**ICANN
Transcription
Thick Whois PDP Working Group meeting
Tuesday 15 January 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 15 January 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-20130115-en.mp3

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

Attendees:
Marc Anderson – RySG
Roy Balleste – NCUC
Don Blumenthal – RySG
Avri Doria – NCSG
Christopher George – IPC
Alan Greenberg- ALAC
Volker Greimann – RrSG
Frederic Guillemaut – RrSG
Carolyn Hoover - RySG
Susan Kawaguchi - CBUC
Marie-Laure Lemineur - NPOC
Mikey O'Connor – ISPCP
Susan Prosser – RrSG
Tim Ruiz – RrSG
Jill Titzer – RrSG

Apologies:
Iliya Bazlyankov – RrSG
Amr Elsadr – NCSG
Marika Konings (ICANN staff)

ICANN staff:
Berry Cobb
Lars Hoffmann
Julia Charvolen

Coordinator: Thank you. I'd like to inform all participants of the conference is now being recorded. And if you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. Thank you. You may begin.

Julia Charvolen: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the Thick Whois PDP Working Group call on Tuesday 15 January.

On the call today we have Mark Anderson, Roy Balleste, Don Blumenthal, Avri Doria, Christopher George, Alan Greenberg, Volker Greimann, Frederic Guillemaut, Carolyn Hoover, Susan Kawaguchi, Mikey O'Connor, Susan Prosser, Tim Ruiz, Jill Titzer.

We have apologies from Illya Bazlyankov, and Marika Konings. And from staff we have Berry Cobb and myself Julia Charvolen.

I'd 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 Julie and I'll note that Lars Hoffman just joined from staff. Welcome (Lars).

Let's see, first up is just take a look at this agenda and think about things that you'd like to change and also if you have any updates to your statement of interest. We'll just take a pause for either of those.

All right, the next thing that we wanted to do is just spin through the three sub teams and get a quick update on how things are going.

I'll just start off let's see is Steve on the call? I heard his name go by. I think we'll wait on Steve.

Alan why don't you give us an update on how things are going on?

Alan Greenberg: Well as of five minutes ago I can say I've kicked things off.

Mikey O'Connor: Way to go.

Alan Greenberg: And I've actually looked at what we have to do and I don't think it's particularly onerous. So I think unless I'm missing something substantive -- I may well be -- I think we've got a some number of days of work on the email list to make sure that we've identified what the issues are we to need to discuss.

And I think one teleconference will do it. And that's presuming we get pretty much all of the input from stakeholder groups or constituencies that we'll be submitting within the next week or so. And I...

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

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: ...from stakeholder groups is...

Alan Greenberg: Since the deadline is last week hopefully within the next week we'll get most of it that we're going...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes we've got of fair amount of mail on - and Marika and I...

Alan Greenberg: Yes so I don't...

Mikey O'Connor: ...get notices from...

Alan Greenberg: ...think we have an onerous job. And I suspect not doing much until we get the input has not been a bad move although I can't say it was deliberate.

Mikey O'Connor: You know, sometimes it's like when you play pool you claim the shot even when you didn't intend it.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I planned it all this way.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay Susan are you commuting? Do we have to...

Susan Prosser: Not in the car quite yet.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Susan Prosser: I must say the flu got me last week so I haven't done anything. I will work on that today, how's that?

I'll - I sent out an email before Christmas that didn't get a response so I'll just ping everybody and see if we can get the discussion going.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I think that, you know, as Alan was saying I think it's going to be helpful to get the input because I think each of these subgroups is going to have a little bit of input that they can take a look at and digest.

So, you know, the input's starting to come in. Alan just before the call posted the draft from the ALAC. And, you know, others have come in so I'm pretty hopeful about this coming week. And get well soon. I hope you feel better.

Susan Prosser: Oh I'm feeling better now. I've just been catching up from last week so...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I get that. I still don't see Steve in Adobe room. Steve are you - Metalitz are you on the call?

No, all right. I imagine I didn't see much chatter on their list either so I would bet that the status is pretty much the same there.

And again I think the same answer applies which is I think we'll - although Volker had on an email that went by. Now that I think about it a little bit I did see some stuff coming from authoritativeness one. And so I think we'll just take knowledge that.

And oh I See people are kind of waiting. So Mark and Don have you gotten in now? I'll run it through the phone call to see if they've made it. It doesn't sound like they have, oh well.

Okay so the next thing is the template which Marika sent out. Let me post this link. Yes (Tim) is saying the same thing that I recall which is that Volker got a pretty good start and Berry's ahead of me on posting the link.

And let me get the stuff up on my screen as well so that we can read it together. Oops.

All right I can see it's pretty small. It's easier for people to read. There we go.

I saw this go by and wrote Marika a note back just saying this looks great. But I would be interested especially in sub team leader reactions to this or anybody else's reaction.

My thought is that in a way this kind of defines the subsection support as well. You know, and each of our questions could have chunks that look like this coming out of them.

So I think it would be great to sort of take a look at these chunks and see if there's either redundancy or something that needs to get added.

And my only thing before I turn to the queue is that clearly if we run into something that needs to change it's not something that should be thought of as permanent. It seemed like a good start to me. Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes I'm not quite sure how relevant the questions are to each of the subjects. So it may well be that each team needs to modify it or only use the ones that are relevant. But I have no problem using it as a template.

The only comment I have is I think Question 6 needs to be enlarged. I think we're really looking for in each of these subjects does the data imply that we are recommending Thick Whois, we are recommending not to use Thick Whois or is it neutral?

Mikey O'Connor: Hang on a minute. I'm going to flash your screen a little bit because I want to get that into our notes so hold on while I create some notes.

Well sorry there will be a short pause while I dazzle your screen again. But this self-documenting stuff is important and so let me try again.

That's better.

Alan Greenberg: I'm impressed.

Mikey O'Connor: Well I should have done this ahead of time. You know it's just one of those things that could've should have would have.

Okay so on Question 6 is a little bit screwed up. And I'll fix this later.

Alan Greenberg: Yes every new line formed a new section.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes Alan I can fix that.

Alan Greenberg: It's...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...can do that afterwards.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes but let me get your thought in here which is that - say that again? So...

Alan Greenberg: I would suggest that six ask based on the particular issue is Thick Whois recommended, recommended not to have Thick Whois or is it neutral?

I'm sure that wording could be cleaned up but essentially we're saying...

Mikey O'Connor: Right.

Alan Greenberg: ...that does a push the, you know, the boulder in one direction or another or doesn't really matter?

Mikey O'Connor: Right. Yes I think that's a good. That's a good change. I like that.

Alan Greenberg: My other comment was just that the sub teams I don't think should be feel they're locked into this if it doesn't really apply in their case.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. I think that's the key is, you know, not to get so (easily) bound to this but that if it's useful and helps the discussion fine let's use it.

And then as you dig in I'm pretty sure that you'll run into other things like the idea that Alan just proposed which is fine, we'll bring it back to this group and fix it.

But at least for me it's always easier if there's a first draft to work from. And I thought this was a fabulous first draft.

So Berry if you could tell Marika many thanks I think this was a great contribution.

Any other thoughts about this before we - I may throw this next one to you Berry. I'm hoping that there might be a little document coming (here) but just

one last pause on these subsections to give people a chance to type chime in.

Okay Berry are you prepared to give us a little run through of the statements that we've gotten so far? You said...

Berry Cobb: Yes Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh good, way to go. I'm going to then throw away sharing and let you take over unless there's something that you need to share I'm happy to do that as well.

Berry Cobb: Yes there's a PDF created of the review template.

Mikey O'Connor: Is it on the list? Should I go get it?

Berry Cobb: No just if you can just...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Just throw it back to you? Yeah okay. I think you have control so I will just get out of the way how about that? Cool. Take it away Berry.

Berry Cobb: Okay thank you. So far what we have incorporated into this document or into the responses received from various stakeholder groups and constituencies I think at this point we don't have all of the responses yet.

And if I recall correctly from Marika I think that there was a request to try to extend out the deadline a couple of weeks just to make sure that we get some of the other statements in there. But that shouldn't stop us from going ahead and starting to review through what we have to date.

What you'll see is that the review tool is divided up across the questions or responses that we were looking for from the stakeholder groups and constituencies.

And basically we can just start at the top and start reviewing these and look for a working group response for each statement.

And then as we start to receive some other statements from the remaining groups we'll throw these in and probably have to go back and review them separately.

So if it's okay with the working group we'll just start at the top with response consistency and move forward. And I'll review each statement and then open it up to the working group for a discussion.

Mikey O'Connor: I have a - this is Mikey. A question, these are the same response consistency. Where's our - do we have a sub team for that? Because what I'm wondering - oh yes there it is.

I'm wondering if in the case of the three sub teams that are active, authoritativeness, stability and data escrow and synchronization and migration whether we want to throw the job of reviewing and analyzing these statements out to the subgroups first and let them incorporate the stuff in their work.

Alan and Susan what's your preference here? Would you rather have us go through these as a working group first or would you rather have a first try at them and then come back to us?

Alan Greenberg: I would - it's Alan. I would divvy up the questions among the working groups and let the working groups do it. There's no point in us doing, you know, both of us doing it in parallel.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes well that's what I was thinking. Now we've got three working groups where they are sort of, you know, you and Susan and Steve are already kind of appointed as leaders.

One way we could approach this is spend a few minutes now on this call finding leaders for the other working groups so that then that divvy up process could happen today and all of the working groups could start digging into this as the responses come in.

And the nice thing about having all this good stuff is that it gives you something to chew on. So anyway Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes I would suggest if perhaps Berry could add a column or for each question identify which working group it's assigned to.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I think that the way it works is we have a subgroup for every one of these questions that, you know, basically response consistency has a subgroup which as I recall...

Alan Greenberg: Yes but in some cases we grouped them together. I'm just saying so we don't duplicate work if we can just identify for each question and brackets after it or something...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes that's a good point.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...(unintelligible) that would make sure that we're covering all of them and not duplicating effort.

Mikey O'Connor: What are - Susan are you still with us or are you back in the car at this point?

Susan Prosser: I am back in the car but I agree with Alan that maybe we should go through it as a subgroup. And then - I apologize I have not looked at the document so, you know, once I look at today I probably have a better idea.

But it seems to me that if we go through and figure out what pertains to our subgroup and focus on that it might work the best.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I I'm sort of leaning that way. I've always found that the process of going through these as a whole working group on teleconferences is a bit unsatisfying. Because it's sort of long and tends to get, you know, it tends to be too long and at the same time too shallow.

Now Avri's chiming in on the other side of that. And I can kind of put words in her mouth as to why but she may want to say so.

My thought Avri was that maybe we let the subgroups do a first try. You know, I'm not saying that we don't do it as a working group but that we give them a first crack at it. What do you think? Go ahead Avri?

Avri Doria: Okay yes thanks. It took me a while to get myself unmuted so that's why (unintelligible).

I actually tend to have two thoughts on this. One is I think we should start working through it when we've got everybody's answers or at least since when we passed the last of the elastic deadlines.

I think going through them one contributor by a time as opposed to one topic at a time is probably not good.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Avri Doria: The other thing I think is that while I'm all in favor of the work being done in
                 workgroups the way I've seen it work best is when you've done a walkthrough
                 of everything in the group.

                 And yes as you say it is somewhat superficial. But you notice where the initial
                 overall agreements are. And then they workgroups takeover working on those
                 places that actually, you know, need the work after having done a full general
                 run through of what you've got.

                 And that also is a good alert to people that say oh my word, I really do need
                 to be in subgroup thing as opposed to a priority saying oh my I don't know
                 what's going to happen anyway. I better get involved in all the groups. So...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...I think a first walkthrough other than that sure, taking the work to the sub
                 teams yes, but not to start there. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: Got it. I like that idea because I agree pretty much with everything you said
                 that I do like the walking through.

                 What I don't like is the subsequent stuff where it seems like we often don't
                 give complex issues enough time because we don't have enough time or else
                 it stretches way out.

                 So what's the reaction of the group to that idea that says we'll sort of continue
                 this leisurely pace? I am conscious that this is leisurely and I'm not terribly
                 distressed that it's - that we're not moving real fast yet. But I am conscious of
                 it and I am trying to figure out ways to get us moving a bit more quickly.

                 But I do like the idea of waiting until all the contributions are in. And I note in
                 the chat that the registrars have got something coming together. And I think
                 Keith Drasek said maybe a couple of weeks for the registries.

So I'm hoping that pretty soon we're going to have these. But once we've got them we do a run through of them all at the same time as a working group.

That gives the subgroup folks a chance to hear some of the big issues. It also gives people a chance to decide which subgroups they really want to be in. I like that idea a lot too.

So I'm pretty entranced with that approach. Is there anybody that thinks that's a bad idea? Let's see weekly, I've lost the thread of the track of the chat.

We're going to start at a pace that's accelerating and that weekly meeting it will accelerate yes, I agree with that. And then yes, the registrar, the registries are coming in next week. Oh good.

Tim's in with Avri. Good, good, good, sounds like we have a plan here. Let's do that.

And so to today's agenda what that says is no let's not do the run through today because we don't have the full set yet.

And maybe we're done for today unless there is something on people's minds. And I'm all for when we're sort of in the acceleration mode not spending time arbitrarily.

I think - Roy is asking in the chat should we set a new deadline? I can't remember does anybody remember if we have?

Berry I'm going to throw the ball to you on that one, do you remember if we set a new deadline or just said get your stuff in?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I don't think we sent out a new formal deadline but there was communication across the groups that they needed extra time and...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Berry Cobb: ...we haven't sent anything out yet.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay so maybe what we should do is agree on one. Avri go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes I meet deadlines are great. Deadlines are always elastic. But if we're going to say at this point that we started to do a walk through today but we couldn't because they weren't enough viewpoints but that next week for sure the walk group is getting through so Berry has a deadline of what is it Monday, what is it Friday, what is it...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...classical Friday first thing Monday morning I don't know.

But if you want to be part of next week's discussion, you know, you've got this last reprieve because...

Mikey O'Connor: I...

Avri Doria: ...because being part of the original discussion I think is important.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. It is. So I'm looking - the ISPs are not going to submit. I've decided it was silly to be the chair and write comments from the ISPs. So I - so we're not going to do anything.

Registries and registrars do you think that you can make - if we were to throw out a deadline of, you know, end of this week maybe for a draft that we could drop into a draft version of this for a call next week?

Anybody else that's on the call if we sort of threw out that as a tentative goal could we make it because if we could have them all done by the end of this week or maybe the weekend we need to let Berry and Marika do some cutting and pasting to get this thing into the document.

Oh so we already have a deadline, 1-23. What's today?

Avri Doria: Fifteenth.

Mikey O'Connor: Today is the 15th. Oh so it sounds like we're shooting for two weeks from now for our walk through. Berry go ahead. Your hand flickers up and down.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I was just going to point out to Don's chat statement there they had kind of requested a two week window so that would give us until the week of the 28th or the 29th that we would have all the responses in for review.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Berry Cobb: But again just, you know, if we are waiting for one or two groups to submit there's still no reason why we can't go ahead and move forward with the statements that have already been supplied.

                  Because it's going to take us if we do this initial review as just discussed it'll probably take us at least two meetings just to get through all the comments before we divvy out to the sub teams.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes it's sounding like the registries - and (Kim) is in the chat and Don is in the chat. Both are sort of saying this week is tough.

                  So why don't we - oh Jill is - Jill Titzer is saying should reconsider the upcoming regional conference interfering. Yes and I've got a similar problem that there is a there is one in LA sort of at the same time.

Avri Doria: No that's the following week.

Mikey O'Connor: That's the following week, oh okay.

Avri Doria: So we'll be traveling that day.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, you know, I - that'll be interesting trying - is when's the ALAC meeting? Is it 29th Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I would have to check but give me a moment and I'll do that.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes because maybe that we're going to be on our oddball schedule in which case everybody in the non-contracted parties of the GNSO are going to be sitting in LA that day.

Avri Doria: But we could possibly just cut out an hour for all of us to do this meeting and then go back to the other nonsense that we don't know what we're doing with (unintelligible) for anyway.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes at least we kind of know what we're doing with this nonsense.

Avri Doria: Exactly so we could actually arrange for those of us that are in this group to, you know, have a space for ICANN to go off do this meeting. Because there's going to be so much silliness going on in those two days anyway.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes that's true.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: And it would actually be great if that was the ALAC meeting because then we could do it a little later in the day...

Alan Greenberg: The ALAC meeting is next Tuesday.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh rats. That's too bad.

Alan Greenberg: That's okay.

Mikey O'Connor: It means we're doing it on 7:00 AM LA time.

Alan Greenberg: If we don't have anything to do in this meeting then we just don't have to reschedule the Thick Whois. We can just cancel it for next week if you...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes that's true. Well one way we can do this Berry is...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: (Unintelligible) Berry's advice. I think there is some merit actually of waiting. If waiting an extra week means we have all of the responses to each question in, all the ones we're likely to get I think there's some merit in waiting in handling them as, you know, as a batch...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I think...

Alan Greenberg: And seeing and to the extent being able to judge whether they are consistent with each other or at odds with each other.

Avri Doria: And in terms...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...of LA the week after - this is me jumping in even though my hand is up. If - I totally agree with the whole - waiting for the full batch if possible. I think that's important.

And with those of us in LA I forgot about time warp. It'll be 7:00 AM so we can do the meeting easily in our rooms before we go off for the day's fun and festivity.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes while I was thinking I might see if we could at least for me...

Avri Doria: Okay that's fine.

Mikey O'Connor: ...it would be nice to have a space at ICANN. They open up pretty early out there. I've, you know, when I was out there for that ill-fated whatever was meeting it was - they were all going at 7:00 so anyway okay that sounds like a plan.

So it sounds like the plan is let's not push people real hard on this date. If - and back to the R&Rs if - is the 23rd going to be a push because of the meeting in Amsterdam? What do you guys think about that? Berry go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Yes Mikey this is Berry. As of right now based on the feedback that we've received thus far the 23rd is the registry stakeholder group's deadline.

And so far that's the latest date of the groups that we've heard a status from as to which it would be submitted.

Of course we can easily have all of that incorporated into the final review tool for a meeting on the 29th.

And it sounds like there is agreement that we should wait until all responses are combined together in one document.

However we are missing next week the 22nd for our normal meeting schedule so we might want to think about whether we want to have the meeting and if we do what would we like to accomplish in that session.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I'm inclined to cancel next week. I don't feel any strong need to do anything else. It does seem like these documents are the thing we really need.

And then we'll sort of aim for the 29th which means that the 23rd deadline could move, become more fluid if people need it as long as you get it to Berry and Marika in time to be summarized for the 29th.

Avri Doria: I think we should keep it as the 23rd deadline as much as we can even though we know people will come in late.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah okay. Let's do that. Don is typing. We'll let Don down jump in. Does somebody else want to get in?

Berry Cobb: Mikey I was just - this is Berry just to also follow- up. Our normal time for this meeting if we did host one on the 29th there in - at the ICANN facility it luckily is 7:00 AM California time so I don't think we need to reschedule the call to a different time to accommodate for what's going on there in LA.

However I will need to try to probably find those a separate room there in the facility.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I think, you know, that's - we could do a little poll and figure out who's going to be there. And then, you know, my guess is some little conference room somewhere would be fine. We could just sit around a speakerphone and make faces at each other.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) we're there. You could do it from your hotel room anyway.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes right. I just hate doing it from the hotel. I don't know why it's...

Avri Doria: Okay sorry.

Mikey O'Connor: But that's okay. It's just a personal quirk, you know, were all allowed those.

Avri Doria: No I think it's lovely having a room to do it and I'd probably make it but if I didn't I still have - be - have a second option to do it from my hotel room.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, yes that's true. Okay I think we have a plan. Don is suggesting that fluid and deadline are not a good plan - a good idea to put in the same sentence which is probably true. So let's leave the deadline firm had have people try to get that done before you go to the intercessional meeting in Europe.

And we'll cancel next week. We'll do the 29th as usual. Berry maybe you and I can figure out a way to determine how to get a room in the Doubletree so that we can meet since we're meeting in the same building as the hotel rooms. It's does seem like we could figure that out.

Avri Doria: I thought we're meeting in the mother ship?

Mikey O'Connor: No I don't think so. I think it's at the Doubletree. I think we're actually meeting in the Doubletree.

Avri Doria: Oh.

Mikey O'Connor: So I think it's an elevator ride difference.

Avri Doria: Oh, okay. That's easy. I can (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: So somehow we should be able to get this figured out. Okay I think that's it. Anything else on people's minds before we wrap up?

But, you know, I got nothing else. I'm actually feeling okay. I'm feeling better now than I was going into the call as these comments come in.

All right going once. Avri's typing. Do want to speak?

Avri Doria: No.

Mikey O'Connor: No okay. I think we'll call it a day. (Julie) can you wrap up the recording and the call and all that stuff and we'll see you all in two weeks, not next week. We'll skip next week's call.

                             END