

**ICANN
Transcription
Thick Whois PDP Working Group
Tuesday 11 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 11 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-20121211-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Wilson Abigaba – NCUC
Marc Anderson – RySG
Roy Balleste – NCUC
Iliya Bazlyankov – RrSG
Amr Elsadr – NCSG
Ray Fassett – RySG
Christopher George – IPC
Alan Greenberg – At Large
Volker Greimann – RrSG
Caroline Hoover – RySG
Susan Kawaguchi - CBUC
Marie-Laure Lemineur - NPOC
Steve Metalitz – IPC
Ope Oodusan – At Large
Mikey O'Connor – ISPCP
Normann Ritchie – RySG
Tim Ruiz – RrSG

Jill Titzer – RrSG
Jennifer Wolfe – NCA
Jonathan Zuck – IPC

Apologies:

Titi Akinsanmi – At Large
Don Blumenthal – RySG
Avri Doria – NCSG
Frederic Guillemaut – RrSG
Susan Prosser – RrSG

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings
Berry Cobb
Glen De Saint Gery
Julia Charvolen

Coordinator: Thank you. The call is now being recorded. Please go ahead.

Julia Charvolen: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the Thick Whois PDP Working Group call on Tuesday, 11 December. On the call today we have Wilson Abigaba, Marc Anderson, Roy Balleste, Iliya Bazlyankov, Amr Elsadr, Alan Greenberg, Volker Greimann, who will normally only be on Adobe Connect, Caroline Hoover, Steve Metalitz, Mikey O'Connor, Norm Ritchie, Tim Ruiz and Jennifer Wolfe.

We have apologies from Titi Akinsanmi, Don Blumenthal, Susan Prosser, Frédéric Guillemaut and Avri Doria. From staff we have Marika Konings, Berry Cobb, Glen de Saint Géry 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 and welcome all to the weekly call of the thick Whois Working Group. As you can see in the agenda we're going to just touch bases on outreach to the ACs and SOs. I think most of the call today is going to be breaking into the mechanics of sort of breaking into groups and getting started on the real work. I'm hoping that by the end of the call today we'll have folks organized enough that we can really get going on doing work instead of thinking about doing work.

We'll touch the technical experts' group conversation there towards the end and then talk about our next meeting. Is there anything that anybody would like to add to that agenda and/or update us on their statements of interest?

Okay, Marika, I'm going to toss the ball to you and let you sort of give us an update on where we're at. I saw the request for comments go out at least to some of the constituencies that I'm a member of so I know that we're underway there. Do you want to fill us in on where we're at?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. So following last week's call I think there were a couple of minor changes that were agreed upon. And following that we've sent it out to the different GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies as well as the outreach message to the different SO/ACs.

I think taking - the 35 days I think took us to I believe the 9th of January so we've given that as a deadline clearly noting as well that if people need more time that they should just indicate that and then provide us with that feedback. So we actually know when or if to expect something from the different groups. So that's all on track.

And maybe if we can just encourage everyone - all the members here on the call to work with your respective stakeholder groups and constituencies to hopefully get some input together for the group to consider.

Mikey O'Connor: Julia, I have a brain teaser for you. Can you check with the operator and see which line is making - oh the line noise went away. Thank you. And for the rest of us can you please mute when you're not speaking? We've got a fair amount of background noise on the call today. And it would help to mute your lines so that we can hear each other. Thanks.

Any thoughts or reactions from the groups about announcement that went out? I think the message from me would be for sure encourage your respective constituencies to contribute. We're definitely in fact-gathering mode and the more facts the better.

I won't retrace all of the conversations we've had about this but it would be good to get information from the constituencies and stakeholder groups. Any other thoughts before we move on to the next thing?

All right well many thanks to Marika and Berry who filled in last week while Marika was taken away from us. I think we're off to a good start on that. The

next chunk is what I'm sort of expecting to spend most of the call on today and that's these groups.

What you see on the screen in front of you is sort of who signed up for what. And I'm going to give you just a few more minutes to look at that and then I'm going to switch over to my little mind map because I've done some looking at those lists and some thinking about merging the groups together.

And I have some questions for you. And then while we're talking about this let me give you a bit of a sort of prelude. I'm hoping that each of these groups will meet somehow - not all of them but, you know, say the first four or five will kick off on this call. And because there's not a whole lot of overlap between some of these groups I'm hoping that they will have some sort of conversation between now and next week's call and that we will actually have started working.

And so what this is sort of like is that process in school where we divide into groups to work on term papers together. And I'm hoping that we can actually get going on that. So a lot of this is about the logistics of how that's going to work.

So somebody's still not muted. Can we tell who that is, Julia? And then - there we go, that's a bit better.

Okay so I've given you enough time to sort of scroll through. I'm going to take that away.

Alan Greenberg: Mikey, is that a document you've sent out already or is that new?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, this is the poll that went out. Marika, I think, sent it to the list earlier this week.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, sorry, I...

Mikey O'Connor: And if not, you know, we can always send it again. I can't remember if it's on the wiki. If it's not maybe we should push it out to the wiki somewhere and announce that.

Marika Konings: It is on the wiki.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. And maybe if folks want to read along Marika, could you find the link and post it into the chat while I switch over to the - yes, see, that Marika she is so together. Okay so there's the little mind map. Let me see how it looks. I think that's readable. If it's - it's always a tradeoff between what you can see and the size of the text so let me know if it's not too good either way.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: But I'm going to sort of focus us in on the - on this top part of the set of issues, the framing issues and the technical issues. Because I think that what we should probably do is get those underway first and sort of wait until we've got our work underway on these and also a conversation with this group of experts that we're - actually making quite good progress in assembling - before we dive into the policy issues.

And so what I did - and I'm now going to perhaps bewilder - yes, this is too big. I've got to come down one notch. Let me know if this text is too small because what I did - I think I'm going to have to do this one group at a time - is I went through the same thing that is in that document that Marika just posted the link to and I looked at them to see how much overlap there is between the people who signed up.

So here's the secret code to what's going on. The people whose names are in bold only signed up for the group that's listed whereas people who are in normal size text signed up for more than one.

And so that said to me so on this list, for example, Steve, Ray, Amr and Titi signed up for this group amongst the first few groups. And this'll make more sense as I go a little bit deeper in. And to me that meant that if I did something I wanted to pay a special attention to the needs of the folks who only signed up for that group because it seemed to me that that might mean that there was - they had a special interest in that group. And that got important when we got down into some of these other groups.

I'm hoping this is going to fit on the screen. I'm going to have to come down another notch. Can you still read that or is it too small? I'm going to follow Jonathan's idea and hide this note for a minute and make this a little bit bigger. That might help. That helps at least on my screen. Hopefully it helps on the rest of yours...

Alan Greenberg: Yes, Mikey, if you can do it just - if you can make the left part disappear because it's not really adding anything and it's taking 1/4 of the space.

Mikey O'Connor: Let me try this full screen button. I've never tried this before. Now what it will do is it will eliminate my ability to hear people's comments on Chat. You know, so if you want to jump in the queue just interrupt me while I talk but if I do that that makes it a bit bigger. Maybe we'll go there for a little while and then come back.

Oh and I can see the messages in the Chat so go ahead and just type in the chat.

Alan Greenberg: I didn't see anything happen on my side when you did that, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh well then maybe - ah, and maybe that's a local thing. So maybe what happens is - let me see if I can now - oh I've now gotten myself into a pickle because I can't undo what I just did to myself. Oh I know. So I'm going to leave it the way it is but if you go and look at the share window that I just

made bigger up there in the top there's a button that says Full Screen. And I clicked that and it filled the whole screen. That made it even bigger.

And Jonathan is there in the Chat saying the same thing. But it only works for your local copy so when I went to full screen I didn't take the rest of you with me. So if it's still too small that's an option for you. Sorry to take us off topic there. But what this does is it finally lets me see the whole analysis that I did.

And so what you can see is that I - I combined two topics, data escrow and stability, and I think it was Tim's suggestion but I can't really remember. Anyway I'll give Tim credit for it.

And the reason I have question marks is because a lot of people signed up for both, Alan, Caroline, Tim, signed up for both groups. So presumably combining them would be fine with them.

What I wanted to do is check with Christopher George, Jeff Neuman and Fred to see if it was okay with them to do this. So, Chris, you're on the call. I'm going to put you on the spot and ask you would it be all right with you if we combined these two topics into one or did you see them as different enough?

And the reason I'm asking you is because you only signed up for one. And I just want to see whether, in your view, it would be all right to combine these?

Christopher George: Yes, I think - I think they can be combined. I mean, they're not - obviously they're not identical but there is a little overlap. And if - even if they're combined if there's things that don't completely overlap if - I don't think that's a big deal.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Well that's the kind of feedback that I was looking for. And you're the only one on the call that can answer that question on this one. So I think that the fact that we have your thoughts is it's okay plus the other folks who

signed up together, Alan, Caroline and Tim, I'm going to go ahead and treat that as a done deal.

And then if the group runs into trouble Tim's on the call, Alan's on the call, Caroline's on the call so the four of you can hear this; if you discover somewhere down the line that this isn't working it's fine to break it back apart. But to the extent that we can clump things together and move things along I think this is a good idea.

So why don't we tentatively go ahead and leave them together and the combined - I'll make up a list of the combined people after the call and send you all email.

Now I'm going to do the same sort of thing when we get down here because - oh, oh no it was this one. I think I'm going to save this discussion for later. There was another one that we combined which was response consistency and accessibility. But I'm leaving the whole policy series of questions for another day.

I really want to get us started basically on three subgroups; the framing one and the technical one. So we've got three things, authoritativeness, stability and data escrow and synchronization and migration.

I think that's enough activity to sort of get underway without overwhelming ourselves with, you know, things to do. So I'm going to suggest that we just go ahead with three - oh Tim's got something in the chat. "I don't think they are identical." Didn't mean that; just that there was more overlap than not so combining them might be more efficient.

Yes, I think that's actually the right way to say it, Tim, is that we don't want to separate these issues necessarily for the report. Certainly we have to circle back to these topics and have answers but that the group is well positioned to do them sort of at the same time.

That said I want to spend some time on sort of the logistics of how we work. This idea of subgroups is good news in one sense; it makes the work on these calls a bit less overwhelming. And it also allows us to do work in parallel. And it also allows us to do work with people who are more focused on a given issue.

On the other hand it makes it a little more complicated to coordinate. And so what would be very helpful is if folks on the call - if people in these groups could volunteer to lead one of them so that there's sort of a point of coordination with the rest of us.

And so I want you to think about that while I talk about a couple of other issues. One of the things that I ran into on the VI - the Vertical Integration Working Group was that we overwhelmed the mailing list with posts. It got to be completely crazy the number of emails that were on main mailing list. I think we had on the order of 2000-5000 posts in something like four months.

And especially since many of us English is not our first language and because many of these posts are very tightly worded it got very hard for people to follow along. And so my idea is that each of these groups would either have its own email list - and Marika has suggested that that's easy for the staff or at least relatively easy for the staff to set up.

Or that the - my idea before learning that was that the group would work just via regular email copying each other and then once a week they would post their threads to the main list so that we still get them into the public archives but we don't flood the list with email. And so that's one thing to think about.

Another thing to think about is whether or not the group would like to work by email or by - with a teleconference. The teleconference stuff starts to get a bit overwhelming for the staff to support although a straight telephone bridge is relatively easy.

But all of those choices are ones that I'd like to have a point of contact for so that they and I can sort of deal with all this administrative stuff and not flood the list with those kinds of questions and not take much more - I am always very conscious of taking time on this main call for administrative stuff.

I really want to get us off of administrative and on to working because the longer we administer the more people we lose on these calls. And the quicker we can get to actually having substantive conversations the fewer people we're going to lose.

So for all of those reasons I would really love to have somebody from each of those groups step forward and volunteer to be the convener or meeting leader type person. And I'm going to take a step back now and see if there are, first, any questions and then, second, if there are any volunteers would be willing to sort of be on one of these subgroups as a leader.

Don't all speak at once. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, assuming, you know, we get reasonable administrative support to set up I think teleconference is absolutely necessary. Getting a critical mass and coming to decisions on email is really, really difficult so...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: ...it would be nice to voice opinions ahead of time on email. Even that doesn't always work that well with busy schedules so...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: ...assuming we can arrange a teleconference, you know, and for these people maybe Skype would work and maybe it wouldn't, I don't know.

Mikey O'Connor: Well and Marika says that they've got - putting together a full blown Verizon bridge like this one is more complicated than the (Adigo) bridges...

Alan Greenberg: Usually that...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Yes and so, yes, I think that's right. Any other thoughts? I would really love to get a volunteer otherwise I'm going to volunteer people so, you know, it would be nice to get self-selected volunteers.

Susan Prosser: Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, go ahead.

Susan Kawaguchi: This is Susan. I'm not - I'm in the car so I've been on mute. But you can assign me to a group - lead one group - subgroup. And just...

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Susan Kawaguchi: ...pick whatever works for you.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh that's lovely. And just to make sure this is Susan Kawaguchi not Susan Prosser, correct?

Susan Kawaguchi: I'm sorry it is - no, it's Susan Prosser. Let's call it...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Really, well that's the reason I asked is because you sound so much like.

((Crosstalk))

Susan Kawaguchi: No this is Susan Kawaguchi. I just thought that would be funny.

Mikey O'Connor: You're just (crazy) here. A combination of car and the fact that those two voices sound so much alike to me. Okay it's Susan Kawaguchi, great. I will take that under advisement. Anybody else want to volunteer to lead one of these? I'm hoping that this is a fairly light job.

If it turns into a heavy job that's, I think, my problem to solve rather than yours because - because it is. So, you know, I'm hopeful that this is mostly a convening and not a heavy duty writing, not a heavy duty summarizing kind of job because I'm hoping that a lot of this will be sort of self-documenting through email and so on.

Going once, Metalitz, would you be interested in doing the authoritative one?
Oh he's not - he's on the call isn't he?

Steve Metalitz: Yes, this is Steve. I am on the call.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: And, yes, I mean, I could certainly...

Mikey O'Connor: I mean, again, I just want to emphasize that, you know, if this turns out to be a pain in the neck we have to rethink it because, you know, I don't want to create a huge burden for people. I just don't want to have to talk to everybody in every group at the same time.

Alan Greenberg: Mikey, it's Alan. A thought: I volunteered for a bunch of these groups and I did that because as I was reading them I don't think many of these things are going to be hugely controversial and hugely difficult. If any of them become difficult and controversial I think we need to revert to the whole group to discuss it.

Mikey O'Connor: Right. I like that idea.

Alan Greenberg: I think by definition we need to document the things and address the issues in the charter. If it becomes a real dispute I think it has to revert to the whole group to talk about. So...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, yes.

Alan Greenberg: ...that almost defines these subgroups as not, you know, a major work of art.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. How would you like to lead the stability and data escrow one since you signed up for both of those?

Alan Greenberg: I already put my hand up and said I would.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh you did? I missed that. Well dang it. Okay so we have our leaders. And I thank you all. So Steve Metalitz will lead the authoritativeness one. Alan Greenberg will lead stability and data escrow. And Susan Kawaguchi - he said very carefully - will lead the synchronization and migration one. That's cool.

God, we're just rocking through this agenda. I was thinking that this would be more of the call than it is. Okay so I'm going to see - oh, Marika, could you help me out at this point and I'm trying to put the room back together.

Alan Greenberg: Marika has her hand up also.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh and I've scrolled. Thank you, Alan. Go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. (Unintelligible) then just a question basically for the sub team leaders if maybe off-list they can let us know how they would like to organize their sub teams whether they would like to have a mailing list that's publicly archived, whether, you know, they need any support.

And in setting up calls or whether they prefer to do things through the mailing list so if they can just advise us about that, you know, we'll do our best to support the sub teams as we can.

Mikey O'Connor: I have a question. That is why don't we do a mailing list for each subgroup but let's also do a mailing list that we call the Ops list that's just the mailing list for the leaders so that we can have a conversation about all this (administrivia) and so that if a given leaders wants to ignore it for a while they can filter it and make it go away so that we can sort of have...

Marika Konings: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: ...coordinative type brainstorming conversations off list but still keep the ball moving.

Alan Greenberg: Could I ask when each of these - it's Alan - when each of these lists get set up can you send out the participant list to the list?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: With the major domo lists that GNSO uses they always block the ability to look at who's on the list.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh is that right? Oh those rascals.

Alan Greenberg: And any of the ones that I've ever tried it's always blocked. I'm not sure why but it is.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Yes, it would be good to do that. All right so, Marika, if you could get our agenda note back up. I'm done now with the screen sharing thing and can't find - there it is, oh thank you, that's perfect. And let me just see if I can rearrange things so that they don't overlap. There.

Okay so on to the next. Oh no I'm going to stop; one more thought for the subteams, which is a segue or a bridge into the fourth agenda item. And that is I think that the homework assignment for the sub teams for this week is to start brainstorming a list of questions from your subgroup to a list of - to a panel of experts.

And we're going to get to that panel in a second. But we're making pretty good progress on finding people who went through this transition before both from a technical and the policy standpoint. And so while we're getting that sorted out I think it would be very helpful for the subgroups to start coming up with a list of questions that they would like to ask that group.

And that way we can sort of funnel out of the subgroups back up into the main group and then out to experts. And maybe - I think it's pushing to have that expert call before we break for the holidays but we'll see. Anyway that's the homework assignment is a list of questions for a group of people who went through this before. Amr, go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Yes, hi, Mikey. This is Amr. I just - I wanted to ask in terms of setting up the mailing list for the subgroup members; is there a reason why these mailing lists would not be publicly accessible?

Mikey O'Connor: Oh I think they will be publicly accessible. It's just what Alan is asking for is a list of who's on the lists. But the rest of us can go look at the lists through the public archives. It's - and the reason that I'm suggesting that we want to do these sub-lists is to keep the traffic on the main list down. I'm quite concerned that the main list - if we used it for all the subgroups at the same time would get very confusing.

But I think if anybody would like to be subscribed to a subgroup list I don't see any particular reason why you couldn't ask Marika to be on the list even if you

don't want to be in the subgroup. It's just kind of a traffic management thing.
Does that make sense, Amr?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, it's Alan.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: To be clear when I said the group is hidden I meant the list of participants of the group not the contents.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Amr Elsadr: Okay great. All right thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: You bet. Good question though; thanks for asking that. And that - I do have a pet peeve about all that but I won't belabor that because many of you have already heard it.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: You're unmuted now. Who was that? Okay. Great so that's the homework assignment is to come up with a list of questions. And so now I'm going to turn off my screen. Marika, do you have anything that you want to share with us about where the subgroup stuff is at? Don, I see is not on the call so I think I'm going to have to leave it to you to sort of summarize - you and Berry - summarize where we're at on that.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. So I don't actually have anything to share on the screen but we had some conversations following last week's call. A number of names were suggested of people we might want to reach out to to provide us some feedback on the transition that was conducted for .org from thin to thick.

And we've been working with Don on trying to identify who those people might be. And his last email - because I know initially we're - I think we're looking at a broader group.

And I know that I think .us was mentioned as well. But Don has actually suggested that for now we focus on the people that were involved in the transition from Affilius because I think he indicates basically that basically there wasn't really a consideration - it was a requirement from ICANN when that - for the .org contract that it should be a thick registry model.

So there wasn't really this kind of consideration should we do thin or thick, what are the pros and cons. Basically there was the requirement to do so so the folks would be more on discussing the actual transition. At least that's, I think, how I interpret his email.

So he has suggested a couple of names of people that we might want to reach out to from ICANN's side, Karen Lentz was involved in that process. And she's also indicated that she will look into her archives and see if there's anything that she may be able to share from ICANN's perspective.

But of course, you know, the working group could decide to broaden that group and include others that may have perspectives on the questions we're looking at.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. I think that what this says to me is that we're close enough because I've been on some of these email correspondences. And I don't want to say names out loud until folks have actually agreed to be in the group. But many of you will know some of the people that we're talking about.

And I'm pretty confident that especially for the technical kinds of discussions that we're focusing on first this is going to be a very good resource for us to ask questions of.

And so I'm pretty confident that those of you in the subteams who are coming up with questions can rest assured that this is a group that can do a pretty good job of giving us at least historical answers to those and also provide a pretty good base for some healthy debate about some of the pros and cons from a technical standpoint.

So I think as you come up with your questions you can be pretty confident that we're going to be able to give you good answers to those questions in the subsequent meeting.

So, Marika, as I suspected could you sort of take the lead in following through on that series of conversations with the folks that Don has identified and make sure that they're teed up and ready to go and sort of have that done by next week? Do you think that's a reasonable timeframe for that?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Just a clarifying question; do you want them to, you know, just to have reached out to them and saying we'll be coming back to you with a list of questions and, you know, maybe get you on the call, that kind of outreach? Or you want to line them up already to participate in the call next week?

Mikey O'Connor: No, not next week's call. I think that probably we'll have a pretty lively discussion of the questions next week. And we may have kind of overwhelmed our subteams so I don't want to put quite that much pressure on the subteams to be done.

But mostly just to confirm their willingness and let them know that these questions are being assembled for them and let them know that I think the - probably the way to do this is to send them the questions well in advance of the meeting so that they can think about their answers and maybe do a little bit of research.

And so certainly not set the expectation of them being on the call next week but just sort of get this team put together so that they know that they are in, you know, in the process.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Steve, go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, thanks. I'm wondering - I may have missed something here but if we get the coordinators of each team identified today and they get started scheduling a call for their team and generating these questions isn't that a better focus for the next week than having a call of the whole group next week? What would this whole group do next week?

Mikey O'Connor: They could digest the work product of the subteams...

Steve Metalitz: Well I think realistically it's very unlikely that even, you know, we have to do a Doodle poll or something to check when people could even have a call. So I don't think it's even realistic that we would have calls prior to next week.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I know. I was sort of trying to slip that by you coordinator type people without any pushback. But it's true that what we could do...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: ...is we could use this time slot - oh I have to - Alan, is next week the ALAC time slot? So are we - I always have to check.

Alan Greenberg: I don't know what's happening with the ALAC meeting to be honest. I think it was scheduled for the 25th and we're trying to reschedule it but I'm not sure.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh okay so we're going to...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I've confirmed with Gisella that...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Sorry.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I confirmed with Gisella that this month we actually don't have a conflict as I think the ALAC is indeed in the process of rescheduling their call and, you know...

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Marika Konings: ...she hasn't picked, I think, this slot as a competing one.

Alan Greenberg: But in any case the next - the week I'm looking at is the Christmas Day which I don't think either of us are going to have a call on.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay so one way we could do this...

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I was a week out when I was looking at my calendar.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks. Back to you, Steve, so one way to do this would be to just use this slot for subteam calls. Is that what you were driving at?

Alan Greenberg: Unless there's overlap between the teams.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Wait, Alan, let Steve talk.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, there is some overlap between the teams. Second, I can't make this time slot next week personally. But I just think it's...

Mikey O'Connor: Oh.

Steve Metalitz: ...I'm not sure it's realistic to expect that all the teams - assuming we set up all the teams today, which we - I think is that where we're headed?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I think that's where we're at. I feel like I have a - I have lists for three teams and coordinators of each; you being one of them.

Steve Metalitz: So we're not going to set up the other teams?

Mikey O'Connor: No, we're not going to do the whole shebang. I sort of want to do three and see how we do on that. And that'll get us through the framing issue, which is the authoritativeness one and the two technical issues. And I think that rather than try and take all of the teams at the same time we'll do those three and see how it goes.

Steve Metalitz: Okay well in that case I'm a little less concerned because...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I think doing nine teams in one week is - that's a bit of a stretch even in my optimistic world view. But my thought was that, you know, maybe the teams could kick off an email discussion that just says well what kind of questions would we ask a technical type person? See if they can get together on the phone. If they can, terrific; if they can't I think that the email conversations might yield a pretty lively discussion on the next call.

Sorry about my phone ringing in the background. I keep hoping for it to stop.

So sort of back to - let's see, back to the original plan that we do the whole call in this time slot. And if the subteams can meet, great, and if they can't no points will be deducted from your grade. How about that? Let's see, Maria is

asking - no, and, Marie, I think that you're asking the same question that Steve just did.

And my thought is that we'll wait on those other subgroups until we're a bit of - into the work of the first three. I think part of the reason I want to do that is because of the logistics and the complexity. But part of it is because I think the - these first three topics we sort of need to understand some of these technical issues before we tackle the policy ones. So there is sort of a content sequence here as well.

I'm going to let Marika go first and then Alan.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I have a clarifying question on the technical expert group. Are we just reaching out for now to those folks that were involved in the transition of the .org so the people that have been suggested from Affilius. Or do we also want to include those that were suggested, I think, in relation to .us or there may be other names that people want to put forward.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm enthusiastic about a broader group because I think some of the ccTLD transitions may give us different and interesting perspectives but that's just my initial reaction. I kind of like more as better at this stage because I'm in sort of fact gathering mode. So my inclination would be let's have some of those other folks in the group as well. I think that, next is Alan. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, two things. First of all could you put back or could Marika put back up the list of participants in each of these groups? I'm - it's dawned on me that we need to make sure the people who volunteered notwithstanding, that we have the various constituencies that are going to be involved in the transition in other words, registries, registrars and users represented on each of these. Otherwise I think we're going to have a potential problem. We may well have everyone covered but I want to make sure.

Tim put a note in the chat saying he's going to be - have a hard time making it any time in the next three weeks. And I wonder to what extent can we try to set some calls up for the end of this week before people disappear? Because I think he's not the only one who, the week before Christmas, is going to be, you know, busy and, you know, clearly the week of Christmas and New Year's is going to be a hard time.

Mikey O'Connor: I hadn't realized how close we had gotten to the holidays. I'm not convinced that we can get anything set up at the end of this week. I think the way we'll do this is we'll do our best and see how it goes. And it's pretty likely that next week's call is going to be pretty lightly-attended.

The main thing I'm trying to do is sort of break the ice. It's not as though we have a hard deadline where I have to get a whole lot of stuff done. But at the same time I always worry at the beginning of working groups that we don't do anything for a really long time.

And so I think the way to leave the expectation is let's do our best and see what results and see how it goes on the call next week without laying down a giant guilt burden if, you know, recognizing that we are rapidly approaching the holiday season and that everything sort of stops for a few weeks. But I don't really want to try and flog us into a meeting late this week. I have conflicts most of Friday - or Thursday and Friday - so I think that goes on the too hard pile.

Yes, maybe we'll figure out who can make the call and make it a subcommittee call. That's Jonathan suggesting in the Chat. I think the thing - let's just sort of play this next call by ear and see what we've learned from the subgroups that have done things and take advantage of the folks who can make it and not worry a whole lot about those who can't.

Okay I think the queue is clear. And I think we've got our next call figured out. So I think our next steps and next meeting are confirmed so I think we're

done unless there's anything that somebody wants to bring up to the group we'll end it just a little bit early this time which is useful for those of us who have to get on the trademark clearinghouse update call coming up in 10 minutes. Going once, going twice.

Okay thanks, all. See you in a week those of you who can make it. If not have a great holiday. Julia, I think you can wrap up the recording and we'll call it a day. Thanks, all. Bye-bye.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Mikey.

END