

**ICANN  
Transcription  
Thick Whois PDP Working Group meeting  
Tuesday 30 April 2013 at 14:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of THICK WHOIS PDP Working Group call on the Tuesday 30 April 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-20130430-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Marc Anderson – RySG  
Roy Balleste – NCUC  
Don Blumenthal – RySG  
Avri Doria - NCSG  
Alan Greenberg – ALAC  
Volker Greimann – RrSG  
Carolyn Hoover - RySG  
Marie-Laure Lemineur – NPOC  
Steve Metalitz - IPC  
Mikey O'Connor – ISPCP  
Jill Titzer – RrSG  
Rick Wesson - Individual  
Jonathan Zuck – IPC

Apologies:

Amr Elsadr – NCSG  
Evan Leibovitch - ALAC  
Susan Prosser - RrSG

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings  
Berry Cobb  
Lars Hoffmann  
Julia Charvolen

Julia Charvolen: Sure.

Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening. Welcome to the Thick Whois PDP Working Group call on Tuesday, the 30th of April, 2013.

On the call today we have Marc Anderson, Roy Balleste, Alan Greenberg, Carolyn Hoover, Marie-Laure Lemineur, Steve Metalitz, Mikey O'Connor, Rick Wesson, and Jill Titzer.

We have apologies from Evan Leibovitch.

And from staff we have Markia Konings, Barry Cobb, Lars Hoffman, and myself Julia Charvolen.

May I remind all participants to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes.

Thank you very much and over to you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Julia, and my apologies again, and welcome all.

We'll do our sort of standard pause and take a look at the agenda, which is over on the right, and give folks a chance to chime in if you have a change to your Statement of Interest.

I will note that we're going to take Item 2 and move it to the end of the agenda because I'm sort of hoping that (Don) can join us. He said he might be able to get on the call late, so we'll push that one down to the bottom of the list and see if he gets on the call.

Any other thoughts on the agenda or Statements of Interest?

Okay. What that means is that we're looking really at Item 3, and in that item are four pieces of work that we're going to take a look at. The first three we've looked at several weeks in a row. And so unless there are feelings of acute pain from any of you, I think that what I would propose is that we skip those today.

There are a couple of minor edits that went in last week, but my suggestion, again unless there's tremendous pain in somebody, is that we save those changes for the upcoming draft of the initial report and sort of tidy all that stuff up then.

I'm feeling confident, encouraged, enthusiastic that we can get an initial report out by Durbin, but the way we do that is by not chewing on these sections over and over and over again. So I'll give you all a chance to raise your hand right now if you want to take a look at any of those first three.

And otherwise, move on to the fourth one in the list, which is the competition and registry services which we took a look at last week, but we started right at the end of the call and I thought it'd be a good idea to take a look at that one again.

Marika, go ahead.

Markia Konings: Yes. This is Markia. I actually have another question or point I wanted to raise. I just got a note from Steve Metalitz who's indicating that he's having difficulty writing in the Adobe chat. I'm just wondering if others are having the same issue.

I just checked with some IT colleagues and they don't seem to have heard about that issue before. So just trying to identify whether this is something that is specific to Steve's computer.

I see other people typing, so it does seem to be working. So maybe Steve, we can connect and try to find out what's going on from your side.

Steve Metalitz: Okay, thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Steve, can you raise your hand? Because if you can't, feel free to just break in if you ever want to get into the queue. But, why don't you try raising your hand too?

Steve Metalitz: Yes. I can raise my hand.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: It's just this chat window, and it's happened before. And on the last two calls, other people had the same problem. But I'll pursue that (in my own way).

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

And if you want to hang on at the end of the call, Steve, I'm happy to sit with you and sort of try stuff and see if we can assess it out. Because, I've got - I have command on this particular work - one, so I - we can do it without tying up staff folks.

Okay. Marika I didn't see any other hands go up, so why don't we go ahead and take a quick look at competition and registry services. There wasn't a whole lot going on in this one. I'm going to make it a little bigger for me.

So I think again, the conclusion on this one is lining up with the conclusions on all the rest of them, which is that this isn't going to have a huge effect in this particular facet of things. But again, I didn't want to just zoom through it in two minutes flat at the very end of the last meeting. I'm perfectly happy if we conclude that this is close enough.

And again, just to remind you you'll certainly get another chance to revise this when we get the initial report pulled together. And Marika's already building that document and she is inserting these chunks as we go through them. So don't feel like this is absolutely your last chance.

But again if you've got a major point that you want to raise, this would be a good time to do it.

Got folks joining the room like crazy.

Marc, go ahead - oh Marc and Ruth too. Marc first.

Marc Anderson: This is Marc. I guess two comments. One, I think it's sort of interesting the choice of the word regime in the paragraph about possible advantages. For the (unintelligible) gTLD's would work under the same Whois regime. This would ensure (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Marc Anderson: (Unintelligible) regime isn't quite the right word there. I know that's nitpicking again - a bit, but that jumped out at me.

So the easy one aside, I guess my other request is, is this one - this deals with competitive advantages of operating a Thick versus Thin registry here. And what I guess I'd ask for is examples.

I mean, it seems pretty obvious that there you know would be advantages and/or disadvantages just to operating a Thick or Thin registry, but this statement doesn't give any examples. It just says, you know, there are advantages and you know moving everybody to the same model would create a level playing field. But I think - you know I think concrete examples of where one method is preferable to the other would be important here.

Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: All right. I think that's a good idea, and I'm not sure - maybe I'll lean on Marika a little bit. I think we may have examples in the issue report that we may be able to pull forward into this. If not, I agree. It would be good to get a few examples in here.

You know, the one that jumps to my mind of course is the reason for the original breakup of NSI into the registry and registrar. And, it does seem like we should revisit that. At least put that to bed.

Marika, have you got any thoughts about that? I hate to put you on the spot, but I don't have the issue report in front of me.

Markia Konings: Yes, this is Marika.

I actually don't think this issue was covered in the issue report if I'm not mistaken. I would have to look back as well. But I think it was actually an issue that was brought up as part of the charter discussions. And if I'm not mistaken...

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, okay.

Markia Konings: ...I think someone from the registry - I think it was Ray Facet at that time that said that may be an issue we should also be considering as part of the discussion. So I think this was actually an item that was introduced as part of the charter.

And if it was in the issue report, I don't think there was a whole lot of substance around it.

Mikey O'Connor: Marc, you want to take a crack at some of those since you are interested in that topic and just circulate something to the list? It certainly seems like a good idea to at least have a bit of a conversation about that.

Marc Anderson: Yes. I guess - I mean, I have some ideas on where I would start. I mean, this not being one of my subgroups, I didn't really want to step on toes. You know, I guess...

Mikey O'Connor: I think we're in a toes-free zone at this point. The subgroups have pretty much wrapped up except for the data privacy one. So I wouldn't worry about that at. At this stage of the game, these are our documents to do with as we see fit. And, this is a good time to modify them to make them work right for us. So, no worries there.

Marc Anderson: Yes. I guess I can throw out some ideas I have. I guess since Marika mentioned that Ray Facet brought it up originally, and Ray's - he's not on the call, but he is in the PDP. Maybe we could reach out to him and ask for some suggestions.

And I'd also request from a registrar perspective, I think there's probably you know a registrar angle to this. So if somebody from a registrar or someone with a registrar hat could throw out some thoughts on advantages to one model versus the other model on advantages and disadvantages, I think that would be a good perspective as well.

Mikey O'Connor: Well, I'm going to leave you with the action if that's okay. I'm in Teflon Mikey mode. I'm trying to not take on action items myself. I'm going to pick up enough in a few weeks anyway.

Could you sort of kick that off and maybe send emails to the list, but then copy and sort of do a shout out to Roy and Volker and some of the other registrars, registries, and see if we can dredge up some examples over the course of this week?

Marc Anderson: Okay. I'll see what I can do.

Mikey O'Connor: That's great. Thanks.

Rick, go ahead.

(Unintelligible) - oh, there you go.

Rick Wesson: Excellent. This is Rick Wesson speaking.

I thought the previous conversation was rather interesting. I was unable to come up with some from a registrar perspective.

I wanted to bring up a point on the capabilities within this part of the discussion for the registry services, and just bring everyone's attention to a PDF that is an extension. I posted a link to it in the chat. It's called the Whois EPP extension and it's only offered by one registry. It was penned by VeriSign, and it's a capability within their registry to obtain some Whois information through the EPP protocol.

And so when we're discussing or describing you know extended services - capabilities to extend services within the Whois paradigm, at least calling this out as an example I think is useful.

And, that was my only comment. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: You know, my jaw just hit the floor. I just assumed that Whois was passed through EPP. Thanks Rick. I didn't realize that that wasn't the case.

Yes. Now does that belong in this topic or does this belong somewhere else? I'm just - I'm asking that not rhetorically, but...



Rick Wesson: Well for this topic, I mean one of the things that we're discussing is competition registry services between Thick and Thin environments, right?

Mikey O'Connor: Right.

Rick Wesson: And so as an example of capabilities that are offered or that could be offered through extensions, any registry can offer an extension through EPP to its registrars.

And so I'm just highlighting there is a capability that is found useful enough that one registry implemented it. That it was from a Thin registry. And I just you know think that it supports Whois and it supports access to this information through registrars. And if you would like, I can probably put together a short paragraph that ascribes it.

And so...

Mikey O'Connor: You know, I think that would be good. You know, it seems like there's a - yes. There's a great - yes, I think that would be fantastic. Actually putting two would be - two paragraphs together would be good, Rick. One would be the kind of umbrella paragraph that says an advantage to Thick Whois, or whatever, a change brought about by Thick Whois is the ability to add services.

And then the one that describes this as an example of one of those, and then we could slot some more maybe under there as well.

That would be fantastic.

Rick Wesson: Well, I can certainly come up with a number of examples of extensions that don't exist if you want far-reaching stuff.

But this is in regardless of Thick versus Thin. This is merely a extension through EPP that supports Whois functionality through EPP. It - whether it was Thick or Thin is kind of irrelevant. It is an example of a way to extend EPP to support Whois functions.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

I think that'd be great. It'd be great.

Rick Wesson: I will send them to the list.

Mikey O'Connor: Terrific.

Welcome Volker. Don't let me forget to circle back to Volker when Alan is done, because I want to bring him up to speed on some of the earlier conversation.

Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you.

An obvious one in terms of registrars is with the new RAA, registrars no longer have to (unintelligible) for - (unintelligible) service if we go to a Thick registry. So, that's obviously one benefit for registrars. Or at least perceived benefit anyway.

In terms of the overall process - overall discussion we're having, we've gone awful far into it and no one has come up with any obvious you know glaring issues that have to be raised, and I wonder if we're straining ourselves too much to try to find some examples when nothing (else) has already come up as - in the natural course of events. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Let me speak to that. I think that the key group that's still working hard is the privacy and data protection group. And basically what I've done while they're working is work on some of the other stuff that we need to do in order to get a report out. So I'm not sure that we're at quite the spot that you've described yet; although, I'm not on that working group.

But until we get that one put to bed, I'm not ready to quite sign up on that. I think as soon as that group is comfortable with their product to the point where they can share it with the rest of us, then I think we can work through it.

And then I think you're right, Alan. If that particular one doesn't turn up something really hard, then I think we're at the point where we can move pretty briskly through the rest of these drafts and touch them up. Certainly get them into an initial report prepared for Durbin.

Durbin's not that far away in terms of working group time, so - and I don't think that we're doing too badly here.

Alan Greenberg: And Mikey, my hand is back up again.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, okay.

Rick, is that a new hand or an old hand?

Sounds like it's an old hand.

Go ahead, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

In terms of data privacy, I am in the group and I've been talking to (Don) with (unintelligible) on the list and privately. So I think we're very close to having something that is about as definitive as it's going to get.

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

Alan Greenberg: You know, and to the extent that we don't - we're not - and it's not clear we're going to have a meeting this week or not, I would hate to have this one - this group keeping on meeting and then just coming up with new things to say instead of canceling a meeting if we're not ready for it. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

No, I think that Marika is pretty well prepared to present us with chunks, and we're sort of digesting the chunks at a reasonable speed here. But I wouldn't be surprised if we don't have two or three more chunks for next week's meeting, et cetera, and be pretty close to an initial report pretty soon after that.

Okay. Anything else on this competition in registry services one? Again, we get another chance to talk about it in the initial report, but I am going to push this along.

Volker, the reason that I mentioned your name is that I kind of signed you up for a little work-along with Marc. In the previous part of this discussion, Marc raised the question, "Well, we talk about advantages and disadvantages to the registry or registrars from this transition to Thick, but we don't give any examples." And so Marc I think correctly was lobbying for a few of those.

It turns out that - I thought we had some in the initial - or in the issue report, but we don't, and it's because Ray Facet raised this question during the drafting of the charter. And so, we're going to reach out to Ray as well. But I kind of volunteered you as the lead guy in the registrar community to

(unintelligible) about that a little bit over the course of this next week with Marc, and I just wanted to make sure that's okay if I did that.

Volker Greimann: Yes, that's okay. Thanks for volunteering me. I - just send me a short email of a list of what you need to know and I'll try to collect all the data that I can.

Mikey O'Connor: Terrific.

Well, Marc's going to take the lead on that. So Marc, I just wanted to tie all that together for you.

Okay. The next one to review - let's see how we're doing on time. Yes, we're fine.

Let's take a look, Marika, at the one on accessibility. This is the first reading of this one. The last one, we were doing our second reading. And - so I think maybe what we'll want to do - Marika, go ahead.

Markia Konings: Yes. This is Marika.

This is just to explain that basically this is a topic that we didn't really have the opportunity to review at the last call or have any extensive discussion about. But what I did is actually look at the public comments received and build the chapter based on the input provided here from the different stakeholder groups and constituencies.

So some of you may actually recognize some of the language there because I decided to do a free - a copy and paste in some instances where very good substance was provided in a different submission. So that's why you may recognize some of that.

But (I said) this is what I've gathered from the submissions and haven't benefited yet from any further working group discussion. So hopefully, that's now the moment that that can take place.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Marika.

And I think that this is the model that we're going to use for the rest of these chapters is rather than organize a subgroup and send them off to work through these things, we'll have Marika prepare us a draft - do a first reading - a pretty light first reading on a call and then - and mostly, that's to get our collective attention. Give ourselves time to read through it really quickly. Give it a week on the list and do kind of a hard scrub a week later.

So, this is I think the time to ask clarifying questions of the draft, and then next week is the time to ask you know change of course type of questions. Although, I don't feel real strongly about that.

Steve, go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: Yes. Thank you, this is Steve.

I thought this was very good. I did have a couple of questions. One is the issue description doesn't exactly match up with what I think this chapter is about. It's - I think this is about basically the ability of people to access Whois data, which is I think important in protecting consumers and users, and intellectual property owners. But I just think the issue description may need to be a bit more sharpened there. Because, I think that that's what this is about.

The second point is that - again, having to do with the title. Just to be clear that some people will read this, if they don't read it any further, as about being accessibility for people who aren't able to access information because of print disabilities, visual impairments, and so forth.

That's kind of what - accessibility has become kind of a label for that, at least in the United States you know for requiring people to make material on the Web accessible to people who can't otherwise see it for example through screen readers and this type of thing.

So again, I'm not sure that we want to change this title. Maybe that's the solution. But I think it's really a question of access to the data by users rather than accessibility with regard to disability.

And then my last point was on really at the end in the possible downsides. I'm not - I think this summarizes a couple of concerns and I think responds to them well. I'm not sure all of them are accessibility concerns.

But on the last one about the proliferation of registries, and that there may be - you know, there may end up being more registries than registrars I guess is what this points out to. And we've always been living in a world where there are a lot more registrars than registries, which makes a difference in the Thick Whois environment.

It's just worth mentioning that ICANN now is committed to establishing a single - I use the word portal, but that's probably not the right word. A single place where people can go and get Whois data from all the gTLD's. This is something that was recommended by the Whois review team and is now being implemented. Chris Gift I think is the project manager on this within ICANN.

So that should be mentioned here as well. I mean, there's a mention of third-party sources - third party services to provide aggregation to Whois from multiple sources, but there's also going to be an ICANN source of that very soon. So I think that should be mentioned in that section as well.

Those are my comments on this one.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Steve. I think they're good ones.

Does - again, I don't have enough screen real estate where I am right now to be able to yank up the chart here, but don't we have a definition of this issue in the charter? And if we do, I would think we'd want to use that one rather than the issue description that's in this.

Marika - yes, I see your hand up. Go ahead.

Markia Konings: Yes. This is Marika.

What actually is in the issue description is what comes from the charter.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, I was afraid of that. So...

Markia Konings: But again, you know I don't think there's any problem in expanding on that if the working group at least filed that as part of its conversation. You know, broader issues need to be considered.

I'd just mention here that which was taken into account there. So I just think the language that (unintelligible) comes directly from the charter.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Well, why don't we take Steve's comment to heart and see if we can sharpen up that inaugural paragraph?

Another thing that Steve's comments about the last section reminded me of - and I want to put Volker on the spot on this one. Volker, did the consistency of Whois data display language get into the RAA?



Volker Greimann: By consistency you mean a format? Yes, we have a - something like that as the Whois specification. Let me just look it up and let me get back to that in a second. I'll just have to...

Mikey O'Connor: No. I - as long as it's there, I'm just not familiar with the newest one. I think we might want to see if that's also in the RAA. And if it is, then we might want to weave that in to this section as well. Just note the - you know, it's sort of like Steve noting the ICANN portal. I think we should also note the changes in the RA and RAA that also bear on this. Just parenthetically.

So - and no need to actually find it right now, Volker. I just didn't know whether it was there. Thanks.

Volker Greimann: If memory serves correct, that's one of the documents that hasn't changed from the prior comment periods.

So and the format of the Whois data as presented in the Whois should be defined now which is a I think a great gain.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes that's huge, great okay. Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, two comments. I was going to confirm that yes it's still in the RA out for comment that we have a consistent format throughout the gTLDs.

Reinforcing what Steve said I think the issue description paragraph is fine. I think the title as Steve pointed out is slightly problematic because accessibility is a code word not only in the US but also in developing economies for making sure that it's usable in multiple languages, you know, in local languages to those with disabilities and things like that.

So I think we really should change the title perhaps with an exclamation - an explanation somewhere if the word is used in the issuer report or the charter. But, you know, just have some title going forward of this section I think we

should, you know, use a term like access of Whois to users or whatever as opposed to the single word which does have specific meanings to some.  
Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Those so maybe that's the solution is just change the title.

Alan Greenberg: In my mind I think so because...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: ...you know, even if the subtitle accessibility in the current Whois environment I don't think it's bad once we've framed it in the issue description paragraph.

But the title which is going to show up in indices, you know, in table of contents I think is just slightly problematic.

And, you know, we're gilding lilies in this group. We might as well do it properly in this...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes right. I mean as long as we've got this lily under the microscope we might as well gild it properly, I agree.

Okay so maybe that's the solution to that puzzler. (Marc) go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Yes (Marc). I don't want to do beat a dead horse too much. I was just going to agree with, you know, Steve and Alan's points that, you know, accessibility does have certain connotations and we should make sure that it's clear what we mean.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes it sounds like we've definitely got that horse on the run. Rick go ahead.

Oh wait...

Rick Wesson: Yes Rick (unintelligible) speaking - yes sorry. It takes a second to...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. I know.

Rick Wesson: ...for the mute button. So I wanted to - want to support the previous comments on changing the title and two highlight that there is a policy on the.org registry which is a thick registry that limits the number of queries that can be processed from a single IP address for .org and that there is a second tier that is available - that is - that has a different limit policy that is only available to registrars.

And so if it - it's an interesting access level and policy level on access that does, you know, certainly rate limits the number of queries that one can execute against .org using a fairly granular structure of IP addresses for that policy.

And I thought that it would go nicely under this particular topic as one thick registry. The policy is kind of - it's one of the things that registrars lose is the ability to rate limit or even set policy on who has access to the Whois. And that's pretty much given to the registry and so it might be interesting to at least highlight this (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: I see what's going on there. Yes I agree that - Volker as a registrar did you track what Rick was talking about? I'm assuming you did but I just want to make sure because if you were tracking I'm curious if you would agree that maybe there needs to be an acknowledgment here that today registrars get to rate limit in thin Whois because they're the only Whois.

But in tomorrow's world with this Whois they lose that ability. Where do you sit on that? Do you think it's something that we should acknowledge and address?

Volker Greimann: You mean that we would limit access to certain IP addresses in the current system and would be able to do so in the future?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Volker Greimann: I don't think that will be a problem for registrars anymore. It will be a problem on the registry side to whether or not to impose limits on the display of the Whois. But I do not see that as a problem at this time.

I mean a Web based Whois normally does not have a limit. So we are - the only limitation that has existed in the current environment is a 443 limitation. And as Port 43 would be going away for thick Whois registries that would no longer be an issue.

Mikey O'Connor: I guess I'm thinking less about the operational issue of, you know, and more about the issue of a bad actor coming along and harvesting vast numbers of Whois records...

Rick Wesson: Like even (systems) currently today and not necessarily by bad actors.

So I think my point has been a sliding. And so for the discussion the - there's two interesting points. One is that when you move from thin to thick that the registrars lose the capability to manage query rates. And that is moved from the registrar to the registry and so all of the registrars that participate in that registry then lose that capability which goes to the registry.

From that point there is a registry that has implemented a rate limiting policy for many years which is.org. And that policy is four queries per minutes per IP address.

And so that has not stopped the wholesale harvesting of who is. It just limits. It's just a barrier to entry. And so I thought that these were reasonable examples that exists today.

Now there is a third which is what some registrars have done such as Go Daddy is probably the largest registrar to limit the amount of information that is available in the Port 43 Whois. And that references a link to click on which will bring you to a Web based interface which has a CAPTCHA.

A CAPTCHA is a mechanism used to determine whether humans are behind it or a machine. And it's through that limit that they then rate limit the detailed information that's available on that registry.

Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: I think that's useful texture to add to this. I agree.

Steve, Steve two, Steve Metalitz two, the sequel.

Steve Metalitz: I think I - if I heard Rick correctly I think I disagree with him because I don't think that the registrar that the move to thick Whois doesn't limit the ability of the registrar to rate limit its own Port 43 access to its own data through Port 43. So I'm - I mean obviously the data may be at the registry level accessible through Port 43 without rate limitations. But in terms of the data that the registrar controls they can still rate limit there.

And this maybe a somewhat academic question if the RAA is approved in its current form because in the thick Whois environment as Volker pointed out the registrars would no longer be required to have - offer Port 43 access. I guess they still could if they wanted to.

Mikey O'Connor: So Steve...

Steve Metalitz: But I don't think it - I don't think the move to thick affects the ability of the registrars to control Port 43.

Mikey O'Connor: But me go back to Rick and then to Volker and then I want to sort of dredge up what's going on than chat. So maybe I'll let Rick speak and then Volker maybe you can summarize the conversation that's going on in the chat here.  
Rick?

Rick Wesson: So to Steve's point if in a situation where registrar is - has a domain name that's registered to a thin registry the registrar's sole point of publishing the directory information, the Whois information. And so because the registrar is the sole point for that detail they are then able to rate limit the global access to that information.

In the situation where we have a registry that is thick registry the registrar then has pushed all of that same information to the registry. And it is up to the registry to limit the access to that information.

The registrar doesn't have the capability of limiting that global access right? They've transitioned that to the registrar - I mean I'm sorry, to the registry. It's our failure for getting all of these terms.

So...

((Crosstalk))

Man: I didn't hear what you just said Rick is then with the addition of the word global I agree with you. Thank you.

Rick Wesson: Yes okay. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Volker? Let's see, I've sort of lost track. Oh Volker dropped out of the queue.

Volker Greimann: I had it on mute I had - because what I wanted to say was pretty much similar to what Rick was saying.

I mean the removal of this Port 43 on the registrar level for thick Whois does not remove any access to data because the way that you would get to that data is first going to the registry and then going to the registrar in the thin environment.

And as the registry already serves as the complete data when you make that first inquiry you would never get to the registrar or need to go to the registrar.

So basically we're just eliminated redundancy that nobody actually uses.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. I assume Rick and Steve's hands are old hands. But if either of you want to speak this would be a good time to do that.

Okay anything else on this one? This is a pretty good first read. I think that maybe Marika you can take a crack at some revisions and push this out to the list and we'll discuss it and then try and finalize it next week but these are I think good comments.

Also keep an eye on the chat. The chat's pretty tasty today.

All right, so that brings us to the update on data protection. And - oh and (Don) I think is on the call. I at least see (Don)'s name in the chat.

(Don) do you want us to push your draft up on the screen for people to look at or do you want us to hold that back a bit until you all have had a chance to finalize it? If you're on the call this would be a good time to fill us in.

Don Blumenthal: Yes I'm here.

Mikey O'Connor: Good.

Don Blumenthal: Why don't we hold until next week? There's just a few tweaks to make. And then rather than fill up one of - again throw up something today that I know is going to change why don't we wait until next week when I'm sure what are the final?

Mikey O'Connor: Okay that sounds great.

That I think and sort of encapsulates the status too which is really why I put it on the agenda was just to find out sort of where we're at. And it sounds like we're darn close. But as I said at the top of the call (Don) I was a little reluctant to push out a draft that I knew was still in flux. And you've just said the same thing so I think we're on the same page there.

Then we'll look forward to the revised one next week.

Don Blumenthal: Excellent.

Mikey O'Connor: With that lets - oh we've got cost implications. Marika do you have a draft for us on that or are we in freeform mode at this point?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. This is one where we don't have a draft yet. But let me just pull up the comparison document we did so it does give a bit of a view of the positions on this topic and as well and the issues that were identified. do again just...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Marika Konings: ...that we can make a discussion about that that would give me some more material in addition to what people have submitted of course as part of the public comment forum to write something up for the next meeting.



Mikey O'Connor: Yes. That looks great. Okay so if I - I have to - okay so it's the one, two, three, fourth row in this document.

And to kind of refresh ourselves on our code this is one where the Xs can mean the opposite of what you might think.

The X does not mean opposition it means no negative impact. So we're kind of in double negative territory here.

And so the summary preliminary conclusion that we arrived at when we pulled this together was more information's needed but in principle most agree that there are - there is no negative impact expected with regard to costs from requiring Thick Whois.

And I think we had a couple of comments from NPOC, VeriSign, and the NCUC. Now can we see those in this draft? I'm mumbling sorry.

If I roll down it gets really small. I don't see any specific, go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I'm actually quickly looking through the comments. Basically because I think what you see in the second page those were issues that were specifically or specific concerns identified.

I think looking here at the comments that were submitted most were actually saying that, you know, no firsthand information to offer concerning costs implications, or we don't believe that there are any cost implications.

So most things well I think - most of the conflict indicated they don't really have a good view on whether there any significant cost. And hence as well I think that the conclusions saying that most don't really see any significant issues there but are interested to see if there is further information available to be considered.

Looking here as well for example the ALAC comments says there will certainly be a cost of transition to both the registries and as well the registrars.

Virtually all registrars already deal with thick TLDs. And the only registry operating thin TLDs are also operating - operate thick TLDs.

So there should be virtually no learning curve or software developments other than handling the actual cutover and most of those registries are already handled at .all conversion.

The current situation with the Thin Whois for the largest - for the two largest TLDs increases the cost to write all those and victimize Internet users due to the need to interact with multiple at times unreliable registrars.

And NCUC said as well we have no firsthand information to offer concerning the cost implications but look forward to reading the input of registries and registrars on this matter.

NPOC also knows that the cost implications are known by those registries who have gone through this before but some of NCUC and (AMPOC) also were hired of course at the current position involved a number of domain names that would need to be transferred or changed.

Let's see I'm just quickly reading through this and giving others the time as well to think about their comments and speak up basically think that the registrars say if change - if no change is mandated a lesser requirement to provide Whois services is changed into RAA as well.

Registrars have to carry on supporting 433 Whois services and esquiring data at their costs. And I think there are issues that already have been addressed I think for the new RAA.

I guess as well the cost will be a one-off cost mitigated by the benefits to come after no Whois 433, no escrow and uniform data.

And I think the registry comments say that any transition will have cost implications but it's not aware of any analysis that would address these issues and circumstance - all transitions do not provide useful information.

We expect that they cost primarily will be from moving information and increasing this infrastructure.

Development costs should be minimal. As a company that maintains the only remaining Thin Whois registries also manages TLDs that use a thick registry model.

The only clear cost consideration applies to individuals and organizations which use the data. A thick registry that allows a single queries for a given gTLD might obviate the need in some instances to pay for access to third party providers that aggregate registration data.

Mikey O'Connor: So I'm going to jump the gun on the (Marc) and say it looks like maybe we need some examples here people.

It sounds like everybody is sort of looking to everybody else for some data. And with that take it away (Marc).

Marc Anderson: Yes I'm good point (Stevie). And I'm kind of struggling on this one because there has to be some cost implication. You know, there's an existing state for registries that are thin.

And to get them to a fixed state involves, you know, it just doesn't happen automatically right? I mean there's some effort on the part of registries, there's some effort on the part of registrars, and then there's the actual migration of existing data hundreds of millions of records in fact.

You know, and whether that be, you know, an engineering cycle, you know, a test cycle, whether that be, you know, just person hours there's absolutely going to be some cost.

So, you know, and I don't know how to quantify that to be honest, you know, what that cost is but, you know, I don't see how we can say there won't be some cost.

Mikey O'Connor: I don't think that's what people are saying. I think what people are saying is we don't know and we're looking forward to seeing that.

So I have a proposal which is - and again sorry for you and - this is another one where the registries and registrars walk out of here with an action item.

But as a non-registry registrar type person I'm not sure that I can offer much in terms of -- I mean I can certainly offer analytical support I'm good at cost analyses -- but in terms of identifying the kinds of costs, and who incurs them, and their magnitude it seems to me that registries and registrars are in a much better position to do that.

And that we do need some work on that because to walk in with a report that doesn't have any specifics there I think is a shortcoming. Rick I'll let you talk and then sort of see what people think of my proposal. Go ahead.

Rick Wesson: Thanks Mikey. So requested speaking I think the way to look at this is that there is an externalization of cost.

And so infrastructure cost pertaining to Whois which is the cost to manage the service are externalized onto the thin registry that's becoming thick.

And so anytime that we have one of these transitions there's going to be a onetime cost for the registrars to move the data one time up to the registry.

After that it will function as all of the other thick registries do. And so there's an engineering cost for the registrars to move. And it'll be similar in the - as far as the exercise is concerned to the magnitude with .org.

On a per record basis the transition isn't necessarily - the cost doesn't apply basically from a per record basis. It's essentially the same amount of effort to move ten records as it is to move 1000 or 1 million.

And the point I think is that the servicing of Whois in managing their function is externalized to the registry.

And so if you wanted to say that there is a cost and, you know, it's some number then you would aggregate that number across the registrars and ballpark it for, you know, the registry as that is externalized to them.

And then of course you would want to discount that ballpark a certain degree because there'd be some magnitude in savings of having one entity perform all of these solutions. And so that's how I would approach looking at this particular question.

Mikey O'Connor: I think this is one where I have a question for the group. Do you guys want to do this all together or, you know, this is my kind of meat.

I love cost analyses. And would be quite cheerful at either dragging all of us through it together on a call or if some of you kind of roll your eyes and go cost accounting is not my favorite thing I'd be willing to form a little sub team to go off and stitch some of this stuff together.

I think Rick's got some great ideas and I've got some too. Who (Marc), Volker, Rick if the four of us can - made a sort of core group and tried to get a call together later this week are there other folks who would be interested in joining us?

I assume (Marc) and Volker this would be something you would want to participate in and help with but I think we do need an analysis here. I don't think we can just plunge ahead.

I'm not seeing much reaction at all (Marc)'s in. Avri's keen to listen in any way.

Rick Wesson: Sorry Mikey, Rick Wesson.

Mikey O'Connor: Go ahead Rick.

Rick Wesson: I would - I could make a call this week. I just wanted to offer one more data point is that the number for processing, handling, and managing a Whois entry or publishing one is very, very small infinitesimally small.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Yes, no I get that. I'm seeing us running out of time. Actually we are out of time. Let me do a little post to the list see if I can pull together a gaggle of folks Thursday or Friday.

I'll go into a full blown share my screen mode. And we'll do some brainstorming and pull some of this together and see if we can't at least come up with a framework of an analysis for next time.

And I think with that we'll call it a day. I was watching a lot of conversation go by in the chat. Avri do you want to take just a minute and sort of summarize where you think that wound up?

I couldn't keep track of it because I was keeping track of too many other things but maybe just a minute before we wrap up on the conversation you were having.

Pause while Avri gets off mute. No she might not be able to get off mute. Well Marika and all can you make sure that we capture that chat. There was substance going by in that and I don't want to lose that.

And with that I think we'll call it a day. See you in a week except for folks who've picked up action items and that's it for me. (Julia) you can end the recording and we'll see you in a week folks. Thanks.

Woman: Thanks Bye.

Man: Thank you.

END