ICANN
Transcription
Thick Whois PDP Working Group
Tuesday 11 June 2013 at 14:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Thick Whois PDP Working Group on the Tuesday 11 June 2013 at 14:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-thick-whois-20130611-en.mp3

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

Attendees:
Don Blumenthal – RySG
Alan Greenberg – ALAC
Volker Greimann - RrSG
Carolyn Hoover – RySG
Marie-Laure Lemineur - NPOC
Steve Metalitz - IPC
Mikey O'Connor – ISPCP
Tim Ruiz - RrSG
Jill Titzer – RrSG

Apologies:
Susan Prosser – RrSG
Christopher George – IPC
Marc Anderson - RySG
Avri Doria – NCSG
Amr Elsadr – NCSG
Rick Wesson - RySG

ICANN staff:
Marika Konings
Lars Hoffmann
Berry Cobb
Julia Charvolen

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

Julia Charvolen: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. Welcome to the Thick Whois PDP Working Group call on Tuesday, June 11, 2013. On the call today we have Don Blumenthal, Alan Greenberg, Volker Greimann, Steve Metalitz, Mikey O'Connor and Jill Titzer.

We have apologies from Susan Prosser, (Christopher George), (Mark Anderson) and Avri Doria. And from staff we have Marika Konings, Lars Hoffman, Berry Cobb and myself, Julia Charvolen. I just see that (Kaling Hooper) has joined the meeting.

Can I just please remind everyone to please state their name before speaking for transcription purposes? Thank you very much, and over to you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Julia. This is Mikey, trying something new today. I'm trying to run the meeting using the computer microphone. So if it drives you crazy for any reason, let me know. I'm also dialed into the bridge and I'll just switch over to that. But I'm always interested in new stuff.

Anyway, we'll do our usual pause for changes in statement of interest, and taking a look at the agenda which is really quite short today. We're just going to try and polish off a few last things in this draft and get one step closer to publishing it. So that's our focus for the day. Any changes to that that people want to do? Or changes to statements of interest?

Okay. Last week we went through the draft up till about Line 758 on the draft that's in front of you. I'm not syncing this, so you're on your own on getting to the right spot. And it dawned on me just as I logged on this morning that I really should have taken a go at the summaries that appear right at the front, so that you could have reviewed those today, and my apologies.

I think we're close enough now that we can basically cut and paste together the summary parts of the documents, and we'll certainly have that done by next week. If I'd been on the ball, I would have had that done for you.

So really today all we're going to do is go through the last few changes. And let me sort of set the stage as to how this worked last week. We sort of had three categories. We said well okay, there are things that we will accept because they're relatively minor and non-substantive changes that didn't seem to cause any controversy. There are things that we just absolutely don't think are a good idea, and then there are things that we'll defer.

And many of the sort of substantive comments that came in went into that defer category. And what we'll do is flow those in to the public comment cycle on the initial draft. So it's not that anything's going to go away necessarily.

It's just that given the lateness of the hour in this review and the fact that we are starting to get pretty light attendance because people have really felt like they've done the heavy lifting on the initial draft, that seemed like the best way to proceed. So that's what we're going to do.

Again this week, starting at Line 758 on the draft that's in front of you, and if you look at the draft that came in Word, which is also up on my screen, the numbers are just a little bit different. There it's 745. So they're close enough that you can probably find your way in either document. But I'll try to refer to the ones that are on the screen.

And this first one is a comment from Marika that - this is the section about eventually the cost impacts. And what we're talking about is sort of our guess as to how big a project this is going to be.

And one of the things that Marika highlights with a comment is saying that in our sentence we say that the work group anticipates a highly automated process that will be used to transfer and populate content data which is likely to require minimal training or manual intervention.

Marika is saying this may not be completely accurate. What happens if the registrars who - what happens to the registrars who do nothing? Some may not undertake any action until they are threatened with termination. And I think this is one I would nominate for the let's defer pile, and flesh this out a bit.

I think until we've got a little bit better sense from the registries and registrars as to how this process is going to work, it's really hard to evaluate this. The little sub-group that was basically me and (Rick) and Berry sort of envisioned that the registrars probably wouldn't have to do a whole lot, because there would be some data store either based on back-up data or from escrow data, and that this process would be pretty automated.

So I'd rather not try and over-engineer this one right now. But Marika's got her hand up and so does Alan. So we'll go to Marika first and then to Alan.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. And maybe a suggestion would be to actually remove the word minimal. I think that at least takes the suggestion away that, you know, it will really take no effort at all to do this, and just suggest that the training (unintelligible).

And then as you said then, as part of the review of comments received, the work group may want to consider whether anything further is needed. But I think at this stage, the minimal really seems to suggest that it's really no big deal, while I think (unintelligible) maybe there are some more things that need to be considered.

So maybe just removing that word - well I actually already addressed that point. And then at least give the working group an opportunity as part of the final report to either add more details here or, you know, potentially add back in the minimal if you feel that indeed it's no big effort to do so.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: I think the phrase that Marika highlighted is waving a big red flag at bulls. It's demanding to be challenged and easily challenged, and I think it's ill-advised. I would simply stop the statement, the sentence, at the comma, perhaps adding a work group (unintelligible) that in most cases, a highly automated process will be used or something like that, and leave it at that.

I mean we've highlighted training and manual intervention. There's also some other things which may cause problems -- certainly exception handling and, you know, there's going to be stuff that we may not have foreseen.

But I think saying that in a general case it's going to be a highly automated process is sufficient. Identifying two particular things like this is first of all not an inclusive list, and second of all is demanding to be challenged. I don't see any merit in this.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I'm seeing agreement from (Tim). So, Marika, let's see. So let's stop at the comma. Again, work group anticipates a highly automated process will be used to transfer and populate contact data. And then some sort of clause after that...

Alan Greenberg: Well add in most cases.

Mikey O'Connor: One or more instance...

Alan Greenberg: In the general cases.

Mikey O'Connor: You know, the working group makes - sorry, Alan. Go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: I think just you can either put generally somewhere near the beginning or in most cases, or in the general case in the end. There's going to be exceptions. We know there are.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. Yeah, why don't we just do that? Why don't we just say again the working group generally anticipates a highly automated process, and then end at the comma (unintelligible).

Okay, let's see. Next is on 808 in Word draft, 822. And here again now we're in synchronization migration section. Sorry, I don't know if you guys are seeing the screen go up and down -- I'm hoping not -- as I roll up and down.

The context is the working group notes that the proposed 2013 registrar accreditation agreement provides for, instead of recommends - now are we at proposed still? Or are we done? I can't keep these straight. Is the '13 RAA done? Or still proposed? Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: It's not approved yet, and approved by the Board. But the draft...

Mikey O'Connor: Pretty darn close.

Alan Greenberg: The draft is done.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: And that provides. If the 2013 RAA never kicks in, that's a different issue. But...

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, okay. So I think this one's fine.

Alan Greenberg: The world could end, too.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, it could. Okay, so on to 839 on the same page on the screen. Let's see. This is a comment, right? This is not - is this new language or is this a comment only? Looks like its new language added onto the issue description.

Marika Konings: It doesn't work exactly, so there's language added here, and I think this is probably one of the areas where some concern was expressed that this is taking a new or different approach to what the sub-team discussed.

So basically what I've only done is indeed added this to the issue description and added a note saying that, you know, if the working group would agree or support this view, we may need to make a couple of additional changes in the rest of the text. But I haven't done that, you know, anticipating that, you know, this may be one of the issues where the working group wants to have a closer look as part of the second round.

I think the only thing that would need to be recognized - because I think it does say somewhere that there was no official ICANN policy statement on this question. I think what we are saying - I'm not saying that this is the official policy statement, but we are identifying at least, you know, what is currently in the agreement, or the discrepancy that exists there. So maybe it can at least be acknowledged as a point that needs to be further discussed.

Mikey O'Connor: Steve, this is your baby, right? Weren't you the chair of this sub-group? I'll blather on for a while, but if you want to - go ahead, Steve.

Steve Metalitz: On authoritativeness?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, my concern here was that all of these comments don't necessarily go to authoritativeness but rather to accuracy, current-ness. That's not the same thing. Authoritativeness...

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: Do we have just an agreement on which one will be followed? I think we have a definition, a working definition, in there. This is - I mean ideally that should

be the most accurate and up-to-date one, but it isn't necessarily. So I think it's a different issue, and I was a bit concerned about bringing it in so long after we actually - I thought we'd finished discussing authoritativeness.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, and one of the difficulties here is that we had a pretty active, engaged sub-group, which is, you know, pretty much disbanded now. So I'd be inclined - well sorry, I'm ignoring the queue. Alan, go ahead and then I'll opine. Go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: That's all right. I don't mind you pontificating (unintelligible). But if you'd like me to go ahead, I will. I have a problem with this not so much about what it says, but the wording it uses. To start off with the registrar's Whois output may not be definitive. There may be multiple registrars' Whois output if you look around.

Number two, you cannot presume that you are looking at the right registrar unless you look at the registry's Whois data which, among other things in a thick Whois, includes all the contact information, but also says which registrar is the registrar who is actually sponsoring the domain from the registry's point of view.

So and it probably doesn't matter because it's, you know, we are surviving thick Whois' all over the place and will continue to. So I wouldn't add a statement like this, certainly not worded the way it is, because it adds more confusion, I think, than it fixes.

Mikey O'Connor: Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. The suggestion (unintelligible) may be a way around it is to actually include a kind of footnote where we explain that, you know, authoritativeness is not to be confused with accuracy, and maybe just highlight that, you know, in the scenario there may be cases where

authoritative data may not necessarily be the most accurate data because of, you know, this discrepancy between possible updates.

I don't know if highlighting that in a footnote may as well provide a clarification for others reading it, and maybe making similar assumptions that authoritativeness is the same as being the most accurate or most up-to-date data, so that we just possibly highlight that.

And as I said, maybe as well take out that statement that talks about ICANN not having taken an official position, although I don't think there is one. But I'm not sure whether calling that out of here, knowing that we have made some comments, will confuse things even more. So just a suggestion.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Marika. Steve, go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, I mean do we actually have any evidence to suggest that registrar data is more accurate than registry data in the thick Whois environment? It may be more current, but the current information may be inaccurate. So I don't - I mean I think this just makes an assumption that we don't have any evidence for. Or maybe we do. I'm not aware of it.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Steve. I think maybe I'll just run through the queue and sort of see where we wind up. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, thank you. I support a footnote for any of these kind of things to, you know, to illustrate how complex the situation is, if we needed to go to it. But we probably don't.

We've been told multiple times that when registries receive court orders, they may change the Whois and it might be a thick Whois, and it may be changed in substantive ways, not only changing the registrar, and it may or may not be pushed in any specific case through the registrar and to the correct registrar.

So I have a real problem with making blanket statements, so I support the concept of a footnote to illustrate the complexity. But, you know, let's not make any simple statements when simplicity may not rule in all cases.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. (Tim), go ahead.

Tim Ruiz: Yeah, I think I'd be fine with the footnote as well. I think for me the issue of authoritativeness is actually a legal question, because that's what it really amounts to is when there's a conflict, when there's a difference, you know, which database is going to be the one considered the default or the accurate, or the data we're going to use or rely on.

And as I'd said quite a while ago that maybe not in most of the agreements between registries and registrars, but I know certainly in some, the registry, the thick registry, has even stated that if there is a conflict, the registry's data is actually the one that is going to be relied on or considered to be correct.

So whether it specifically addresses authoritativeness or not, I think that's really the issue, is if the databases conflict, which one is going to be considered the correct data.

So in a lot of ways that's sort of a legal question, and not so much about accuracy, although I agree that as we're trying to decide who should be authoritative, you know, to try to solve that question, you know, leaning towards the most accurate database might be part of the issue, although I think, though, that it may also be that what's practical in a thick Whois situation may be that the registry should be authoritative.

So the question then is how do we make them the more accurate database. So those are some of my thoughts, but I support a footnote, because again it's a complicated subject, just a lot of issues, and we're not going to be able to resolve them all right here before we get this report done.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, (Tim). Volker?

Volker Greimann: Yes. Actually I just wanted to say much of the same (Tim) did. I think it's not a problem of which one is the more current database, but rather the accuracy of which database is to be relied upon as a legal concept when determining who has ownership of a domain name.

From my registrar perspective, we have always treated the registry database as the authoritative database, i.e. if there was divergence between our database, either because it has not been transmitted to the registry yet or because the registry made a change that we were not aware of, in each and every case we assumed that the registry is the correct database, and any change that has not yet been transmitted to the registry is simply not yet authoritative, to use the word.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay, well here's my thought. I think we're pretty much in agreement that this phrase should get pulled from the body of the report. I'm a little reluctant to put a footnote in. I would rather have the, you know, this come back to us in essentially the next round of comments, fleshed out with nuance that we've just talked off in this call.

One of the things I think we just did is we've repeated a lot of the ground that's covered in other parts of this section. And I really am reluctant to try and wordsmith a footnote, given the number and types of issues that we've got with this language.

I'd much rather have it come back so that when the group is really at full strength again and we're really back in intense analysis mode, you know, we can do justice to this rather than winging it right here at the end. So unless anybody just goes crazy, I think I'd like to put this in what Berry and I started calling the punch list, and bring it back around after the, you know, along with the comments. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I'm still wondering if (unintelligible) simple footnote to really make sure that people understand what we're talking about, which could just say, you know, when you talk about authoritative, and just have a footnote say this concept is not to be confused with accuracy, which is a different discussion or a different debate, just to point that out as a very basic concept, nothing more, nothing less.

I don't know if that's something that would help the reader at least understand what this is about and maybe not confuse the two concepts and, you know, having us address maybe a lot of comments we could have prevented by a very short statement on that topic.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm edgy. I mean I don't want to rule too harshly here, but I feel like we're crafting something pretty important on the fly right at the end, and I'd rather take a few more comments. If people are confused, I'd rather have them say, "What? What do you mean?" And then get more grist for that editing job that we do on the far side of the thing. But I'll go to Alan and Steve and the queue and see where we wind up.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, thank you. I would support - I don't feel strongly on it, but I would certainly support and agree to a comment, simply noting that the two are often confused. But I put my hand because I have a question. When you say put it on the punch list, are you saying take the new text out and then reconsider it later? Or leave it in and reconsider it later?

Mikey O'Connor: No, take it out.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: And consider it later. Steve, go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, I tend to agree with you, Mikey. But I'm hearing from Marika that somebody read this and was confused, and thought that authoritativeness

was the same as accuracy. So I'm, you know, if she can craft a footnote that would clarify that for whoever was confused about it, you know, we could take a look at that.

Mikey O'Connor: All right, well let's leave it like that then. Let's see if, you know, I think part of the issue with this particular text is that there's a lot more going on in there than just, you know, the heads-up about authoritative versus accuracy. And I tend to defer to Steve on these because this is the section that he led the drafting of.

So, Marika, do you want to take a crack at that footnote and we'll take a look at it next week, and if it passes muster then we'll go that way? Otherwise we'll put the whole thing off. How about that?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. And as I said, I think it could be as simple as not to be confused with accuracy, which is a different concept. I mean something along those lines. I'm not thinking of anything more elaborate than that, so hopefully that will...

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Marika Konings: (Unintelligible) assignments.

Mikey O'Connor: Cool. All right, good. Well that's a step in the right direction. All right, so next is at the bottom of the next page, starting around 870 on the draft that's on your screen; 856 in the Word draft.

Again I tend to defer to Steve on these. What's changed here is the working group did not agree that this inconsistency was problematic, primarily on the grounds stated above that the working group assumes that any data collected by the registrar becomes authoritative only after it is incorporated into the registry database, and then that's a footnote.

It should be noted, though, that there may be exceptions. For example, the registered name holder is the person whom the registrar holds the registration agreement, not necessarily the person the registry thinks is the registrant, because the update by the registrar wasn't instantaneous, also see Footnote 18.
So I see Steve's hand up, so I'll just go to Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, this is Steve. I'm okay with the change in the text. I think the footnote is a good example of the confusion between authoritativeness and accuracy, so I would just get rid of that and have a sentence about it that Marika crafts. That's fine. But I think I found the footnote pretty confusing, so I would suggest we drop it.

Mikey O'Connor: Well I certainly had a hard time reading it. Marika, are you okay with that if we just lose the footnote but keep the change?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I mean for me (unintelligible) question, but again I don't think it's relevant for the report here. In that case, you know, does the registrar really consider the registry database an authoritative if they know that the person, you know, the registrant they're dealing with is not what is in the registry database? But I think it's a more hypothetical question that we're addressing here, so I'm perfectly fine with removing the footnote.

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

So next one that - on your screen -- line 950 -- yes. It changes -- this is in the Data Escrow section. We got Data Escrow sub-teams - I can't - members on the call? I can't remember who was on that one.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think that was Alan’s group, if I'm not mistaking.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh good.

Marika Konings: And am I right, Alan, or not?

Mikey O'Connor: Right.

Alan Greenberg: I can't remember. Yes. I think we did Data Escrow and something. I don't - can't remember what, but...

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

So the first one is changing. Relapse - Accreditation Relapse to Accreditation Expiration...

Alan Greenberg: Relapse is never a word I used, I know.

Mikey O'Connor: That's still settled on.

Alan Greenberg: So I don't know where that's from.

Mikey O'Connor: Relapse, you mean? Or expiration.

Alan Greenberg: Relapse I certainly didn't use, so I don't know where it came from.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. So we'll -- unless somebody cries loudly right now, we'll accept that...

Alan Greenberg: Yes. That's the whole...

Mikey O'Connor: ...change.

Alan Greenberg: That's -- the whole issue description I think was added, so I do not - I don't take responsibility for it.

Accreditation Relapse -- I'm not sure Accreditations expire. I don't think that's a -- I'll bow to a registrar, but I don't think that's a term that's quite appropriate. May terminate it for cause or lack of action...

Marika Konings: Wait...

Alan Greenberg: ...but I don't think expired is the right word.

I'm not sure what Relapse means.

Marika Konings: I think that suggestion actually comes from our (unintelligible) Liaison team, so I'm actually hoping that they have the right vocabulary for it.

But if someone else has any other...

Mikey O'Connor: All right.

Marika Konings: ...suggestions I'll be sure to update it.

Mikey O'Connor: (unintelligible), you've got claim to be a registrar.

You got any thoughts on that?

Man: Yes.

I think, you know, it's six of one after the other between Expiration or Termination or Terminates or whatever. I'm not sure it's real - it'll make that much difference. I think the point gets pretty clear either way.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. We'll accept this one then.

The next one is the sentence that says, 'Both registrar and registry escrows follow the same system and we (unintelligible) profit on Sundays and the

(unintelligible) on all of the days containing all new data since the last full deposit.'

And I have no idea where that came from, but Marika is saying that's not correct. So...

Man: It was correct before she changed one of the registries. It was meaningless, but correct.

Mikey O'Connor: How do we want to handle this?

I mean, we don't have new language. We just -- anybody want to -- Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika.

I think the original reference comes from a Wiki page, which apparently didn't get advice, I've been told, which maybe addresses to actually just take it out. I'm not really sure if it's - if it's relevant for this discussion how that system happens or when it happens.

So maybe at this stage -- unless there's someone that can - is able to provide the correct schedule and people think it's worth including. And again, it's something I could check as well internally to find out, but I'm not really sure if we lose a lot by just removing that sentence from the report at this stage.

Mikey O'Connor: Right. I'm okay with that. (Tim)'s okay with that. And I'm not seeing cries of anguish. Why don't we just take that out? Okay.

Next one is 955 and it's the meeting under the Thick Whois model, which is a good thing -- a little repetitive. It says, 'Registrars and Registries store Whois data in different unrelated Escrow accounts,' then adds, 'In the case of Thick registries, personal Whois data is also escrowed by the registry.' Neat.

Just seems to be clarifying. I don't see any huge...

Alan Greenberg: Why -- it's Alan.

Why do we need that sentence? Isn't that the basis of the whole report?

Mikey O'Connor: That's the whole -- yes, that's the whole ballgame.

I'd be okay losing that sentence. Actually...

Alan Greenberg: Maybe Marika has a reason why it was added. I don't see it.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Marika, do you want to...

Marika Konings: This is Marika.

I think that this should be again an additional clarification that that is the difference that would happen in the case of Thick Whois. I think it - there has to be a reason why this was added. But again, if that's already clear from the rest of the report, I'm not sure if we need it here if people don't consider it necessary.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

I mean this is essentially sort of trying to encapsulate the whole - the whole ballgame. So I'd be okay losing that (unintelligible). Oh (Tim), go ahead.

Tim Ruiz: Oh.

I was - I was just - I was just going to say the same thing, so I'll just lower my hand. I think the caption says, 'Data Escrow in a Thick Whois environment.' So I think it's implied unless there's some confusion about what Thick Whois is, but I think that's probably explained elsewhere.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

I -- and I think better explained elsewhere. So why don't we lose that addition. Is that okay, Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

I'd - what I - I think - I think we can lose it, but it - on looking at it, I realized in the paragraph on description we never mention the term Whois. We have a theoretical discussion of what Escrow is, but really here we're talking about Whois data.

And if we add Whois data in the first thing, it then becomes intuitive that if you have - if you have a name in Whois data you got to escrow it, because it's part of the Whois data you have.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh.

So you're saying maybe add the word upon that...

Alan Greenberg: Because data escrow is the...

Mikey O'Connor: ...(unintelligible) that.

Alan Greenberg: ...act of storing Whois data.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: And then the rest of it falls out, I think.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. I think that's right. That's a good catch. Okay? Anything else on that topic? Otherwise, we'll - I'll roar ahead.

I think the next one is on 978 and it's adding a footnote -- footnote 20 something. I'm just trying to get to the Word version.

Marika Konings: Yes. And this is Marika.

I think this is just one of - a point that we've added to really highlight how important in this case it would be to have that data through a Thick registry. I think it's just to emphasize the point that in a case indeed of a - of a failure we haven't always been able to rely on the back (unintelligible) data Escrow data because it was either incomplete or formatted incorrectly.

And I said that in some of the cases or in those instances, take registry data has proven invaluable and actually is standing up failed registries, so it's - or registrars.

So I think it's really just emphasizing the point from the staff perspective how valuable Thick data has been in the past.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm fine with that with one complaint, and that is I hate having footnotes on our conclusions sentences.

Is there some other sentence in this section that we could cast that footnote to, because otherwise when we summarize this we have to have to

summarize it with a footnote, which from a drafting standpoint makes me a little bit crazy.

Other than that -- oh, and I see we have a queue. (Alan), go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Thank you.

This is a case where I think it's not a footnote I think it's substance. It's rather interesting information and information which it would have been nice to have when the - when the sub-team was talking about Escrow, because it's - it changes theory into practice.

So I think this is a substantive issue that actually should be mentioned somewhere in the text. I'm not quite sure I know where. I guess there's, you know, it's probably Data Escrow in a Thick environment.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: I'm not quite sure where the sentence fits or if it fits verbatim, but that sounds like a substantive issue that we should be talking about, because it justifies to some extent the conclusion.

Mikey O'Connor: Right.

Marika, are you okay with that approach? Are you willing to...

Marika Konings: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: ...wordsmith that back up into that higher section?

Marika Konings: Yes, I can do that.

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

And...

Man: (Tim) has his hand up.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, I'm sorry. (Tim), go ahead.

Tim Ruiz: Yes.

I'm okay with the conclusion on what you're going to do with that too. I just wanted to mention, though, that actually this is a Compliance issue, in my mind.

If we get to the point of registrar failure and, you know, data is not there or not formatted great or whatever, then something failed in the Compliance aspect earlier on in the life cycle of that registrar.

So however we address this I think, you know, there's a Compliance component here that is definitely a part of this problem and you really should have all effort to not get to that point.

And I'm not saying we don't need to consider that we maybe end up here, but you don't get there unless there's Compliance failure along the way.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, okay. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

I think that's just echoing the - a truism in the world that, you know, planes only fall out of the sky when there are multiple failures. And, you know, disastrous situations with regard to the domain name system only happen with multiple failures.

You know, in the - in the nice, simple world we find each failure immediately and correct it and there are no disasters. But the real world doesn't work as nicely as that, so...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

And I don't think that we want to get into...

Alan Greenberg: No.

I'm just...

Mikey O'Connor: ...trying to (unintelligible) the failure.

Alan Greenberg: ...a lost cause.

Mikey O'Connor: You know, they're in - therein lies dragons. Let's not tread into that. No. But well, we'd like any action to pull that up in the draft.

Then 996 there's a recent development section and that section has a conclusion. Oh, this is where we had language in there that we'd defer and she's just amplifying that. And I think I wrote that sentence and view it as pretty friendly.

Now if we go to -- let's see how we're doing on time. I think we're okay. Let me...

Alan Greenberg: Next one I have is 1084.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

And this is - this is one that we've discussed a bit, at least on the list. And we ran it out to a group of registries who had a little bit of conversation about it, but got no painful reactions.

So the gist of this is that if I read the sentence, it says, 'The Working group notes that valuable information may be learned from the PIR Condition report that describes the transition of dot org within the Thick and is considering whether a specification for the proposed new gTLD Registry Agreement should serve as a model for implementation, but would welcome further community input before making the final decision on its implementation recommendations.'

Actually, this sentence got a little mangled I think, Marika. Wasn't the original intent of this sentence to talk about the format of Whois data? And somehow it's...

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika.

Mikey O'Connor: ...dropped into this -- yes. Go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: This is Marika.

I think that sentence actually appears somewhere else. I need to just quickly look back where else, because I think it's in one of the sections where we actually spoke about that.

I don't know if it was -- I need - I need to look back which sections we had. But this is actually more a broader point on the implementation as we were looking at the specification for and it's just a suggestion as this is again one of the items where we may not want to have a closer look at - as part of our discussions on the final report if we want to provide more guidance with regard to implementation.

So suggestion was to actually have it called out here so to provide members of the community with an opportunity to actually specifically comment on that proposal.

So that would help the Working group making a determination whether it, you know, you want to have a firm recommendation that a specification should be used as a basis for implementation of this recommendation or whether there are other models that would need to be considered or other guidance that needs to be provided.

And in the meantime I'll scroll back up to find that other reference.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I think you're right. I now get it.

So specification for is broader than just format of Whois data, correct? It's a whole...

Marika Konings: Yes.

It's...

Mikey O'Connor: ...boat load of...

Marika Konings: That's - that is correct.

The start of it I think talks about the format and the labeling, but then anything that goes into it as well, which are the minimum data elements that would need to be provided.

So basically this is just specification that it is now the requirement for Thick gTLD registries.

Mikey O'Connor: Well I think just before I get to the queue it might be good to just remind the reader what specification for the new registry agreement's all about -- just some - a quick summary of that.

(Alan) and then (Steve) go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you.

I can support what Marika said, but not what's written. What is written implies we will make a decision - we will make a recommendation on implementation. We are not obliged to.

We might decide it's too hairy a mess and we don't have the skills which the Implementation team will have in conjunction with registrars who are planning to put something, you know, who have to implement what they - what they come up with.

We may well decide that we can make some suggestions or something like that, but we're not really making an implementation recommendation and the last part of this sentence says we will. So if we add an if into it I'm happy, but it's got to - it's too specific right now.

Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Well, that's a good catch. Thanks, (Alan).

(Steve), go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: Yes.

I'm not sure -- I think it's premature to have any reference of specification for this. This Registry agreement has not been accepted or adopted by the board. It's still out for public comment as we speak.

And I know I've been preparing some comments on specification for, so I'm hoping that it's not - it's not final. Maybe I'm wrong, but I just wouldn't - I don't see what it adds.

We'll have plenty of time if later in the process -- if we do make recommendations on implementation -- to deal with this.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Marika - (Tim), go ahead.

Tim Ruiz: Well -- and maybe I missed some things, but I was just -- in regards to what (Steve) was saying, I think all we're saying in here is that it would serve as a model.

So his concern is that it might change between what we're looking at now and when the comment is on it. If that's the case, maybe we just need to pull out, you know, a specific model that we could put in the report somewhere and refer to that.

You know, we could say it was based on specification for as of such-and-such a date, if the concern is that it's going to - that it's in flux, so that everybody's looking at the right thing, is what I'm trying to get it to.

So there's no question, you know, in other words, you know, there might be multiple versions that people have reviewed a specification for. If that's the case, then maybe we need to just pull it out and put it in the report the model that we're talking about that we'd want to have comments on.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

So let me kind of replay the bidding here. You know, I - this sentence is pretty soft. It's saying we're considering whether you need to take a look at this and, you know, maybe it would serve as a model for implementation, but we're looking for input about all that.

And then, you know, I like (Alan)'s idea of sort of further softening it by maybe changing it to say something about if the Working group feels it's appropriate to make detailed implementation recommendations -- I mean, I think that leaves a fair amount of room for that document to either change or not exist at all or, you know, you might...

Alan Greenberg: That's good. We...

Mikey O'Connor: It's just a model, so...

Man: Mikey, before making any possible implementation recommendation.

It makes it sound...

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, that's good.

Man: ...a little vague.

Mikey O'Connor: That's a nice, simple change.

How about that as a way to further soften this? (Steve), if we softened it that much would you be okay leaving -- I really don't want to do an actual model at this point.

I don't want to go off and extract from the current version and put in an appendix, because (unintelligible) are going to change. And so I'd rather leave this pretty slushy for the next round of the - in the office, if you're okay with that.

Steve Metalitz: That's okay. This is (Steve).

Mikey O'Connor: Marika is -- pardon me? Go ahead, (Steve).

Steve Metalitz: That's okay with me.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Marika, I see your hand is up and I think I thought it was an old one. Go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes. No. This is Marika.

Just to confirm that the other reference is actually in the Response Consistency section and I think it's something we already reviewed and again, that these are very general as well.

I, along the lines of the Working group, is considering recommending that the labeling and display requirement as of line in specification for our (unintelligible), but again noting that community input is encouraged.

And I think again it's saying what we're trying to do here is just encouraging people to provide input and for them the Working group can consider whether or not to actually make any specific recommendations in that regard.

Mikey O'Connor: (Tim)?

Tim Ruiz: Yes, I - yes, I guess all that's okay.

I guess I just have a real issue with slushiness and we're asking for community feedback. I mean, you're going to get slushy feedback and what value that is, I don't know.

If we're going to hold something out as a model it should be stable if we're asking for comments on it. That doesn't mean it can't change after the fact. But, you know, to have - to say we're holding this out as a model and it's something that's in flux and it starts to change, how do we even know that we still want to hold it out as a model or still want to consider it in a model, let alone, you know, expect consistent feedback on something that's in flux?

So that's why, you know, I'm not saying we have to develop a model but perhaps we pull out, "Here's what's in Section - specification for today. We're considering of - using something like this as a model," you know, you can comment on that.

That might be - that might make some sense. But in all this slushiness and then we're asking for comments, I, you know, I don't know what value we're really going to get out of it.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. No, I think that's right.

I -- and so one way to do it would be to just yank the current snapshot of Section 4. Comment's closing pretty soon on that? I think -- anyway, put that in an annex, refer to it and say this is, you know, put the right words around it that says we acknowledge that these may very well change and that it needs the language in place that says we are considering using something like this, but here is the current state of it to give you a good feel for where we're going.

I think I'd be okay with that. Marika, did that make sense to you? You want me to replay that one more time for...

Marika Konings: No. This is Marika.

Mikey O'Connor: ...(unintelligible)

Marika Konings: I think it makes sense to have it - have it in an annex so it's easy for people to refer to.

And I think that may also help with the other point that we have in the report, where we talk about the display and labeling. So I think it makes it easier if people know what we're exactly talking about and I think we can make clear and - the heading to that section to say this is, you know, in that.

And then we'll have you refer to, I think, to the proposed or the revised New gTLD agreement, which is -- I don't know if it's still open for public comment or we can link to the public comment form (unintelligible) noting that it's not a final document but it's just a - the most current version we currently have that addresses this issue.

Mikey O'Connor: I got to circle back to (Steve) just one last time, because this sort of runs counter to the issue that you were raising.

Are you okay with that if we put a bunch of disclaimers on it that say, "Look, this may very well change as a result of public comments," (Steve)?

Steve Metalitz: Sure. That's okay with me.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. All right. Let's do that. Cool. Okay.

The next one is -- I don't know. I think that we're done. I think we're done. Our timing's pretty good, too. We have five minutes to go. All right. Well I think that's a good day's work.

Oh, Marika go ahead. Go ahead.

Marika Konings: If that doesn't work out -- I think, you know, based on what we discussed today I'll make the updates we've all agreed on.

And maybe this is then as well the moment for me to actually start working on an Executive summary that's - so that for the next meeting we actually have a kind of final document for review, because I'm assuming now that we're at this stage, at least from the perspective of, you know, the recommendations and some of the big conclusions there are no major issues or things where we're changing any more.

So I just want to check with the group if that's the next step we should be taking.

Mikey O'Connor: I would certainly support that. I agree.

I think that conclusions are not changing and it's stable enough that we can proceed with that and hopefully get that done. We might give the list a heads up that the draft that's coming is going to have that, so people should pay special attention to that. Try and get that pretty well signed off on the next call. That would be the goal, I think.

Okay. I think that's it. With that, I'll wrap this up and we'll see you in a week. And I think we're getting darn close to the -- thanks all. And I think this was a great refinement. Great job.

(Julia), you want to end the recording or just -- I think we're done.

Marika Konings: Have a good day.

Mikey O'Connor: See you, gang.

Goodbye.

END