

**ICANN
Transcription
Thick Whois PDP Working Group
Tuesday 08 January 2013 at 15:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Thick Whois PDP Working Group on the Tuesday 08 January 2013 at 15:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-thick-whois-20130108-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Marc Anderson – RySG
Roy Balleste – NCUC
Ray Fassett – RySG
Christopher George – IPC
Alan Greenberg – At Large
Volker Greimann – RrSG
Caroline Hoover – RySG
Mikey O'Connor – ISPCP
Jill Titzer – RrSG
Avri Doria – NCSG
Steve Metalitz – IPC
Tim Ruiz – RrSG
Carlton Samuels - ALAC
Jonathan Zuck – IPC
Don Blumenthal – RySG
Jeff Neuman – RySG
Marie-Laure Lemineur – NPOC
Amr Elsadr – NCSG

Apologies:

Frederic Guillemaut – RrSG
Susan Kawaguchi – CBUC
Iliya Bazlyankov – RrSG
Wilson Abigaba – NCUC
Susan Prosser – RrSG

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings
Lars Hoffmann
Berry Cobb
Glen de Saint Géry

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

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you so much, then. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the Thick Whois call on the 8th of January, 2013 and on the call we have Carlton Samuels, Mikey O'Connor, Alan Greenberg, Volker Greimann, Mark Anderson, Roy Balleste, Berry Cobb, Jill Titzer, Steve Metalitz, Ray Fassett, Tim Ruiz, Avri Doria, and for staff we have Marika Konings, Lars Hoffman, Berry Cobb, and myself, Glen DeSaintgery.

We have apologies from Susan Kawaguchi, Iliya Bazlyankov, Frederic Guillemaut, and Wilson Abigaba, who might join us, but later. And we have just had Chris George join us as well as Carolyn Hoover, so I think it's over to you, thank you Mikey, but may I just remind people to please say their name before speaking because it makes the transcript more accurate. Thank you so much.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Glen, and before we get to the statement of interest agenda stuff, Marika, do you make your introduction?

Marika Konings: Hi, this is Marika. No, I just wanted to introduce Lars Hoffman, who is the latest addition to the policy team and he just started yesterday, so be nice to him, please. And so he'll be following along on some of the calls. And I'm supporting just so he can, you know, learn the ropes until he's - feels confident enough to take you on by himself, so -

Lars Hoffman: Hi everybody. Thanks for letting me listen in. I'm looking forward to learning everyone.

Mikey O'Connor: Well, it's great to have you in the gang, (Lars). This is a pretty good gang, so I think it'll be fun. As you can see in the upper right part of the screen, we have an agenda. We'll sort of take the simultaneous pause to let people tell us about changes in their statements of interest and also chime in with any

changes or additions that you'd like to make to the agenda. Alright, sounds like we have a plan.

I think the first agenda item is to sort of take a quick moment to sort of update ourselves on how things are going in the sub-teams. The ones that are really active are these three. But during the holiday break, people were sort of asking, "Well, but what about me? I'd like to work on my stuff and I'm not on any of these." And so we went ahead and sort of informally established the rest of the sub-teams, just by setting up an e-mail list with pretty un-secured instructions as to what to do. But if anybody's feeling energetic, by all means, strike up a conversation and see where it leads you.

But to sort of pause and take a look at these first three just because those are the sort of active ones right now and sort of see where everybody's at and if we need anything in the way of help or (unintelligible) or anything like that. So Steve and Alan, you're the two leaders that are on the call. Susan is not with today, but do either of you guys want to give us a quick snapshot on what's going on?

Steve Metalitz: Sure, this is Steve. The authoritative sub-group got off to a fast start and had a call with a few of our members and it was followed almost immediately by a very helpful submission from Volker giving a proposed draft definition of authoritativeness, which was our first question we had to wrestle with since that's our assignment. So we had a fast start but unfortunately we haven't followed through yet. We had that meeting on December 21st and we have not had much since then.

So I'm going to try - circulate something later today. I think Volker's definition is quite good and, you know, see if we have agreement on that and then move on to a few of the other questions that had been identified. So we've gotten started but we haven't made quite as much progress as we might have. But hopefully we can get back on track now.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm going to invoke my chair-like powers and grant complete absolution for holiday-related inactivity because it's - I think it's really important -- especially at - in the ICANN world -- to take a breather and so I think it's great that you've gotten underway and look forward to seeing more stuff.

Don't forget to file away questions for our expert panel. I think Marika is going to be able to give us a little update on how that's going, but just in sort of watching the e-mail that group is coming together quite well and I think we're going to have a really good group of people who can answer questions. So don't forget that resource when you're doing your work.

Alan, do you want to take up the...

Alan Greenberg: Sure.

Mikey O'Connor: Go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Sure. I appreciate the absolution because otherwise the guilt would be bearing me down unbearably. It would just be too much of a weight on my shoulders. And I would have to have resigned, so I appreciate the absolution. We've done nothing. But I have an e-mail that I'm starting to put together to send out today and we should try to get off relatively soon.

I'm assuming -- by the way -- the mailing list was sent out with the title "Data Protection" with the one that maps the stability in data escrow. Is -?

Mikey O'Connor: I have to defer to Marika on that one.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. No, I think that and - because we already created as well the main list for the remaining -- or the other -- sub-teams. I'm assuming that the data protection one is the impact on privacy and data protection.

Alan Greenberg: Oh, then what's the one...

Marika Konings: So I think...

Alan Greenberg: So what's the one called for stability and data escrow? Because I couldn't - I didn't find one with that kind of name. That I was - that I would - was joined to, anyway.

Marika Konings: Let me just check.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm loving the chat, by the way.

Marika Konings: We have - you said stability and data escrow, right? We have (unintelligible) hyphen stability hyphen (unintelligible). You didn't get a message from that?

Alan Greenberg: I'll double check; I didn't see one but I may have missed it.

Marika Konings: It should have been sent I think on the 13...

Alan Greenberg: I'll double check; I'll let you know privately if I'm not on it.

Marika Konings: It should've been sent on the 13th of December if that makes it easier for you to find.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Okay, thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Alan.

Alan Greenberg: That's all that I have at the moment.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Well now I'm getting more cautious in my absolution granting; there's been a pretty lively chat about that, anyway. I don't have much of an update

from Susan; I know that there was some conversation going on before the break but we'll sort of pick that one up next week. I think now it's sort of over to you, Marika, to sort of give us an update on the situation with the stakeholder group and constituency statements. That's our next agenda item.

Marika Konings: Yeah, so this is Marika. As you may recall, we sent out requests for input from stake - (unintelligible) stakeholder groups and constituencies as well as other ICANN SOs and ACs before the holidays and I think we gave them as a deadline the 6th of January but also making very clear that if they need more time to develop their responses they could just let us know and then that would be no problem to provide them with additional time, however to date we've only received input from the business constituency.

Glen will be sending out some reminders to the different groups, you know, just so we can see if there are any groups that are - just haven't got around it yet but are still planning to do something and then given - give them an opportunity to actually let us know that they'll still be submitting something and maybe, you know, -- I see Alan's hands up -- but maybe some others of the different constituents are able to provide as well with some feedback if there are any groups that are still working on items.

And then I think the working groups should probably discuss, you know, how to review the feedback received. Every feed chatting with Mikey before the call, you know, we can go the traditional route and put it in a kind of public comment review tool where we break down the different items along the different topics the working group is looking at, but another approach could as well be to give the different subjects -- or based on the subjects -- that input has been provided on back to the relevant sub-teams so they will be looking at it and providing a response that the working group could then review. So I think that's all I have for now.

Mikey O'Connor: Terrific; thanks Marika. The chat is - oh, I hope we didn't lose Marika right then. You still there Marika?

Marika Konings: I'm still here and I'm actually seeing the people saying the deadline was the 9th, so apologies there. So actually people still have a couple of days but we'll be sending out a reminder nevertheless, so - to make sure people let us know or hopefully get it in by that date.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. And it -- also looking at the chat -- it looks like quite a few of the constituencies are working on something, so I think we're going to have pretty substantive comments coming in. I can print that the ISP - or not, since I'd be the one that was doing it in. I haven't even contemplated doing it, so it's great that we've got someone who wants it.

Alan Greenberg: Mikey? Mikey, it's Alan.

Mikey O'Connor: Go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, ALAC is still - we have a little bit of a discussion going whether we should just rely on our existing statements or explicitly answer these questions. We'll make a decision very quickly and -- should be decide to submit a statement -- it will be in - it'll take at least a week and a half or so, but it will be in. So I'll let you know in the next day or so what - whether we're doing one or not and what the target date is.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. And if you have -- excuse me -- if you have existing ones that you're comfortable with, just re-submit them so that it'll go back in.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, they don't (unintelligible) all of the specific questions, which is why I'm advocating that we do something, but we'll get back to you one way or another.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay, terrific. Alright. Our next one is sort of continuing the conversation about questions for the expert group. And as I look at that, you know, we've got a fair amount of activity going on in sub-groups, but I think that it's

probably not a bad idea to continue a conversation in here about that just so that if we've - and you know, I'd hate to get to the expert panel and have missed one.

On the other hand, there's sort of two approaches to this. The way that the sub-groups are running right now, the three that are active are fairly technical and so one way to do this would be to let the sub-groups come up with their questions, have a session with the expert panel that's more narrowly focused, and then leave the expert panel with the expectation that we'd like to visit with them again after we get further into the expert - into the other sub-groups. So there's a little bit of a process question; I don't want to spend a lot of time on it, but if there are questions that are on your mind that you'd like to get into sort of a first round of conversation with the experts, this would be a good time to sort of throw some out. Steve, go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, thank you; this is Steve. I'm not entirely sure that this is responsive, but I did post some questions about the pir.org registry report that was - that is one of our references. Is that the kind of thing that would go to the expert panel because the expert panel would include people that were involved in the .org transition? Or is the expert panel - I guess I'm not entirely clear what the expert panel is expert about.

Mikey O'Connor: That's a good question. You know, I think at this point anything is fair game. Basically, the reason we've formed that group was that we realized that people in the working group itself aren't necessarily people that went through the transition. And so expert panel is a phrase that I may have come up with that may not really be quite accurate. A better phrase might be something like witnesses or people who, you know, people who actually went through it that we could use to interview for either historical stuff or a technical kinds of eyes.

And so to the extent that there are questions that a group like that could answer, I think its fair game. I see chat from Don Bloomenthal saying, "Some

of the Afiliias related folks on the panel were involved in preparing the report." So I don't think that it's a bad idea to try and get an answer to your question in advance and then if we can't maybe we can quiz the people who were there at the time about what they learned. Sort of, you know, I'm in sort of, "Let's follow all avenues" mode at the moment and, you know, I'm - you know, I think it's also pretty flexible and malleable.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Well, again, just to - for those who aren't - who may not have read all the e-mail traffic the two questions, really -- one had to do with the extent to which there were discrepancies between who is data registry, who is data and registrar, who is data after the transition of .org from thin to thick -- that was one question. The other question had to do with the number of privacy complaints or complaints relating to privacy issues which were received at the time of the transition or in the year or two thereafter.

It seems as though this was supposed to be an annual report but then Don pointed out that the appendix in the registry agreement that called for it was eliminated in 2006, so there may only be at most one or two additional reports after the transition. But in any case, those are the topics and it would be - again, I think that the fact that we have a relatively large registry that actually made this transition not that long ago is a usable resource so let's -- I agree with you -- let's get as much information as we can from anybody that's got that information about that transition. But those are just two issues that were raised by the report.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. And I think that - I'll - I started documenting some of these questions, too, in the notes just so we don't lose them. Because one of the things that may make sense is to build this list of questions and send them off to the group in advance of a call and say, "Well, if you've got any documentation on these lines it would be great to get it back." And, you know, sort of keep that going.

Any other questions on people's minds that would be good ones to ask a group who were fairly close to the transitions and that? This would be a good time to brainstorm some of those up. I think the sub-groups are likely -- in their somewhat more detailed view -- are likely to produce an amount of this series of question but I don't want to get to the conversation with that group and realize that we never asked everybody else and missed some really good question. And so I think what we'll do is probably leave this item on the agenda just as a placeholder every week to keep collecting these questions and then not spend quite as much time on it in subsequent calls.

Aubrey's asking in the chat, "Is the math online?" And the answer is yes but I don't know how current it is, so I will take an action to push it up to the wiki. It's - I don't recall the structure of the wiki at the moment, Aubrey, but I know that it's up there somewhere and if you can't find it, ping me on the list and that will nudge me to send you a link that maybe other people can use. Oh, Marika's way ahead of me posting.

And the trick there is that the latest version is sitting on my computer and I took a pretty serious vacation over the holidays as well; I didn't do a status report and I didn't post the version of this that came out of the last call, so I'll jump right out onto the wiki after this call and post what I've got here so that the - yeah, 15 December sounds about right. So I'll take an action, Aubrey, to get this out, because it's pretty dusty at the moment.

Aubrey's - yeah. And I discovered that really the only effective way to look at this is through the program that created it -- the Freemind program -- I thought that something was happening that wasn't. So if you look at the web based versions that I posted they're not very good. And I'll work on that as well.

Okay. This was a remarkably short call, but I guess I'm not surprised. You know, this is sort of the get the engine running again after the holiday's call. So I can't remember now; are any of the ALAC conflicts next week? Or can

we simply meet same time, same place next week and deal with ALAC conflicts later?

Alan Greenberg: ALAC is done early the last Tuesday in the month I think. It certainly is not - it's not next week, anyway.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Alright. So we can say that next week we're going to meet at this time and publish all that.

Alan Greenberg: Yep.

Marika Konings: Yeah, and this is Marika. I think Gisella sent out the conflicting dates earlier this week and the first one I think is for the 22nd of January and then we're moving to the later time slot.

Mikey O'Connor: Alright. Let me just respond to Aubrey's question about who's on the sub-teams. She wanted to see who was on which one. I think with that - I think we're done with the agenda unless there's anything else - any other business that people want to take up I think we can wrap this one up fairly quickly and carry on. Anything else on people's minds? Alright. I think that's it. Oh, Tim is typing; I'll wait. Oh, much typing. This may be the - ah, this is the thanks Mikey series. Okay. So Glen, I think you're in charge of the call today, I think you can wrap this one up and end the recording and we'll see everybody in a week.

Man: Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks a lot.

Steve Metalitz: Thanks. Bye-bye.

Alan Greenberg: Thanks Mikey and see you next week. Hear you next week.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thanks Mikey, I'll do that.

Woman: Bye.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks all; thanks Glen.

Man: Bye.

Mikey O'Connor: Lars, this is not typical.

END