay with that I think we'll just go for the standard mailing list system we have for now, and in the future we can offer that option as well. So I think the question for the Working Group is now that I think we already have two questions that I think Steve has put forward, whether we want to set a - cut off that line by which Working Group members of subteams need to put in their questions.

We can then have those on a, you know, one document altogether and send that to the Working Group for their information to see if there are any, you know, issues or things people want to add or possibly change and then basically bring that to the expert group.

And this may just be a first batch of questions. It's, you know, others may arrive in the future but this may be a first way of engaging with the experts and as well allowing them to provide some feedback on the questions to the Working Group.

Mikey O'Connor: And Don in terms of your question about Beijing I think that our plan for Beijing, and again - and Marika can set me right if I've got this a little wrong.

But I think our plan for Beijing is to have a working meeting there. We're not going to have a big public do where we make big presentations. We're just going to have another Working Group meeting with a bit of a public session at the beginning and the end to let people either raise questions or raise comments or something like that.

And to the extent that the expert group members can join us for that, that would be great. And if they join through remote participation then that will all be going.

It'll be the normal kind of call. It's just that a lot of us will be in the same room.

Don Blumenthal: Okay so it's more that - this is Don for the transcript. So it's more that people will be invited. We're not planning on convening a meeting of the expert's group.

Mikey O'Connor: No. Right.

Don Blumenthal: Okay. All right. And just like I said I know a lot of the folks and particularly the technical people who are still with Affilias don't go to ICANN meetings so we'd be missing out.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Don Blumenthal: They're kind of a critical group for some of the issues.

Mikey O'Connor: Right.

Don Blumenthal: Okay with that I've got to jump off to a Beijing planning meeting and throw in my two cents on what PIR should be doing in terms of computer security.

Mikey O'Connor: That sounds like fun. Well have a great meeting. Thank Don.

Don Blumenthal: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Steve you've got - you've been very patient so back to you.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, I mean, my question was just that I would encourage us to send in the questions that are available now. And also is there any requirement that the questions come through subgroups or...?

Mikey O'Connor: No.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: No. I'm arbitrarily making that choice because I, you know, I think that there's a lot of the work that we have yet to do that's probably never going to find its way into a subgroup.

I think the goal I had with subgroups is to tackle some of the preliminary issues and in the case of the privacy one some of the more complicated issues in subgroups.

But by no means am I expecting to do them all in subgroups now. So if people have questions that are sort of outside of subgroup topics, this would probably be a good time.

And maybe Marika what, set a deadline of next week's call for getting that first batch of questions together? Is that an unreasonable deadline? It seems not terribly unreasonable to me.

Why don't we tentatively pencil that in as our goal because I know that in the case of Steve's subgroup they've had questions out there for some time now, and it would be nice to get some of those in front of the expert group so they can start chewing on them?

So maybe another action is an announcement to the list sort of giving people an alert that they should pose their questions between now and next week's call via the list to you and Berry, and we'll take a look at this - any of those questions on next week's call just to sort of tune them and then send them along to the expert group.

Okay. Well we sort of did a subtle segway into planning the Beijing meeting. Let's just tie that off fairly quickly. Does anybody have sort of a severely negative reaction to this notion that I threw out a minute ago that we basically have a Working Group meeting in Beijing?

We surround it with a good invitation that draws on our initial report to sort of frame the issue that we're discussing, encourage people to join us and we'll do just a little bit of an introduction during - meeting at the beginning just to sort of give assembled folks at the Beijing meeting a bit of a background statement but not spend a whole lot of time on that - maybe rely a bit more on the invitation and the material in the confluence page for that meeting to let people do a little bit of background reading.

And then we'll conduct a regular meeting during Beijing. And then towards the end of that meeting open - sort of have sections at the beginning and the end to allow a bit of interaction with the assembled folks.

But then in between those bookends just conduct a regular meeting whatever our agenda happens to be. Marc, go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Hey Mikey this is Marc. I personally think that's a great idea. I think for the people that are at least in attendance having them be able to meet face-to-face and opening things up to, you know, to sort of as you put, you know, public comments and feedback I, you know, I think that's a, you know, a great opportunity to be able to do that and you should take advantage of it.

I don't know that I will be in attendance. Not - you know, travel plans haven't been finalized yet. But I do not think I'll be on the travel team but I would encourage you to do that anyway. I think it would be a great opportunity and it sounds like a good plan.

Man:	Marika, can you remind me what time of day this meeting is going to be in Beijing? Is it early in the day or is it...

Marika Konings:	This is Marika. We've requested a 11:00 to 12:30 on the Wednesday. And - but if the working group - because I think we set that up more thinking of the more public kind of facing session.

But if now an interaction is to maybe go to a more, you know, face-to-face working group meeting, we could also see if there's an opportunity to actually make it a breakfast meeting and have a 7:30 to 9:00 session if that's preferred so there's less conflict possibly with other sessions. So that's up to the working group to decide.

Mikey O'Connor:	Well, there's another advantage to that in that since the time zone difference between Beijing and the East Coast of the US is 12 hours, and with Europe, it's about six. If we have it at 11:00 to 12:30 Beijing time, that's going to knock out a lot of remote participants like (Mark) and even more in Europe because it'll be a very awkward time in Europe.

So it might be a not bad idea to consider shifting this towards the breakfast meeting slot. How does - what's the sense of the group in terms of a breakfast meeting versus a middle of the day meeting on Wednesday? Strong reactions one way or the other?

Man:	What do you mean by middle of the day?

Mikey O'Connor:	Well, 11:00 to 12:30, which is the moment - the time that Marika mentioned.

Man: Okay. I'm almost invariably busy at that time, typically just before the GNSO council meeting. But...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, that's what I was thinking.

Man: ...if I miss it, I miss it. Don't worry.

Mikey O'Connor: There's probably - if we do an 11:00 to 12:30 local meeting, we probably will lose a lot of people to conflicts because by that time, the meeting is pretty much in full swing. So my inclination would be to lean towards a working session, breakfast session. But again, sing out if that doesn't - I'm not getting a whole lot of negative checkmarks in the chat. So maybe that's the way to go, Marika, is - and that way we'd be able to bring more people in that were coming to Beijing through remote participation which would be nice.

There's probably - if we do an 11:00 to 12:30 local meeting, we probably will lose a lot of people to conflicts because by that time, the meeting is pretty much in full swing. So my inclination would be to lean towards a working session, breakfast session. But again, sing out if that doesn't - I'm not getting a whole lot of negative checkmarks in the chat. So maybe that's the way to go, Marika, is - and that way we'd be able to bring more people in that were coming to Beijing through remote participation which would be nice.

Why don't we think about that as a plan? Because I'm not sure that we're really in a position to develop much in the way of materials for a standup public meeting just yet. I'm a little uncomfortable doing that until we've got, especially the privacy issue a little bit better understood and resolved. So tentatively, let's go with the breakfast meeting plan and go from there. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Just then to briefly check would people be okay if we tried to schedule it for the Thursday morning from 7:30 to 9:00? That - does that raise any significant objections or can we try to move it to that time?

Man: Oh, that's going to knock out (Don) and me, I bet. Can you check and see when the SSAC meeting - there're a series of security meetings that start on Thursday morning. And I - whenever they start, I have to be there because I'm part of the (DSSA).

Marika Konings: I can check with (Judy) what time they start on Thursday and if, indeed, it's a conflict with 7:30 to 9:00, we can either move to Wednesday or otherwise Monday morning would be an alternative as well.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Marika Konings: So we can check that.

Man: Okay. Sorry to - go ahead Steve.

Steve Metalitz: You - has a schedule been posted for the Beijing meeting or are you just, you know, assuming that since SSAC usually meets Thursday morning, they will meet Thursday morning?

Man: Yes, I'm just assuming that because we've sort of engineered this trio of meetings over the last four meetings in a row that says SSAC kicks it off and then the board risk management framework committee and then the DSSA sort of in a big blob in the morning on Thursdays.

Steve Metalitz: Okay, so I mean, this is always a problem we face in trying to schedule something, is that some - you know, there's some information. There's nothing formal and...

Man: Yes, I know. It's always moving parts.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, I mean...

Man: It's really complicated. And I think that, you know, quite frankly if something had to give in this clockwork machine, given the state of the analysis that we are at, I would - there are several working groups that I'm on that I'm pretty adamant we need to meet in Beijing.

This one I'm a bit less adamant because we haven't quite gotten to the point where we need to stand up in front of the public and talk about what we're doing. I think it's a great opportunity not to be missed, to get the group together face-to-face, but if the scheduling got to be impossible, at least from my vantage point, Beijing is a less critical meeting.

Clearly the next meeting is going to be very important for us because that's where the initial report will be out and comments will be coming back and there'll be, I think, a really strong need for a public meeting on the next one, (Durbin), I guess.

So that's another thing that I would sort of color on this one, not quite as critical. And I think maybe leave it at that for now and let Marika kind of run with those thoughts and see what develops. Is that okay with folks? Okay. Let's take the rest of the call to just walk through the document that's been sitting on the screen all during this call.

This is sort of a framework to capture the state of the discussion right now. And Marika, do you want to sort of walk us through it real quick, maybe take command of our screens and just sort of work us through it? I know a lot of folks, myself included, don't actually read things until they're pushed in my face on a call.

And so I think it would be good to just, you know, during this call, let's walk through it, get any initial sort of very strong reactions, especially negative ones. That's, I think the ones that we're really interested in. And then, you know, if we get through all that, maybe start trying to dive into one of the one's that hasn't got a working group behind it and actually start revising it. But I think with that, I'll take it - I'll let it go over to you, Marika.

Marika Konings: Sure. This is Marika. Thanks Mikey. So basically, indeed, inspired by what some of the (soft) teams were doing, trying to really in a very short way summarize the positions of the statements or comments we received to date.

It's time to do that for all the topics in the document you see on the screen now.

So basically what I did is look at all the different statements and basically tried to write a little index on where the different groups stand with regard to that specific issue. So, for example, you'll see the first one, response consistency, basically the (tick mark) meetings that the group uses as having a positive impact should takeaways be required and will be considered a benefit.

And you see, for example, here that there's one group that NCC identified as they believed it would have a negative impact if that would be required. So in that way, I worked my way through the different issues and also try to make a preliminary conclusion based on the number of checkmarks and Xs, trying to make an assessment on whether those, you know, most agree, almost all agree and whether more information was needed, because in some of the comments, basically people indicated, well, we don't really know.

We're actually hoping that others may be able to share some more information so we can make our determination. So that way I tried to draw up some conclusions for each of them for the working group to look at.

So I think the first point to make here is that all the groups probably should take this back and really make sure that I've made the right assessment for that comment to make sure that I've identified their comments in the right way.

I think you see in some where I've actually put, as well, that no comment made or no position taken. I think there's one where I didn't fill anything in, I think on the existing (voice) application.

You see there in the middle. I think the (MPOC) statement, where I'm actually not really sure whether that comment was meant to be in support or viewed

as having a negative impact, so again, I would really encourage everyone to look at this template or at this document and provide your feedback if you believe that identifies our position strongly or whether other information is required here.

So then looking at the template, I think on most of the topics, at least for those where no further information was needed to make an assessment, I looked at the different conclusions. And you can see that in most of the cases, it's - most agree that takeaways would be a good idea or almost all agree.

But, of course, there're still some red tick marks. So the thinking then was, okay, but of course, in order to hopefully come to a joint position, it would be really good if the working group can actually start then looking at why are those red tick marks there? Is there a way to look at it that issues have been raised and try to see if there's a way to, you know, address those?

So what I did then, in the second page, and again, here I would like to request everyone that seen there, the comments included here, to look at this and make sure, again, in the details, I just put in there a summary of a comment because some of the submissions were quite long, for you to have a look if I captured the essence of your issue accurately.

And if not, please let me know so we can update it accordingly. So the idea would be then for each of the subjects or each of the topics where groups identified issues with requiring takeaways to identify them as in the details. Then we added a column for observations so there I already started adding in some comments or some notes that the working group may find helpful or may want us to build on.

Then the idea would be we need to work through each of them and was trying to identify some questions together with Mikey that may help guide that

process. So the first question would be asking is the issue identified specific to a transition from (unintelligible)?

Or is it actually an issue that relates to a broader discussion and may not be relevant for this specific working group? So the first question - or the first response, if the answer is yes, then the question will be, well, has this also occurred in existing gTLDs or (thick) gTLDs?

Has it occurred before? I mean, I have evidence that this is, indeed, an issue. And if yes, then the group is asked to identify how has this been addressed? And based on that, then the other question is are there additional measures recommended to actually address this issue? Because we've identified that it is an issue in existing gTLDs, so how are we actually going to deal with them and if this becomes a requirement?

Or this may also be if the answer is no, it hasn't occurred or we do still believe it is an issue, there may be additional measures of safeguards the working group may want to recommend as part of a possible recommendation for requiring takeaways.

And then the last column is basically on that first question of if an issue is specific to (thick) Whois, if the answer is no, I think the idea would be here, then, can we actually identify other efforts that are already looking into this issue or where this information can be provided to make sure, as well, that you know, groups have spent a little time in identifying issues and writing or providing information.

But if, indeed, the working group believes that it's not - rather than for this working group to look at it, are there other efforts that we can identify to which we may want to submit this information so it can be taken into account within those specific contacts and address there?

So basically that's the idea and I'll release the document now so you can have a look yourselves. But that is basically the idea behind this document and really trying to move the discussions of the working group further by trying to identify where it looks like you have broad agreement on a certain approach but at the same time, identifying or diving into those issues that have been identified and basically trying to categorize those to see, you know, are they really specific to (thick) Whois and if so, you know, what can we do to mitigate those issues or provide safeguards so that they're no longer issues and, you know, maybe possibly we can get to some unanimous recommendations on some of these items.

So, again you know, this is a first draft. I'm really hoping that you all have a chance to look at this in greater detail to really make sure that we've identified the right positions for all the working - for all the groups that submitted statements and then, again, on Page 2 of the document, to really make sure that we've summarized the issue accurately and if there's any additional information that you believe would need to be added that you submit it to us as well.

And as Mikey said, I think some of the (sub) teams may start, you know, doing this and working their way through the questions as part of their respective discussions, but for some of these items where there are currently no (sub) teams, the working group may start diving into this and, you know, we can help in filling out the different sections and trying to have a complete record, indeed, of how the working group, you know, reviews the issues.

What are the issues? Are there any specific recommendations that need to be made? Or are these issues that are better addressed or are being addressed in other efforts that relate to Who is? So I think that's, in a nutshell, what we've tried to do here. For any questions, I'm happy to try and answer them.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Marika. Alan's hand went up so I'll go right to him.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Two points. Is it possible we can put response consistency to bed? My understanding is there has been significant progress in the RAA discussions on this one and the RAA may be mandating the consistent format. Maybe we can get a staff report for the next meeting on where that one fits.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, it's my - that's my understanding as well. Marika, you're typing. If you want, you can just sing out instead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I'm actually typing on the breakfast question, not (this one).

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. And Avri, how do you like that new TLD that I created for you when I typed that without spaces? I'm thinking you should probably apply for that. Sorry about that.

Alan Greenberg: And - if it's back to me...

Mikey O'Connor: Anyway - yes, back to you.

Alan Greenberg: The second one is, I would suggest on the cost implications that we reverse the notation. We have a negative response which makes Xs good and ticks bad.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, so it makes it hard to read.

Alan Greenberg: Well, it just makes it confusing. A quick look at it, it looks like we have some onerous problems with cost implications but the Xs are saying no negative impact.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, that's true, so maybe just change the nomenclature on the (marks). Yes, that's a good thought. In terms of RAA agreement, isn't one getting published

soon? There was a rumpus about that just recently. There's one that's getting published but it's preliminary. Anyway, Marika, do you have a sense of Alan's question on the response consistency thing? I wish Volker was on the call. He could rattle that right off.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I don't know. I think as Steve said, (Steve posted this one) in the chat and (Fadi) says yes, on the call, that I think that a new RAA tax is expected to be released today, so hopefully that will give some further insight. But I don't have any further knowledge of that particular issues.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, okay. So maybe we can take that as an action. (Frederick), go ahead.

(Frederick): Oh hi. Just regarding the RAA, we had some emails on the constituencies this morning. And I was just going to try to look for them and so I can type you the exact dates or the release. It should be released either today or tomorrow, as a draft version - very draft.

Mikey O'Connor: Right. Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I think soon is a good summary and today or tomorrow is probably fine for our purposes because whenever it comes out, we can - maybe Marika, if you and (Barry) could sort of keep an eye out for that release and just extract the current stated language on response consistency, that would be helpful.

Alan Greenberg: (Mikey), it's Alan. The more interesting thing, then, what's in the RAA is whether they've come up with a way to approve it. If anyone was involved around the 2008, 2009 one, remember that was somewhat problematic.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Yes. Well, I'm not going to go looking for trouble on that one. But duly noted. Any other sort of overall reactions to this? I am - as I think I mentioned several times on the list, I'm quite keen on this document as a way to do a

couple of things - partly, to summarize the discussions that we've had already but also to sort of concentrate our attention on issues that we yet need to talk through and try to resolve.

Because my personal goal is that we walk out of the end of this working group with a list of (knotty) issues that we've taken a hard look at and a consensus approach as to how to address those issues. And so I'm quite keen on this discussion or on this document as a way to focus that discussion and also serve as sort of a punch list or a checklist to make sure that we don't accidentally skip on or miss one or forget one.

And also to, quite frankly, focus this on the hardest ones because I think that if we can focus on the hard ones and figure out a way through them, we will have done a great good for the community and for ICANN in general. And so, you know, I am keen on the idea that's on the second page that there may be some things like the issue that Steve was talking about earlier where we sort of say, "Look, this really isn't an issue that's unique to or really relevant to the transition to (thick) Whois for a few registries."

But on the other hand, I also agree with Avri that - and maybe I'll put words - actually I'm not going to put words in Avri's mouth but I'm going to put words in my mouth and say that I do not want to use scope as a way to dodge an issue.

I don't want to just wave a magic want and say, "Well, that's a difficult issue and it's out of scope, so poof, it's gone." I think that that's the distinction I want to make, is that when you review this document, review it and we should agree that these things are in or out of scope and where there's this agreement that's probably in that same difficult issue category and there we need to work hard and collaboratively to try and figure out ways to address the issue.

And, you know, if it remains an issue, ways that it might be mitigated. And if we can't figure that out, then figure out what we're going to do. So that's sort of my rant, I guess, if you will, about that.

And I was partly doing that rant to let you know how I feel but I was also sort of doing that rant to give you time to collect your thoughts. Do people have any other reactions to this document? Would you like another week to sort of do the homework that's implied by what Marika was saying, which is please take a very hard look at this document and make sure that we've represented your concerns and issues correctly? And by all means, fix anything that we made errors on. (Mark), go ahead. Avri's okay but (Mark), go ahead.

(Mark):   Hey Mikey, it's (Mark). Yes, I just wanted to say, yes, I like the document. Thank you, you and Marika for pulling it together. You know, I will have some feedback on some things I think that need to be changed, at least from a VeriSign perspective.

But I think it's a great start and a great way to pull together sort of a quick overall view of, you know, of what the input and information coming from the community has been.

But, you know, I also wanted to just sort of echo what you just said about, you know, not waving a magic wand at tough issues and saying it's out of scope. You know, I think that's a great point. You know, and if - you know, we can't just say something's out of scope or there are no issues.

You know, I think that's, you know, that's sort of taking the easy way out. You know, if something's out of scope, we have to say, you know, "Okay, we looked at this issue and it's out of scope because of XYZ or, you know, because it's being addressed here," or you know, we have to say why.

And the same thing, you know, we can't just say something's not an issue. We have to say, you know, we looked at, you know, aspects of a particular, you know, point and we don't believe it's an issue because of XYZ.

So, you know, we can't - you know, like you said, I just wanted to - you know, I thought you put it nicely. We can't just wave a magic wand and say something's not an issue or something's out of scope.

You know, I think we'd be doing, you know, ICANN and the community a disservice. We have to, you know, really put some thought into it and explain why something's out of scope or why something, you know, is an issue. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks (Mark). Marika's answering a question that Steve posed in the chat. The short version is, yes, I pushed a copy of this spreadsheet out to the list a few days ago, Thursday or Friday, and I bet pretty soon a link to the - either a link to that note or just reposting it to the list could happen. But it's by all means, out there in the wild, Steve, and you're more than welcome to share it with any and all who might be interested in it.

And one of the things that you, as representatives of your constituency or stakeholder group will be wanting to do is to make sure that issue that - what you - what's easy to check is an error or misstatement where we've captured what you said wrong.

What you'll want to check is the error of omission to make sure that there isn't, you know, that we haven't missed something that you, as either an individual member of the working group or as the member of a constituency feel is really important that we didn't put in. Because clearly that's harder to do and so I just want to amplify that you'll want to be doing that too. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. And one of the other things, working (programs) may want to start thinking about is how to fill in the second page. So, you know, are there any observations we should be adding, you know, any description of one of the issues specific to (thick) Whois or not.

And also, you know, if it has occurred in existing gTLDs. Also you'll start thinking, like, other ways to mitigate, indeed, the identified issue. But what I'll suggest is suggested ways to actually mitigate or address the concerns.

So I think if people already start thinking about that and have suggested language there we can include, we can start updating your document and use that as well as a discussion or a tool for discussion on the upcoming meetings to work our way, I think, through each of these items.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Marika. And Avri raised a good point in the chat, which I didn't mean to make that mistake. But she's pointing out that some people are not here as representatives of stakeholder groups or constituencies. They're simply members of them.

And I think, you know, the main point I'm trying to get to is please, please, please, please all of us take a hard look at this document and make contributions. I didn't want to - I stated it the way I did but I wasn't intending to make the implied notion that only reps should comment.

I think this is a working group. We all get to comment on this. It's 10:00 on the dot. (Mark) needs to drop off. So let's leave it here for now and rejoin this conversation pretty hard next week. I think we're getting down to the working part of the working group.

And we'll carry on. Any final thoughts before people want to drop off the call? All right then. Have a great week. We'll see you in a week and it's nice to have us back at work again.

Man: Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Marika, I think we can - or Glen, I think we can wrap up the recording, too.

Woman: (Have a good day).

                          END