**Thick WHOIS PDP DT Meeting**

**TRANSCRIPTION**

**Thursday 27 September 2012 at 1800 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Thick WHOIS PDP DT call on the Thursday 27 September 2012 at 1800 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-20120927-en.mp3

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

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/

Attendees
Elisa Cooper - CBUC
Keith Drazek - RySG
Alan Greenberg - At-Large
Carolyn Hoover - RySG
Susan Kawaguchi - CBUC
Mikey O'Connor - ISPCP
Evan Leibovitch - At-Large
Jonathan Tenenbaum - RrSG
Ray Fassett - RySG
Ekaterina Dureva - Individual

ICANN Staff

Marika Konings
Barbara Roseman
Gisella Gruber
Apology:

Susan Prosser
Steve Metalitz
Jonathan Zuck
Carlton Samuels

Coordinator:     At this time I'd like to advise all participants today's conference is being recorded. If you do have any objections, you may disconnect. You may go ahead.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's Thick Whois PDP Drafting Team call on Thursday the 27th of September. We have Alan Greenberg, Keith Drasek, Carolyn Hoover, Mikey O'Connor, Ekaterina Dureva.

From staff we have Marika Konings, Barbara Roseman and myself Gisella Gruber. And we have apologies noted from Susan Prosser, Steve Metalitz, Jonathan Zuck, Carlton Samuels and Ray Fassett. And Susan Kawaguchi has joined the call as well.

If I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. I hope I haven't left anyone off the attendance list. Thank you and over to you Mikey.

Elisa Cooper:     Excuse me. This is Elisa Cooper. I think I was left off.

Gisella Gruber-White: My apologies Elisa. Your attendance has been noted. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor:  Thanks Gisella. Welcome all. Our usual short agenda. Continue working on this draft. I think we're getting pretty close but one never knows. Just a brief pause to let people either add stuff to the agenda if there's something that's on people's minds or update us with your statement of interest. If either of those are relevant, this is the time to speak. Okay.

I sent you a copy just a few minutes ago via the list of the draft that's on your screen. What you're looking at is my screen as I edit this draft. And so I just

wanted you to have copy of your own if you want to scroll around because you can't scroll this one.

And that way you can either follow along what I'm doing or go other places to look stuff up. It should be on the list if you need it. I'm just thinking that we're going to go through the few remaining issues that we've been discussing on the list. For the most part there seems to be a pretty high comfort level but there are a few things that we need to touch on.

Keith I'm going to pick on you in a minute so I'll just give you a heads up. I think one of the things we want to do is circle back to that language that you took away under advisement to make sure that we've got that right.

I want to zero in on the topic that Tim introduced and we've had a pretty lively discussion on the list about authoritative in a database sense as opposed to authority over the data in a more legal process sense. I've got language in there for that.

We had a lingering issue from last time that (Jeff) had some language in a draft that we need to take a look at. And I think those are the three biggies. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg:   Yeah. Just a point of order; the copy that I got didn't have an attachment.

Mikey O'Connor:   Well that probably means everybody...

Woman:   Me too.

Mikey O'Connor:   Everybody got a copy without the attachment.

Woman:   That'd be great if you could send...

Mikey O'Connor: Isn't that clever. I think doing that we'll jump limp along. It's too - I'm too old to multitask that. Sorry. That's my screw up.

Alan Greenberg: That's fine.

Mikey O'Connor: That's for pointing it out though. I'd have been breezing along. The one that I sent earlier in the week is really close but not quite the same as this. Apologies.

So with that, Keith let's - you're going to even have to refresh me as to which part of the language is the part that we were going to look at for you.

Keith Drasek: No problem Mikey. Can you hear me okay?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. We can hear you, yeah.

Keith Drasek: Okay. Great. So yeah, I mean I mean I think the question - I think it was Alan-forgive me if I'm not remembering correctly. But I think Alan raised the question about, you know the word consistent and was confused or had some concerns around the inclusion of the word consistent under consistence of thick Whois.

And, you know, the reason I suggested the word consistent use was to ensure that the charter and the work of the PDP working group did not single out one entity. I think with Avri's addition or suggested addition that we've incorporated where it talks about for existing and future registry operators, I think the - I think my concern is satisfied. So I would be fine with removing the word consistent if that's the holdup.

Mikey O'Connor: That was certainly the one we sent you away to think about. And the language that's highlighted on the screen is the sentence that we removed consistent from. So good. We'll tick that one off as okay unless somebody else gets excited about that.

Alan Greenberg:   I'm happy with that. It's Alan.

Mikey O'Connor:   Okay. Good deal. Thanks a million Keith. The next one is the one that I just inserted. That's this one. The one yellow - that's highlighted in yellow. Hopefully this is big enough that you can read it on the screen.

This came from Tim and I have just plunked my draft into the charter in a place that I think is a good close spot because, you know, in my mind anyway this is a database issue. It's not a legal authority over the data kind of issue. It's more of a technical issue.

And the words that I used - the word authoritative I think got us off in the weeds. So let me clarify what I meant and then we can sort of take it from there.

What I was thinking was that the issue had to do with the fact that in the thin model in a database sense the authoritative database sits with registrars for the registrant data. Whereas in the thick the registry maintains in a purely technical sense the authoritative database even though the registrars still have the legal and contractual authority over collecting and maintaining that data.

And I think that if there's a better set of words than the ones that are on your screen to make that clear, that would certainly clarify it from my vantage point. But I want to sort of throw this out to the group. Unfortunately we lost Ray on this call. I think he could have been a big help.

But I won't do this immediately but Barb you've been really good at some of the clarifying language stuff. So if three's a lifeline that you could throw me on this one that would be great. Or if anybody else has one I'd be sort of all ears because at least my intent and I don't think Tim's intent was to broaden our scope to talk about who has the legal and contractual authority over that data.

I think we were merely talking about the issues associated with technical migration. So with that, Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg:  Yeah. I think we can solve the problem by using the word authoritative but defining it for the purposes of this scope. So then we can use the kind of sentence you just used and not try to find the single word which everyone will understand implicitly to mean that.

Mikey O'Connor:  Okay.

Alan Greenberg:  You know, I think that the - otherwise we're going to be agonizing over a word and different people have different understandings of it. And I think that addresses it.

By the way, there is one subtle difference in the thick model and that is the registry has the ability to lock the data and that can't be changed under any given circumstance whereas in the thin model it can be. So that does give the registry a certain level of control over the thin model. I'm not sure it's relevant to our discussion. But, you know, I thought I'd mention that because it is a difference that technically does impact what one might see. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor:  Yeah. Huh. Interesting. Anybody else got any thoughts on this? I'm happy to take a whack at recreating that sentence. I may have to listen to the transcript to do it but. If more words - I started to do that a little bit in the email thread and I could also go back to that and steal one of those words.

Alan Greenberg:  It's Alan. If authoritative bothers people, maybe definitive.

Mikey O'Connor:  Well, I mean I like authoritative because it does mean something in the technical sense.

Alan Greenberg:  Yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: But I want to make that - I want to highlight the distinction there. Because - and I think the - maybe the key issue for this group is let's presume away the problem of definition. I think I can do that.

But I think the scope question is what's really important, which is - it was certainly my sense when we were in the IRTP thinking about this that we weren't going to go into the broader legal contractual authority kids of dimensions with this working group.

And so my inclination would be to use that narrower and more technical definition in this sentence.

Barbara Roseman: Well you can also - another strategy that's been used in the past is to state that there are these other issues but they are not within the scope of the current work. Right. You know, so you can acknowledge them and say, you know, that these - that there's a - there are clear implications for how this would have to be worked out through either contracts or cost or whatever.

You know, you can just point to all those issues and say that those are not within the scope of this working group and would have to be addressed under another discussion or another - you don't have to say it has to be a whole PDP or something because it might not be. But that it's not going to be something you directly address. Sorry. That - Marika just reminded me that I have to say this is Barbara speaking. So I'm saying that.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. I knew that. I was going to come behind you and (fill that in).

Barbara Roseman: No, for the transcript this is.

Mikey O'Connor: That's something that's very comfortable for me as a Project Manager is to say here are the things that are in scope and oh by the way, here are the things that are out of scope.

Barbara Roseman:     Right. So we recognize these issues. We recognize they exist. But, you know, and they're obviously worth discussion but they're outside the scope of this particular work.

Mikey O'Connor:  Yeah. Okay. That popped Keith's hand up. So Keith, take it away.

Keith Drasek:     Yeah. Thanks Mikey. And I think - I mean obviously for the existing - take TLD registries. They are authoritative. That it's written into the contracts. That's basically the way it is. I'm not sure that we could just jump to the conclusion that all future registries will be authoritative over the registrars.

I think it's an open question at this point. Unless there is some sort of a definition, you know, of a thick registry that says it is authoritative, it may not be so. I mean that's certainly the case, you know, today and with the existing registries. And there are a lot of technical reason I think why it makes sense.

But I'm not sure that we can necessarily jump to that conclusion. So I'm not sure that using the language that, you know, it's completely out of scope is appropriate at this point.

Mikey O'Connor:  What if we - well our - I think that what we need to do when we speak about this is make clear - are you talking about technical authoritative in the database sense or are you talking legal authoritative as in contract?

Keith Drasek:     I think it's - I think it's both. And I think they're very much tied together. So - hey, I'm not sure if you had a chance to see Tim Ruiz's email he just sent just before the call. And I don't know if Tim is on or not. But...

Mikey O'Connor:  No.

Keith Drasek:     ...he was responding to some of the back and forth. And why don't I just read it. Says for me the authoritative question is the crux of the issue. It must be clear who is authoritative in order to resolve disputes legal or otherwise.

And if that comment that registries are going to become thick yet not be authoritative then I think that will have a big impact on who may support it and who will not.

So we can ignore it in the charter but I guarantee you it will come up in the working group. So that was a comment - that was a comment from Tim and he went on to say regarding my earlier concern, I never said or intended but the PDP Working Group should take on the issue of whether or not registrars should be required to continue to prove Whois.

He agrees that would be out of scope. He said he only meant that the charter should not state definitively but they will have to as it may misguide the working group, so. I think, you know, Tim and I may be coming at it from different angles but I think what we're both saying is that it's not a given at this tie that all future registries or existing registries would necessarily be authoritative. And I think its something that needs to be discussed.

Mikey O'Connor:   Yeah. And Tim is sort of the genesis of this thread. So I read with great care what he says. And he's saying it must be clear who is authoritative in order to resolve disputes legal or otherwise.

That would tend to mean to me the broader less technical definition of authoritative is what appealed to Tim. And I kind of hear the same from you Keith. So what I'm starting to hear is that I had this reversed in my head and that the scope should be the opposite way. Is that what you're getting at as well Keith.

Keith Drasek:     I think that's right. I see some folks have their hands up, Barb and Alan want to...

Mikey O'Connor:  Yeah. I'm sorry. Go ahead. I'll churn through the queue. Barb, go ahead.

Barbara Roseman:     I was just going to suggest - I was going to suggest a word change but I'm not sure it gets quite at what - how the discussion has evolved here. I, you know, for the technical side of the authoritative registry issue, you're really talking about primaries and secondaries.

Now I know that that language is more familiar for people who talk about name servers. But, you know, I think that that would be a way of perhaps distinguishing between the technical versus the larger legal ramifications of authoritative.

You know, so you could talk about the implications of migrating the primary repository for registrant data. And then Tim did point out in another place that there's a - there's a distinctive overlap between Whois data and registrant data. But it's not - they're not, you know, simply congruent with each other.

And, you know, so again I think we need to be clear what it is we're trying to distinguish here. If we're really talking about the registrant data, then that does include all the larger contractual legal issues. If we're talking about the data that appears in the Whois, then I think we can talk a little bit more succinctly about primary and secondary.

But I don't want to push this - I don't want to be the one to push the discussion in either direction here. I'm just trying to give you some clarifying terms.

Mikey O'Connor:  Thanks Barb. That's helpful. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg:  Yeah. I really have a question, not a statement. We're not inventing anything here. There are plenty of thick Whois registries in the world and the registrars currently support them.

Now registrars are required by contract to have a Whois service. Right -and I'm sure when a registrar sends my data in to .org as an example, they don't discard it. They keep a copy.

When I go to a registrar's Whois and I say Alan Greenberg .org, are they showing me the data from the registry or are they showing me the private copy typically?

I've always assumed that for the data that is stored in the Whois repository in the thick Whois in PIR I'm seeing that data regardless of whether I go to InterNIC or I go to Go Daddy or whoever the registrar is. Is that a - is that not a correct statement? Do some registrars show their private data, which might be out of sync?

Mikey O'Connor:  Not sure we have the answer. And for a scoping discussing...

Alan Greenberg:  Well but I think, you know, there's an established model. What, you know, what is the expectation today with a thick Whois? Because that's what we're trying to move towards.

Mikey O'Connor:  Yeah but I'm starting to feel like we're doing the work. What I'd like to get to is not do the work of the working group but make sure that we've got the right questions for them to answer.

Barbara Roseman:    Yeah. This is Barbara. I think that's actually a really good point because you want to make sure here at this point that we don't get bogged down in the answers that people are trying to get to. We really just want to pose the questions here. And so you just want to make sure that your - the questions are clear and your terminology is comfortable enough that people are going to be able to use it moving forward.

They may even change it once they start the working group to say wow, that didn't get quite at what we were, you know, trying to distinguish here. But what you're trying to do is provide a framework and a language for having the discussion and for achieving some consensus on an outcome.

But this particular setting up the charter is not where you want to lay out every single issue because that's doing the work of the working group.

Mikey O'Connor:  Yeah. Yeah, yeah. Okay. I think in order - unless somebody has more clarifying to do, let this poor chump go off and take a crack at a revision to this based on the conversation we've had so far. And I'll get it to the list with the hope that we can maybe hammer this one out over the course of the next week.

And so I think what I want to do is move on to the next puzzler, which is one we skipped on our way to (Jeff)'s - we ran out of time last time. We skipped this one. And so the word uniform is highlighted on this page. And it's much like the issue that Alan raised about the word consistent, which is the word uniform in this sentence changes the meaning of the sentence in a pretty substantial way.

Let me read it and I'll do the emphasis. Competition in registry services. What would be the impact on competition in registry services should all registries be required to provide a uniform Whois service? Would there be more or less or no difference?

And I think that the issue that Ray is raising -- it's too bad he's not on the call - is are we really going for uniformity or are we just going for a consistent model? Because uniformity in this context may imply virtually identical Whois services across registries and I don't think that that's the intent.

And so my inclination would be to change this to something like provide Whois using a consistent model or some such rather than uniform, which seems overly restrictive. Barb, go ahead.

Barbara Roseman:     Yeah. So one of the issues that I think this is trying to address is that people - I'm sorry. Different registries and registries provide their Whois answers in different formats. And, you know, that can mean as simple as they provide the, you know, some of the registrant data first then the registrar data and - or vice versa.

And I think the goal of this particular issue is to indeed provide consistent responses so that everybody knows assuming it's possible so that you can, you know, receive a response and immediately know which field corresponds to which bit of data.

And this is going to become even more important with the internationalized registrations because the scripts may not be, you know, transparent to everybody. And so, you know, I think that consistence is - consistent model is the form I'd go for but I do think you have to be a little careful here that what you're trying to get at is you want consistent responses to clear these.

Right. You don't really care how they store the data I mean unless you do. But that what you want is Whois responses that are, you know, transfer data that is going to be consistent from one registrar to another or from one registry to another.

Mikey O'Connor:  I think you and I are agreeing.

Barbara Roseman:     Yeah. I'm agreeing.

Mikey O'Connor:  But I'm also not sure that that's the properly within the scope. So we'll go to Alan first.

Alan Greenberg: You said what I said but in a milder - what I was going to say but in a milder way. That's (fishing creep) in spades. I mean there's no question that we ICANN should have a definition right now of what thick is and what thin is and what we expect from a registry and a registrar in those two models that we have. We don't have that.

I don't think it's this group's responsibility to write the specification manual for thick Whois or for thin for that matter. So if currently your thick registries some come up out in order and some come out in the other order, that's a problem, which - perhaps a problem needs to be addressed. But I don't think it's our problem.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. And now that Alan's done, let me circle back to a conversation that we've been having in the IRTP right now - IRTPC, which is that in the RAA discussions there is discussion about uniform Whois, which is exactly what Barb described, a consistent display of Whois data.

It's my contention that a consistent display of Whois data can be achieved in thick or thin registry models. And that defining that consistent or uniform display of Whois data is way outside our scope. Our job is to figure out the implications of thick versus thin but not to specify.

Barbara Roseman: Yeah. No. I - sorry, this is Barbara. I wasn't saying specify here. I was just saying if that's what you're trying to get at here, then consistent might be a better use. But...

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. Well and I was thinking - oh, Ray is joining. Cool. Maybe he's coming back. Ray, are you on the call?

Ray Fassett: I have just joined. Sorry for being late.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh. You can now paint a picture of a fellow that just found a log on the ocean and is clinging to it with his fingernails. So good day.

Ray Fassett: I'm glad I could assist there. Thank you Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: We've been through that point but we're working on one of your - on your remaining point. So...

Ray Fassett: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: ...let me replay the bidding on this one and then we'll circle back to where we wound up on the other one and check in with you on that. We're working on your highlighting the word uniform Whois service. And let me just see if I can replay this fairly quickly.

The issue is that using the word uniform Whois service confuses the issue of what we're doing, which is making the choice about thick versus thin Whois models with the issue of uniform display of Whois data, which is an ongoing discussion in the RAA negotiations right now.

And it - I sort of made the contention that -- Barb backed me up -- that you can display Whois data in a uniform way in thick or thin and that that whole issue is way outside our scope.

So what I was proposing and I think we're sort of landing on is to say - to reword that sentence to say competition in registry services - what would be the impact on competition in registry services? Should all registries be required to provide Whois services under the thick model? And delete that uniform reference. Is that the issue that was in your mind when you highlighted that?

Ray Fassett: This is Ray Fassett. I think really no. It's just the issue of, you know, it's just - and having been consistent in the language so that later someone in the working group reads it and sees consistency. And I think though what you did does accomplish that it sounds to me.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. I'm going to do that then right now. Using - oops. Does anybody cry out in agony? This is your chance. So now what it says is required to provide Whois service using the thick Whois model. And avoids what I think is a gigantic scope explosion with uniform Whois because that's a really different issue. Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Mikey, it's Alan. I think that's good. The way I originally read uniform was a synonym for thick versus thin. So I think you've certainly captured it with your rewrite.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. And avoided a mind field. Okay. Let's go back up to the one that we just worked on a little bit. Ray, I'm going to replay the bidding on this really quick and sort of prime you to join us on the email list on this one. Because I think you're absolutely right in raising the question and you may have noticed that Tim has come back in on the list as well.

My confusion, and I think it may be mine and mine alone, is that I was thinking of the kind of techie database thing. Oh wow, there's an authoritative place where you store data but authoritative only in the technical sense, not in the contractual/customer facing sense.

We were churning along pretty well saying well let's just insert that definition and then state that the contractual kind of stuff is out of scope when Keith chimed in and then so did Tim coincidentally via the list and said these are very connected issues.

And so I come to the conclusion that we need to rewrite this again. I think we need to really work hard on it on the list. I'm going to take a try at a rewrite and I just want to prime you that this one's still open.

I think where I'm headed on this call is I want to see if we can get everything else buttoned up except for this issue and then hammer on this issue on the

list and get it squared away. But I would love to hear sort of your thoughts about whether that's the right direction and if not, what's - what is the right direction. So take it away Ray.

Ray Fassett: Hi Mikey, thanks. Ray Fassett. I think what you're saying makes logical sense in terms of an approach. Obviously there are strong views on this. I have reviewed Tim's.

Speaking off the top of my head, you know, I might question Tim where he says, you know, must be clear who is authoritative in order to resolve disputes legal or otherwise. I might say that might be the job of the working group. But beyond that then I might even ask - again asking myself a question, if you will, okay. Is the purpose of Whois to resolve disputes legal or otherwise?

So Mikey what I'm trying to say is to your point I think you are heading down the right path is let's look at everything else first. This does need to be addressed in some fashion. And I appreciate your willingness to try to do that.

Mikey O'Connor: We'll see how well it goes. But, you know, it's a very interesting scope issue. And one of the things that we're going to have to work really hard as a drafting team is to steer clear of actually deciding anything about this. We just need the right words - the right container for the discussion of the working group itself.

And so I'm going to - I'm going to take a try at it but only from a scope standpoint. I'm certainly not going to try and answer the policy issues that are contained in there.

Okay. We are down to pretty much the last thing, which is that right at the end of the call last time we got to (Jeff)'s thought that from sort of a language standpoint there's kind of a balancing opposite point that maybe out to be addressed by the working group.

That said, you know, the paragraph immediately above the one that's highlighted there says should the working group reach consensus that thick should be required then there's a bunch of other stuff for them to consider and then three bullets.

(Jeff) raised the possibility of saying maybe we should also have one in there that says should the PDP reach consensus that thick Whois should not be required for all gTLDs. Then the working group needs to look at the possibilities of other registries choosing to go thin.

My initial reaction was oh, that's an interesting thought exercise. But the sense I got on the very short piece of the call -- that we had - we really literally only had about three or four minutes to talk about this -- was that no, if the PDP working group decides not to recommend thick Whois for all gTLDs, that's the end of the story.

And the remaining issues, the ones like (Jeff) is raising will just be handled by current contracts, current policy, et cetera, et cetera. And that there is in fact no need to do this and actually not - that this is actually not a good idea because it again dramatically increases the scope of the working group and takes us into a land that nobody particularly wants to go into.

So I just wanted to drag that one in front of you again because we really only had a few minutes. Just checking the list. No, (Jeff)'s still not on the call. I asked (Jeff) to send something off to the list about this and he did not.

So my presumption is that he doesn't feel super strongly about this or he would have sent something to the list and we could have had a little debate about it. And so my inclination is to delete it but I do want to hear from folks. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg:     Yeah. I think your analysis in where we should go is spot on. There are established processes. If we - if the working group decides that the thin Whois registries do not need to migrate to thick, then there are established processes for a thick registry to ask to go thin be it contract negotiations, RSTEP.

I don't think it's our decision or even our recommendation whether that path should be legitimate or not. I mean ICANN made a strong decision in the new - in the new registry's contact. I don't think we - it's our job to try to evaluate that. So I agree with you 100%.

Mikey O'Connor:     Cool. We've got some tick marks. Anybody disagree? Anybody want to fight hard for this particular one? This would be the time to do it if you want to. Otherwise I think I'll delete this one. And I'm not seeing anybody's hand up. So here it goes.

All right. That's I believe it. So I think what I want to do on this last 20 minutes is go through this thing one last time. But this is essentially the first consensus call with one notable exception. And that's the whole authoritative thing that we'll leave outstanding.

So I just want to basically drag us through it. This is the time to - and in fact I'm going to go to clean draft so that we're not distracted by all that crud. Oops, I don't want to do that. I want to do this. Make it a little bigger. You can see it better. Because I think we're essentially done with the exception of that one issue.

So here it is, clean draft style with a few remaining notes in brackets that I - either I or Marika have to go back and fix. And so I'm just going to basically read it to you.

For generic top-level domain registries, the - ICANN specify Whois service requirements through registry agreements and the registrar accreditation

agreement. And so I think we're going to fix that. Is it - oh it is the - never mind.

Registries of historically satisfied - oh, wait a minute. Keith just typed a great big thing into the chat. Keith, you want to jump on the call here for folks who aren't going to be able to see this chat or do you want me to read it?

Keith Drasek:    No that's fine Mikey. Why we go and finish with what you're working through and then I can circle back.

Mikey O'Connor:    Okay. So let's see. So registries have historically satisfied their Whois obligations under two different models. Two models are often characterized as thick and thin. Registries - this distinction is based on how two distinct sets of data are maintained.

Whois contains two kinds of data about a domain name. One set of data is associated with the domain name and the second set of data is associated with the registrant of the domain name.

That by the way is a change that I did. That sentence used to be right up at the end of this paragraph. And then based on our conversation last week I wrote an almost identical sentence here and I liked the first one better. So I just took it into its own paragraph.

IN a thin registration model the registry only collects the information associated with the domain name from the registrar and is in turn - what - only collects the information associated with the domain name from the registrar and is in turn published by the registry. That doesn't read right to me.

Only collects the information associated with the domain name...

Alan Greenberg:     All right. We can't - it's - Mikey, it's Alan. Did we define the information associated with the domain name above?

Mikey O'Connor:     No. I can't scroll.

Alan Greenberg:     Then it's an undefined term and it is vague.

Mikey O'Connor:     Well not only that, it's the - yeah, okay. So that's why we reworded it before. So...

Alan Greenberg:     Again, we're suffering from lack of definition of what these are.

Mikey O'Connor:     Yeah. Such as status (unintelligible) date - (vertical) dates, dates - I'm not going to get too tricky here. I'm going to change only to merely to highlight the fact that there's a diminutive. That's the thing that was bothering me.

Thin registration model the registry merely collects the information associated with the domain name from the registrar. And that information is in turn published by the registry. This - that - ooh. I hate it when I get that.

All right. This - that - this (unintelligible) registrar status of the registration. Here's the definition. And it's - the meaning of - this is backward. (Unintelligible). We're going to take this one out, put it up here in our definition.

Everybody comfortable with what I just did? Did you see what I did? Because now what we've done is we've defined the data that's assigned - associated with the domain name. This is the sponsoring registrar status for the registration creation and expiration date, name server data and last time, et cetera. Ray is in on this. Good. Okay. Anybody else uncomfortable. Remove the period. Thank you Carolyn.

Okay. Now we say in a thin registration model the registry merely collects the information associated with the domain name from the registrar. The registry in turn publishes that information.

In the thin registration model registrars maintain the second set of data associated with the registrant of the domain and provide it via their own Whois services as required in Section 3.3 of the RAA for those domains they sponsor. We're going to put a footnote in on the term sponsor. Going to make a paragraph here because I think it's clear. Oops.

In a think registration model the registry collects both sets of data, domain name and registrant from the registrar and in turn publishes this data via the list.

Alan Greenberg: Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Go ahead Alan.

Alan Greenberg: The thin one is not quite complete or not quite accurate because the registry does have control over some of that data. Registry can put locks on it and publish that lock. It's what it's publishing is not purely what it gets from the registrar at any point...

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. You're right. Well...

Alan Greenberg: ...at any point in time after their initial registration.

Mikey O'Connor: In the thin.

Alan Greenberg: In the thin yes.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. So where - you're right. Where do we - so I - (you know) (collects) the associated with the domain. So this is - I think this is better removed. Merely is better removed.

In the thin registration model the registry collects the information associated with the domain name from the registrar and the - oh. I need a comma there. And the registry in turn publishes that information along with...

Alan Greenberg: This - if it wasn't a parenthetical - if this wasn't already a parenthetical, you could nest - you could put a nested one in.

Mikey O'Connor: Get out of here. You're hurting me now. Along with maintaining certain locks at the registry level.

Alan Greenberg: It's not only - it's not only locks. It's status.

Mikey O'Connor: Locks and status (unintelligible). Registry level. That's such a long sentence that we're going to turn it into two. Registry in turn publishes that - publishes domain name information along with maintaining certain lock and status information at the registry level.

In thin registration - okay. So we don't need that because we've already got that. Registrars maintain the second set of data associated with the registrant. Don't think we need that. Registrant - registrars maintain data associated with the registrant or the domain and provide it via their own Whois services as required by Section 3.3.

Hopefully these are clarifying. Oh, I've built a queue. I'm sorry. Alan, is that old or new?

Alan Greenberg: Sorry. It's old and I'm away from the computer, so...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor:   Create it as perpetually old until you yell at me. Keith, go ahead.

Keith Drasek:     Yeah. Thanks. The question of domain name status is - it is certainly a record that's displayed often and it's actually true for thin or thick is that the registry, you know, basically has the ability to have various status on the domain name. Lock is one of those.

So I think for that sentence if you're looking to shorten it up a bit you can simply refer to the domain name status and not lock. A lot of - lock is a subset of the various status available.

Mikey O'Connor:   Perfect. I love shortening. Okay. I was doing a lot kind of on the fly there. Are we okay so far? Yell out if we're not. Otherwise I'm going to keep going because we are starting to get a little closer to the end.

In a thick registration model the registry collects both sets of data, domain name and registrant from the registrar and in turn publishes that data via Whois. All right. So now we're down to the meaty bit.

PDP Working Group is tasked to provide the GNSO Council with a policy recommendation regarding the use of thick Whois by all registries -- Barbara, capital R -- both existing and future. Oh, never mind. All - oh, I see what was going on here, sorry. We want this at the end of this thing. All gTLD registries.

Barbara Roseman:     You left a space there between registries and (both here).

Mikey O'Connor:   Yeah. And I think (unintelligible). Keith, this is your sentence so if I've changed the meaning of it, it was unintentional. So look at that real close and make sure that I've just clarified it.

Keith Drasek:     Thanks Mikey. This is Keith. But I'm fine with the way it is right now. That was the way it was intended.

Mikey O'Connor:   Okay.

Keith Drasek:      Thanks to Avri's input.

Mikey O'Connor:   Yeah. It just got dropped in the wrong spot. And as part of its deliberation on this issue the PDP Working Group should at a minimum - that's a key I think. We do leave the PDP Working Group some room to maneuver here. Consider the following elements as detailed in the final issue report.

Response consistency I don't believe had any changes. Thick registry can dictate the labeling and display to be sure the information is easy to parse and all registrars clients would have to display accordingly, which could be considered a benefit but also a potential cost of Whois information.

Sure information is easy to parse. And all registrars' clients have to display it accordingly. It's starting to get quite long. This could be considered a benefit but also a potential cost. And also be a benefit in the context of international (as to) registration data as even with a use of certain scripts. Uniform data collection and display standards could be applied.

Going go until you yell at me and just yell because I'm staring at my screen, not the queue.

Stability. In the event of a registrar business or technical failure it would be beneficial to ICANN and registrants to have the full set of domain registration contact data stored by four organizations, the registry, the registry's escrow agent, the registrar and the registrar's escrow agent, which would be the case in any thick registry.

Capital letters on those Barbara or not? I would think these...

Barbara Roseman:      (Unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor:   I would think these are capitalized, right?

Barbara Roseman:      Yeah. Those are capitalized.

Mikey O'Connor:   Yeah. Okay. And the registrar's escrow agent. (Cool). And then in this case I think it's the other way around. I think this gets lowercased at the end. Because now we're talking about the generic.

Barbara Roseman:      Right.

Mikey O'Connor:   Accessibility is the provision of Whois information at the registry level under the thick Whois model. More cost effective in protecting consumers and intellectual property owners. Okay. Seems like a tasty discussion to me.

Impact on privacy and data protection including consideration of possible cross border transfers of registrant data. How would thick Whois affect privacy and data protection also taking into account the involvement of different jurisdictions with different laws and legislation with regard to data privacy? That's kind of a mouthful but makes sense to me. I'm going to leave it alone.

Cost implications. What are the cost implications of a transition of a thick Whois for registries, registries capital R, registrars capital R and registrars - oh, I see. Registries, registrars and registrants as a transition to thick Whois for all gTLDs. Ah.

Ray Fassett:      Mikey, this is Ray. I have a question on this one.

Mikey O'Connor:   Yeah. Go ahead Ray.

Ray Fassett:      It's really the very last sentence in this (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor:     Oh, hang on then. I'm shooting...

Ray Fassett:        Sure.

Mikey O'Connor:     ...this one up. This one's not quite grammatical.

Ray Fassett:        Sure.

Mikey O'Connor:     Just get a comma in there to slow that one down a little bit. Okay. Go ahead with the - what are the implications if no changes are made and the status quo is maintained? Take it away Ray.

Ray Fassett:        That seems a very ambiguous question. Open ended, hypothetical. You know, I don't know how you measure it. And I think it means - I think what it means is what are the cost implications?

Mikey O'Connor:     Certainly in this paragraph, yes. I would take that as a friendly amendment. And I would also say to the registry model - oops - and the status quo is maintained.

Ray Fassett:        I'm not sure what it is - cost implications to who? That seemed very ambiguous to me. What is that referring...

Mikey O'Connor:     Yeah.

Ray Fassett:        Yeah.

Mikey O'Connor:     Well I think this is sort of like the countering - this is the opposite of this question. Think what's trying to be said is on this one we're saying what's the cost of a transition and this one we're saying what's the cost of not transitioning.

Alan Greenberg:     Then why don't we - it's Alan. Why don't we just say that?

Mikey O'Connor:   Let's say something like conversely.

Alan Greenberg:   Because we're not changing the registrar registry model. Well, we're not changing the registry model. We're requiring a - we're requiring or not requiring a transition from one Whois model to the other.

Mikey O'Connor:   Right.

Ray Fassett:   This is Ray again. Let me interject. I think the first part of that question is very specific on who we're referring to when we talk about cost implications. Don't think the second part is specific on who we're talking about when we reference cost implications.

Mikey O'Connor:   Is there some way to make this sentence both directions at the same time so that we just picked all this up?

Ray Fassett:   Well you could say are there cost implications of a transition to thick Whois for registries (perhaps). I'm thinking out loud.

Mikey O'Connor:   Yeah. I think that what the intent with this second one is is actually the intent of the IRTP, which is the IRTP kids want a place to be able to say, you know, there are costs right now that we're incurring because it's thin. And so I don't want to narrow it quite that much.

Keith Drasek:   Mikey, this is Keith. Could I jump in?

Mikey O'Connor:   Yeah. Go ahead Keith.

Keith Drasek:   Okay. So I think it's important to, you know, if the question is about cost implications, it's not just are there cost implications. It's important to say, you know, to define what they are. So I think it's important to keep that in. And,

you know, maybe you need to say, you know, if there are cost implications, you know, what are they or maybe there's a way to rephrase that.

But address Ray's point that the last sentence is not maybe as specific as the first. It's simply to add the words registries, registrars and registrants just like in the first section.

Mikey O'Connor: Right.

Keith Drasek: So conversely what are the cost implications to registries, registrars and registrants if no changes are mad to the registry model and status quote is maintain?

I think that's still - I think that's specific enough but still, you know, allows for not just, you know, deciding yes there are cost implications but actually, you know, you know, there needs to be the cost benefit analysis or there, you know, or at least an assessment of what they are and the defining of what they are.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. We don't have to make reference to the registry model if no transition is required or is mandated.

Mikey O'Connor: If no transition - like that. How do others feel about that? Barb, go ahead. You're being awfully polite. You shouldn't be this polite at this point because I'm not looking at the queue. Hopefully I didn't leave you there too long. Or maybe that was an old hand. Or maybe you're on mute.

Barbara Roseman: I am on mute. That was the problem. I think that I - I was going to say that what you might want to do here is make reference to the cost benefit analysis but, you know, that there obviously a cost involved in any, you know, in a transition unless the decision is that no change needs to be made.

But you might actually want to imply it or suggest that there might be a cost benefit analysis to no change being made. That, you know, there may be inherent costs in operating in, you know, with a thick-thin differential that would disappear if you went to an all thick model.

So I just - I don't know. I like that idea of referencing the cost benefit analysis and, you know, maybe it's not weaken the scope of the group to provide that but to say, you know, here are the different considerations that should be taken into account or, you know, something along those lines.

Mikey O'Connor:  I think that's what the second half - I think that that's the intent of the paragraph is...

Barbara Roseman:  Yeah.

Mikey O'Connor:  ...to get the cost on both sides and...

Barbara Roseman:  Yes.

Mikey O'Connor:  ...(well all right). And I think that Ray's right. The second half of this paragraph was a little vague.

Barbara Roseman:  Yeah. No, this is much clearer. I agree.

Mikey O'Connor:  Ray, how are we doing on sharpening it up? Are you okay with this version?

Ray Fassett:  I think you're doing great Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor:  Okay. Marika's got her hand up. Oh, and we're way over time. Gracious, nobody whacked me on that. Maybe that's what Marika's going to do. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. No, I'm (not working on the hands). To just say - to apologize because I was the one who wrote that sentence original in the issue report and sorry for not making that clear but I think it's (gotten) to the point that people made looking at indeed what are the costs if you wouldn't transition.

And I think that partly probably goes as well to (Jeff)'s point because this would look at as well. But what happens indeed if you don't make a decision. What are the implications for example was well of, you know, having the different models interacting with each other.

So I think this might be a way as well to have his point addressed should it go down that route. But I think this is a helpful clarification as you've made now.

Mikey O'Connor: Good deal. Gad. I'm sorry. I ran us over the end of the hour. Do people have another five minutes to just hang on on this final edit? If not, we'll just - we'll dump out right now. I just totally lost track of time.

Alan Greenberg: It's okay with me. Alan.

Mikey O'Connor: I think we're - I tell you what. Let's call it quits for today. I'm really sorry I went over. I wasn't paying attention. Dangnabbit. I will go through and do - and indicate how far we got in this final edit because I think we are making some very useful changes very quickly now that we've got sort of a shared understanding of where we're going.

And we'll pick this up again next week along with Mikey's try at the authoritative paragraph and see f we can wrap it up. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. Just one last comment or more a reminder that the deadline for submission of documents and motions for the GNSO Council to consider it in Toronto would be the 9th. So just to keep that in your minds if that's still the deadline you're working towards.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh boy. That's tight. We won't have time - well. I'm going to try a draft for our first consensus call on the list with the hope that we can get to consensus. Everybody thumbs up next week. That's a little aggressive but that two week apart consensus call thing is a convention. I don't think it's a rule in the PDP. And we're a drafting team. Are people comfortable with that? (Unintelligible)

Alan Greenberg: There's an - Mikey, it's Alan. There's an awful lot of people who think we've been dithering with this too far too long.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Some people are just never satisfied. Okay. That's it for today folks. Thanks a million. We'll see you in a week.

Alan Greenberg: Thanks for all the heavy lifting Mikey. Bye-bye.

Mikey O'Connor: See you later.

Woman: Bye.

Woman: Bye.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Coordinator: This concludes today's conference. At this time all parties may disconnect.

Gisella Gruber-White: (Lovely). Thank you...

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Gisella. Great job.

END