

**ICANN
Transcription
Thick Whois PDP Working Group meeting
Tuesday 26 March 2013 at 15:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of THICK WHOIS PDP Working Group call on the Tuesday 26 March 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-20130326-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Roy Balleste – NCUC
Don Blumenthal – RySG
Avri Doria – NCSG
Christopher George – IPC
Volker Greimann – RrSG
Carolyn Hoover – RySG
Tim Ruiz – RrSG
Jonathan Zuck – IPC

Mikey O'Connor – ISPCP
Marc Anderson – RySG
Rick Wesson - RrSG

Apologies:

Jill Titzer – RrSG
Susan Kawaguchi – CBUC
Marie-Laure Lemineur - NPOC
Alan Greenberg – ALAC
Susan Prosser – RrSG
Frédéric Guillemaut- RrSG

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings

Berry Cobb
Lars Hoffmann
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Go ahead with the recording.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much Ricardo. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is a Thick WHOIS PDP Working Group on the 26th of March 2013.

On the call today we have Mikey O'Connor, Chris George, Mark Anderson, Roy Balleste, Don Blumenthal, Carolyn Hoover, Jonathan Zuck, Avri Doria and Tim Ruiz.

We have apologies from Susan Kawaguchi, JillTitzer, Suzanne Prosser, Marie-Laure Lemineur, Alan Greenberg and Frederic Guillemaut.

From staff we have Marika Konings, Berry Cobb, Lars Hoffman and myself Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind all participants to please state their names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thinks Nathalie and welcome all to the call. We've got as you can see over on the right a pretty active agenda.

We're starting to get into that busy period in Working Groups that's so much fun where a lot of information's coming in and we get to review it and work on it.

So we'll just take a brief pause to see if anybody wants to add or change anything about the agenda and check in on statements of interest, any changes there?

All right then. What you see on your screen is a document that Marika circulated to the listed day or so ago and then just updated recently with a little bit of information from Michael Young.

Marika, do you want to take us through this? How do you want to proceed here?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. As you want. So basically what I've done is the feedback that was received on the (ad hoc) Expert Group mailing list I just put it into underneath the relevant questions for the different responders. And that's you see up on the screen.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Marika Konings: So don't know if you've had an opportunity to review that or, you know, or if people want to take a minute to read through it and then - because I'd say I guess one of the questions is, you know, is it sufficient information for the sub teams to, you know, continue their discussions or whether there any clarifying questions or follow-up questions that people may want to ask and then go back with to the expert group.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. I think those are the questions that were on my mind for sure.

If (Steve) isn't on the call today, do we have anybody from the Authoritative sub team on the call or are we speaking to a group that isn't here?

Mark Anderson: Mikey this is Mark.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, good you're here.

Mark Anderson: I'm on the Authoritative group but unfortunately I've missed the last meeting so I'm not sure I can give an update on that.

Mikey O'Connor: Well the status on that is that we've got - and we're going to get to that in a second on this agenda is we've got some drafts that came out of the group and Marika has created a tentative draft for the report.

And I think that maybe you'd rather than belabor this now what we probably need to do is push these responses back to the groups to make sure that they don't conflict really with the tentative draft.

You know, we've got sort of this funny timing thing where we sort of went ahead and did a draft. And I think we just need to sort of do a reality check there.

Mark could I saddle you with the job of sort of nudging this response back to the Authoritative group and...

Mark Anderson: Yes absolutely. Yes I see your point. I see what you're going for. That's not a problem at all.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I, you know, my very quick read is that it doesn't conflict a whole lot. But I would like to sort of close the loop on that.

Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I think just to agree with you, what you said Mikey I think as well having briefly looked through it seems be in line with what we've covered in the proposed section on authoritativeness as we raised there as well the issue that, you know, there may be a discrepancy but it's, you know, not necessarily a thin versus thick issue that may have already happened now.

And I think it's something that comes back as well in, I'm trying to remember now which of the sections.

I think the synchronization one. I think in that one we also raised the same topic. And I think it comes back to one of the points made by Greg who says that once the data was migrated to a Thick registry the Thick registry was for practical purposes considered authoritative and the registrar wouldn't actually point to the Thick registry to the database there as a way of avoiding any discrepancies.

And I think that's one of the elements or one of the suggestions that have been made I believe by Volker on the mailing list and something that was included or, you know, suggested on the mailing list that may be discussed further in relation to synchronization chapter or whether that would be a potential solution, you know, for addressing this problem with possible differences or discrepancies between there between data.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I think that's right. And I, you know, we also I think it was on the last call which I listened to but did participate in. I think that's where we started to make the distinction between sort of the authoritativeness in terms of where you go look for data as opposed to the responsibility for maintaining it and that the registrars are where the data comes from.

And so I think the key here is just to weave these all together so that we make sure they're consistent and if there any things that are consistent that we sort of highlight those.

So Mark if I could leave you with that action, that would be great.

Mark Anderson: Yes absolutely. I will take that back to the subgroup.

Mikey O'Connor: Terrific. Now Marika is this the - as I scroll through this wasn't it really only the responses - was this so for the Authoritative group or was there another series of questions from another group? My mind is foggy today.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. If you scroll down to...

Mikey O'Connor: Oh there we go.

Marika Konings: ...three yes. There's a question from the privacy data and protection (services).

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Let's see. Who we've got - well Don is here. Don have you had the chance to take a look at this response?

Don Blumenthal: Yes I have. Mark's on that subgroup also.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh good.

Don Blumenthal: To be honest my first reaction was I'm really disappointed as so few responses we got.

And the people who answered in some ways are the least likely to have knowledge in this area. I was hoping we'd get more from people like Chuck and Howard who are more the legal/policy side.

The response is to do a quick and dirty summary didn't surprise me which is that the issues really weren't looked at very closely.

Mikey O'Connor: Well sometimes, you know, a nonresponse is what you get. And...

Don Blumenthal: Yes I know but it doesn't help the cause given some of the discussions on our phone calls.

Well maybe it helps.

Mikey O'Connor: Well...

Don Blumenthal: I don't know. So the one thing I did have a question about is the last paragraph of the document there. I'm not quite sure what (Christopher) means here about rate limiting sell out of discomfort. Is he saying that it's not used or it is used?

Mikey O'Connor: Well that's a good question. You know, the last paragraph for Michael Young sort of...

Don Blumenthal: Okay that's - I apologize.

Mikey O'Connor: ...response to that.

Don Blumenthal: ...wrong document...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes well the one on the screen has got Michael's common in there. And I think he...

((Crosstalk))

Don Blumenthal: (Unintelligible) over to the screen.

Mikey O'Connor: That's right. You're using that cool new toy on your tablet.

((Crosstalk))

Don Blumenthal: (Unintelligible) or Mikey could you scroll down again?

Mikey O'Connor: I think you have control.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: I could - I can - I'll tell you what, I'll force everybody's stuck on the end now.

Don Blumenthal: All right.

Mikey O'Connor: I just took control for second. I'm going to release control now so hopefully others can scroll up and down again.

But, you know, what Michael was sort of saying was that they started thinking about rate limiting and then they sort of backed off.

Don Blumenthal: Okay. All right I...

Mikey O'Connor: All right, go ahead.

Don Blumenthal: No. Read this here.

Mikey O'Connor: Hotel you what. I'll let you read for a second Don and all go to Mark while you're doing that and then we'll circle back to you. Mark, go ahead.

Mark Anderson: Hey Mikey it's Mark. I was just going to - I remember there being a, you know, somebody correct me if I'm wrong but wasn't there a component of org where they are supposed to develop a bulk WHOIS service but ended up in not offering that? I think this is what that refers to.

And then, you know, I think, you know, it's not that they - I think they did develop a rate limiting service. I suspect, you know, most people have rate limiting service on WHOIS to one degree or another. But I think that's what this is referring to.

You know, Michael says we developed the rate limiting service in both the interest of technical control and mitigation of DDoS as well as the discouraged active data mining of WHOIS. So I think that's, you know, that's probably a fairly, you know, important point that, you know, rate limiting is, you know, one of the ways that you can discouraged data mining with the WHOIS service. That's all I was going to comment now.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I said think that certainly reads consistently with the way I read it.

I'm going to throw something in from the Chat and then I'll circle back to Don.

(Roy) commented that he looked also at the responses on data protection. And in his opinion the expert panel cannot it seems answer data protection laws with certainty because it lacks an expert in European law in particular data protection law. And Tim chimed in with agreeing with that.

Don back to you. I don't want to really spiral into a data protection discussion. I mostly want to get a sense as to whether we need to take another step with the experts and if so what that next step would be. Back to you Don.

Don Blumenthal: Yes just real briefly. Yes I agree. And I think one of the commenters said that yes (Keith) wasn't there. You know, the thing is I think when you're talking to the experts were talking about expertise on what the law was ten years ago.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Don Blumenthal: In any event but yes, now I, like I said, I just was just not clear on what (Christopher) was saying there. Michael's correct.

You know, we do rate limiting on WHOIS queries. And I don't think we ever offered that service.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Okay well I think I'm going to leave this topic and I'm going to leave you Don with sort of the same action I've left Mark with which is to take these back to the group and see A, how they weave back into discussion and B, whether there any follow-on questions that you want to put to the group.

Don Blumenthal: It's already cut and pasted into an email that's ready to go...

Mikey O'Connor: All right.

Don Blumenthal: ...for tomorrow.

Mikey O'Connor: Good deal. Okay. Well unless there something else that people want to draw out of these comments I kind of want to push on through this pretty full agenda into the draft that we've circulated on the list so sort of last call on these comments from the expert group.

And I'm not seeing any hands so we'll move on then to the - whichever one Marika puts up first, probably authoritativeness but I'm not sure. Yes, there's authoritativeness.

Now these just to replay the bidding, have been discussed once, these drafts have been discussed once on the call last week.

And I - it's sort of my sense that in many cases what we're doing is we're reviewing them mostly to check to see whether the changes that were suggested last week made it into the draft made it into the draft correctly and hopefully getting close to being able to approve them.

Marika you want to refine my understanding?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Just to clarify that it's only this draft that was discussed at the last week's meeting as well as the stability one.

But on the stability one I think there was only one comment that I still had a question I had on one of the edits that was specific for - specifically for a request.

And I've reached out to him but I haven't heard back yet. And that's why I haven't circulated that draft again.

But this one is the only one that was reviewed last week. And indeed that change is marked in here updates on last week's discussion.

The other drafts are actually new drafts based on the reports from the sub team and/or the discussions from last week's meeting.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. So I'm going to push us pretty fast through this first one because the sense that I got at least from listening to the call last week -- I'm sorry was unable to make it -- is that we're pretty close on this.

And so unless there's something that leaps out at people or if you missed last week's call and there's something that you seeing for the first time I'd like to give this one the tentative approval with the understanding that then we would - I'm thinking - and I'm sort of inventing this as I go that maybe what we do is rather than circulate all of these to the list individually for consensus that we simply put it in a pile of report draft for now.

And then when we get all the sections done I think it will be easier for us to go through them all together and iron out inconsistencies and drive towards consensus.

So I'm not going to try and go through the whole formal release followed by a week on the list followed by formal consensus process here if that's okay with folks. So I am sneaking that in on you. Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. In relation to this specific draft one comment and I do have is, you know, know we added on, you know, the UDRP and the fact that in the case of the UDRP registrar's WHOIS data is treated as authoritative.

And there was actually one comment as well in the feedback we received from the expert panel from Greg Aaron that I think observes that same thing that is basically, and he's basically wondering whether ICANN should

consider whether change is warranted to the UDRP rules knowing that if the TLD is Thick then the registry is authoritative source of data.

So this may be a question or, you know, a possible conclusion that, you know, if there would be at the end of the day a recommendation for Thick WHOIS that that may be one of the elements that you may want to suggest or consider that's also addressed at the same time.

And maybe that's something that already should be called out here noting that, you know, it is being treated differently currently in the UDRP but that there should be consideration of possibly changing that should there be a requirement or, you know, possibly requiring that for existing TLDs all right or something like that.

So just to know that that's a point you may want to discuss a little bit more.

Mikey O'Connor: Well I listened to that discussion on last week's call and was sitting there sort of nodding and saying yes, that sounds like a good idea and that maybe what we ought to do is a section of the report that says pretty much what you just said Marika which is that this is essentially outside of our brief but that this question came up during our discussion and it would be a good thing for the GNSO to consider.

Is that sort of where you were headed in terms of how to structure that? Does this sentence need to be expanded to do that or do we do another little section of the report?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. The question I would have is whether, you know, the Working Group could also say based on our review of, you know, authoritativeness as we've observed, you know, as requested in our charter we note that currently there is a discrepancy as, you know, for the UDRP and registrar data is considered authoritative instead of registry data which we believe should be the case in Thick gTLD s or something like that.

So therefore we recommend that this is addressed. And I think that we can leave it up whether that sufficient already address it through this way or whether indeed it requires a further, a PDP or a separate initiative but, you know, would basically clearly state what your intent is.

And I think that we can have further discussions on how that should be addressed or in which way.

You know, just speaking off the cuff here I don't know if it's something that's part of this PDP we could require or that - whether that should be something that is put into the UDRP review which is already scheduled to take place and I think one or two year's time.

So there is already an effort that could look at that if needed or whether, you know, this would be sufficient to address that already now.

Mikey O'Connor: I think the way to handle this is, you know, (Lars) or somebody could run back to the transcript.

I think the sentence that you stated a minute ago was pretty close with the caveat that I'm not sure that we would want to necessarily recommend that it be done but simply say this looks like an inconsistency to us and that somebody ought to take a look at it.

I'm not sure that it's in our brief to recommend changes to the UDRP but simply to notice it and say yes this is very interesting and something that needs to be looked at.

Tim I see that you're agreeing with Marika as I think I am. Are you okay with my somewhat hesitant posture on recommending things or are you thinking that we could go ahead and recommend as well?

Tim Ruiz: This is Tim. I think I'm okay either way. I think if we do say, you know, that we recommend something that what we recommend is that the GNSO take a look at it, not that we would necessarily recommend, you know, anything specific but just that, you know, noting the inconsistency there that it is something the GNSO should look at however we word it.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. I think we're all sort of sitting on the same page here. Does anybody disagree with that idea? This would be a good time to jump in if you do.

So far I think what we've got is pretty strong agreement in this conversation at least between me and Marika and Tim.

And I think it was also a pretty strong agreement on the last call too.

So Marika does that give you enough to work on in terms of vamping up this draft a little bit?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. What I may be trying to do is indeed add that specific recommendation as, you know, a number one recommendation. Because I guess there may be others as we go through the different drafts that, you know, come up.

And then I think at the end when we have all the drafts together we can decide whether these belong indeed in these specific sections or whether we call out a, you know, a separate chapter in which we list then all the recommendations that flow from our discussion and review of the different items.

So and but that's a way yes, actually to record them at least here and then we can decide at a later stage on whether, you know, where they actually belong or fit best.

Mikey O'Connor: Perfect. That sounds great to me.

Anything else on this draft? You know, I think this one's been pretty well reviewed and, you know, it was discussed pretty extensively on the last call and I thought that the changes captured that discussion.

So this is sort of a last call on this one for a while. We'll by (Steve) a beer and carry on.

Okay I think the next - what's the next one Marika that you want us to take a look at?

The escrow, all right, let me just make this big enough that I can read it.

Now this one doesn't see many changes at all. It's the one that we pretty much - go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. So this is actually it's a new draft. So this is actually based on what Alan submitted to the Working Group. And then we had, you know, reviewed sort of the proposed responses from Alan, had some additional discussions.

And so basically that is what you see here on the screen. So this is really a newer work draft that hasn't been reviewed in its current state.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Now I get it. Thanks Marika.

I'll get to you in a second Don. We just - I listened to the discussion about this on the call last week as well.

And the sense that I got was that there was pretty strong agreement and that, you know, the one sort of topic area for discussion is the points that was raised by the registrars which is that it's really embedded in the last paragraph that says, you know, at some point given the structure of things

not necessarily in the context of this Working Group it might be a really good idea to take a look at the need for registrar escrow in a completely Thick environment.

And with that over to you Don.

Don Blumenthal: Well you caught me just as I was looking for that hand up and down control just (to take) my hand down.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I think you're at the end and as, you know, following on from the previous discussion because we do here have again another recommendation (unintelligible) as you said to, you know, explore the implications of (to) data as far as whether that should be changed or not.

So maybe again this is one that we then call out specifically on then at a later point decide whether it belongs near the chat or whether, you know, sometimes we just group them all together as well in one place so people can review all the concrete recommendations that have come from the Working Group's deliberations.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. I think that's right. So we'll do that too again putting this one on the pretty well reviewed pretty much agreed pile and then sort of leave that continuity presentation question for another day once we've got a complete set of these.

Other any other reactions to this? Again this one was discussed a fair amount on the last call. And at least my sense in listening to it was that there was pretty solid agreement. So I'm teetering on putting this one in the also reviewed enough for now pile.

And I'm not seeing any hands. So I think we'll do that and move on to the next one which is synchronization. Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings: So this is Marika. So maybe to explain here as well, so basically this is also based on the input that was received from Susan and the work her step team had done on that and but then in addition we had some discussions on the call but then there were also some follow-up emails on the mailing list.

So I've tried to integrate all of that into the document you see on the screen.

And as I pointed out in my email as something that I haven't really incorporated here yet but it may be something that I think is something to working but I've noted as an observation but I don't know if the Working Group wants to make a strong recommendation out of that is a possible solution to a draft increased risk for inconsistencies by removing the Registrar 443 requirements.

So I don't know - I think that's a specific item the Working Group may want to discuss further whether that's going to be specific recommendation or more of a discussion point that is left in here or - so I think that's the main item.

And then there's also one comment still on the (multi-mass replication) that I've put forward to rate to ensure that we have the right reference here.

But I think as people observed it was also relevant for this discussion so we also highlighted that part here.

Mikey O'Connor: Let's do those one at a time. It sounds like we've got two to talk about, the port 43 one first and then the I remember a conversation about the multi-master replication last week that was sort of leaning in the direction of saying...I'm not sure we need to specify with that degree of granularity the kind of replication that needs to be done but let's spend a second on port 43 for awhile.

Does anybody - Volker were you sort of carrying the lead on that conversation? My guess would be that it was you but I can't really remember. Maybe either you or Tim or anybody else on the registrar side could kick us off on that.

Volker Greimann: You mean the registrar port 43?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Volker Greimann: Yes that is a bit of a pet project of ours because we don't really believe that it's needed. Port 43 cannot be mirrored at least as I as a technical layman know it cannot be mirrored from the registry so that would be one entry point for inconsistencies to develop.

As the registry is already providing port 43 and as the registrar will not be appointed that by the registry I don't think there will be much demand for registrar port 43 and it's just a risk factor and a cost factor as well let's be honest. So that's something that we would very much like to see gone for the thick WHOIS.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay and then Tim jumped into the queue. I'll let Tim go next and then swing around to others. Go ahead Tim.

Tim Ruiz: Yes this is Tim. I think something that was in the experts' comments on authoritativeness is important and that's that sort of for thick registries I think I believe most registrars are actually - when their port 43 is queried -- and this is in the case of GoDaddy -- for example if you query GoDaddy for a WHOIS on a .org domain name to our port 43 we simply pass that request onto the registry and then pass the response back to the requester. So what they're really getting is WHOIS from .org.

So if that's the case, if that's what most registrars are doing as the experts seem to indicate for thick registries then in reality synchronization really isn't an issue in that case once the transitions have been made. And then that of course brings into question whether the registrar's port 43 is really necessary other than for continuity's sake, you know, on applications on the edge that need to be taken into consideration given it takes time sometimes for those kind of changes to be made in other applications that had relied on it.

So in some ways I think you might look at synchronization in a similar manner as we look at authoritativeness. It may be something that in the long run takes care of itself.

Rick Wesson: Rick Wesson joining. My apologies for being tardy.

Mikey O'Connor: No worries, welcome to the gang. So Tim raises an interesting choice here. I mean, what this is starting to turn into is another one of those recommendations for others to think about kind of recommendation is sounds to me. And what Tim brought into to the what I thought was a pretty good summary from Volker is the compatibility with applications at the edge question.

I think if we extracted from the transcript the two comments, the one from Volker and the one from Tim, we would have a pretty good description of the issue and the questions to be puzzled through for another one of these no this isn't a showstopper for the thick WHOIS discussion but it's an interesting finding that others may want to look at in the future section. So I'll go to Marika. Tim is that a new hand or is that an old one up? I'll go to Marika and watch yours.

Tim Ruiz: It's an old one, I'm sorry. I'll put it down.

Mikey O'Connor: No worries, no worries. Go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. This is just to point out that we do have as well as a separate topic the registrar port 43 WHOIS requirement as a specific topic to look at and we did receive as well as specific comments on that. So as we consider this and I'm not necessarily suggesting that we may be do that today, but there are some observations and points that were made as well by some of the other groups that had commented.

I mean, several had actually expressed that they didn't have any specific view at this time but I think partly as well there in some of the comments there seems to be a misunderstanding between registrar 43 or port 43 access and the Internet based WHOIS access where some believed that this actually is to eliminate both while I think upon Volker's suggestion while it would only eliminate the port 43 requirement but leave the web access requirement in place which may be something to discuss with the different groups and indeed see if that would be an acceptable solution or whether there's still large concerns.

Because for example the IPC raises that they believe that redundancy is a feature and another (unintelligible) if the goal is to maximize reliable access to WHOIS data. They also know that it's currently also required for existing thick gTLDs so presumably there has been a reason to do so.

I saw in the comments I think from the registries that they actually know I think the other side of the coin which I think the registrars observed or the comments made by (unintelligible) cost savings I think they actually know that maintaining registrar port 43 access will help to call WHOIS server calls for thick registries to the extent that queries are directed at registrar systems. So I think there are both sides of the coin that need to be considered.

So just a note that several groups did provide input there so we're to hear some further feedback on this proposal and possibly discuss this further as part of a review of that specific topic.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I think that's a perfect example of where we want to try and get the first draft of these things done quickly and then start ironing out the inconsistencies or the overlaps between them. Because I think one of the points that Tim raised that's really interesting to me is this notion that port 43 requests are simply passed onto the registry and then echoed back but they're accessible via the registrar. That's a different kind of critter in a way than actually a full blown port 43 WHOIS access system. So maybe what we do is we take all of this, summarize it and then drop into the port 43 discussion which is as Marika correctly notes coming up.

Anything else on port 43 stuff before we move onto the one other change? And it's great to have you on the call Rick. We wanted to talk a little bit about multi-master replication which is on Page 2 of this one. And I think that the - in listening to the conversation last week the sense that I got was that we maybe didn't need to get this specific but maybe acknowledge that there are ways that this could be done and perhaps mention this as one of them. But there wasn't much in a way of appetite in the group certainly to specify how this be done but at most sort of acknowledge that there is a variety of ways to accomplish this.

So is that sort of the sense of the group? Marika did you want to jump in on that?

Rick Wesson: Mikey if I could...

Mikey O'Connor: Rick I heard you. Go ahead Rick.

Rick Wesson: Sorry I'm not actually in front of a laptop to raise my hand. So I think you hit the nail on the head. I really like the way that you put that in that I can certainly provide some language to the list so that you have some documentation on what multi-master is and that it's been around for a long time and deployed in many applications. People don't necessarily know about it. But I don't think that we should specify that this is the case. I don't think

that we should actually use this mechanism but that it exists and that's it's an option is very reasonable to put into the report I think.

Mikey O'Connor: I think that we're close. I'll read you the language we've got now Rick. Right now it says, "Others pointed out that this risk can also be mitigated by making use of multi-master replication." And then there's a footnote that points to a Wikipedia article which we might want to take a look at.

And I think that the way to kind of get to the place I'm at is to say others pointed out that this risk can also be mitigated by making use of techniques such as multi-master replication and then I think we're in pretty good shape.

Mark go ahead.

Rick Wesson: I think we're just refining the edge of the particular idea and that multi-master shouldn't actually be deployed as a technology. I think that having the registrar communicate to the registry this information which they have been doing for years in the thick registries as well as CPP was designed for this provides all of the mechanisms and really this comment is to enumerate an issue that was identified as a risk but I would be hard pressed to advocate for its implementation.

Mikey O'Connor: Cool all right. Mark you're next.

Mark Anderson: Hi Mikey it's Mark. I'm stressed that this comment seems a little out of place in that it seems to be related to escrow and I think escrow is where it applies. It says well while the registrar would still have in escrow the data synchronization issues would be removed, I'm not sure synchronization is the right place for this. I believe and it would apply to escrow in cases where if you have registrar and registry escrows that are inconsistent, you could use multi-master replication techniques to reconcile the differences but I think the synchronization, I don't know, I don't think synchronization is the place to

make this comment. I think this is more for escrow. That's my understanding of the issues in previous discussion.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm going to cogitate about that. Jonathan is going away in the chat here saying oh he's got to scoot. Well never mind. I think you're reading it...

Rick Wesson: Mikey for escrow there's a simple scenario that timestamp wins and so whatever the latest, most recent timestamp is the most recent version.

Mikey O'Connor: Let me read you a little more of the paragraph Rick since you can't see it. I've got to figure out how to go far enough back to capture the whole thought. I think maybe what we've got is a drafting puzzler here.

In thick -- I'm going to go back a couple of sentences -- in this registries inconsistencies between the registrar WHOIS and the registry WHOIS may arise as such modifications are not necessarily transmitted to the registrar. Effectively registries and registrars could conceivably output completely different WHOIS data. It's suggested that this could be fixed by removing port 43 WHOIS requirements for registrars and thick registries. While the registrar would still have and escrow that data the synchronization issue would be removed. Others pointed out that this risk could also be mitigated by making use of multi-master replication.

I think what we should do is send this one back for a redo because I think what's happened is we've tangled up two or three concepts in one paragraph and I don't think they quite flow correctly. I think Mark you're right. Some of these things - I don't think that there's disagreement, I just don't know that we've written this clearly yet. Anyway that's sort of my take on it.

Tim you're next.

Tim Ruiz: Yes I guess and not that I'm promoting one concept over another but I just think too that one of the - one way that the issue solves itself is that if as I

said or as the experts seem to indicate registrars are just simply querying the registry for WHOIS data then what is the purpose of the registrars maintaining a separate set of data if it's just a duplicate. I mean really all we've done then is escrowed the registry data with the registrars.

Maybe there's some advantage to that but it could also just simply be solved by the registry escrowing its data maybe in multiple locations so that there's some backup copies or whatever. And I'm not sure we really gain anything by the registrar being required to maintain a set of WHOIS data that it also escrows. And maybe whether we decide that's the case or not it isn't necessarily necessary and so I just would hope that we wouldn't just assume that that's what the situation is going to be but that we make sure that we look at all the other possibilities.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I think in terms of...

Tim Ruiz: And just one other quick comment: that doesn't necessarily suggest port 43 goes away or doesn't go away because it could still be available in either case even if it's just registrars passing the request onto the registry and mirroring their response.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I'm getting pretty keen on my idea that this one needs a redo because I think it's just awkward drafting that draws some things together in ways that I don't think we intended to.

Rick has a comment that says in the case of this registry there is no option for data unsent to the registry to be archived and registrars escrow.

Rick Wesson: So Mikey what I'm -- I'm finally in...

Mikey O'Connor: Welcome to Adobe.

Rick Wesson: My apologies for being late again. So the point I'm trying to make is that for data to be committed to -- in the thick model -- to be committed to the registrars data that would be escrowed, it would also be required to be transmitted to the registry. So there's no opportunity for in the thick model a registrar to have data that is present in their escrow data than the registry because it has to be transmitted to be essentially committed, right, to be published.

So in the thick model there's a prerequisite that the data has to be transmitted to the registry before it is committed. And so there isn't an opportunity for a registrar to have data that would be more authoritative that is in escrow that is not at the registry. Does that make sense? Maybe a little flow diagram would...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I was thinking that. A little flow diagram would be neat. I think that that would...

Rick Wesson: It's kind of an impossible situation is what I'm getting at.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes and I think that the other thing that's going on in this draft is that we are co-mingling escrow issues, port 43 issues and synchronization issues all in the same paragraph and I think those need to get pulled apart just a little bit.

I'm going to chop this one off with Volker unless somebody's just totally beside themselves because we are getting close to the top of the hour and I want to move along. But can I push this one back to somebody for another try at drafting? Marika do you want try your hand at untangling this conversation? Do you want one of us to do that? How do you want to proceed there? It looks like Volker's sticking up his hand.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Oh okay. Well hang on Volker and then we'll get to you in a second but let me get to Marika first.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I was actually hoping that Volker was volunteering to help with that because I think it was actually (unintelligible) I took from his e-mail on this topic so I would definitely welcome the help.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay Volker over to you.

Volker Greimann: Well I would like to agree first that probably it would make sense to pull all these different topics apart and make it more clear where we are heading with the synchronization topic. I also would agree with Rick that the registrar's data is always of less importance than the registry data. Of course when a customer makes a correction to his data then that data would be fresher but if it's not in the registry yet then it would be just a pending change, not an authoritative at least in my view.

But in my view it would still be helpful if the registrar held onto and escrowed the data simply to take care of possible registry failure. We've seen that in a ccTLD one or two years ago where they had a data crash and requested all the registrar data back from the registrars because they simply did not have that data anymore.

I agree that this would be less of a danger with an escrow system but you never know so I think just having a duplicate copy somewhere be that with the registrar makes sense as another layer of security.

Mikey O'Connor: Tim just came back in the chat saying isn't that the purpose of registries escrowing data? I'm kind of - this is a great conversation but we're just flat out of time.

Could I ask maybe Tim, Volker, Rick to sort of push some e-mail back and forth and see if you can come up with sort of a diagram of this and a

summary of this conversation because I think it's really great conversation but we're just out of time.

I'm going to kind of leave that hanging. I'm going to leave Volker you with the action to see if you can kind of drive something forward on that. Is that okay with you?

Volker Greimann: If I had the time I would gladly volunteer.

Mikey O'Connor: I know you're busy. I know you're busy.

Volker Greimann: I have a day job as well.

Mikey O'Connor: I know and I know you've got other stuff going on besides this working group.

Volker Greimann: Yes I'll be available for assistance for questions and I can help drafting but I simply won't have the time to take the lead on this sorry.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Does anybody want to take...? Who was the - was this one of Alan's? I forget who's leading which piece. Alan's not on the call. He almost volunteered me to do something on the last call.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. It's actually Susan's I believe -- Susan Kawaguchi's.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh okay. I tell you what, we are out of time. Let's leave this one as something that needs to get fixed. If anybody wants to volunteer I would be eternally in debt but I need to push this along to a question about next week's call and so rather than belabor this now I think we've arrived at the point of knowing this needs work. We'll put it on the needs work pile. It may slide out past Beijing to actually get that worked on but so be it.

The last question on the list is next week's meeting. And the question for you on the call using your little green checkmark is whether - green checkmark

means yes you're available and willing to meet next week, no checkmark means no I'm traveling or I'm overwhelmed with holiday or something or red - Marika's using red no I'm not available. So green means yes I can do a meeting next week, red means no I don't think so.

And I'm getting a smiley face from...I have a feeling that next week is at risk. That's the reason I'm asking. Tim can do it, Volker can do it, (Lars) can join us. I'm tempted to try just because these conversations are so good and every time we have one we move the ball a little bit further forward and I'm getting a few companions. Let me see, people are typing. Let me just see what pops up in the chat real quick.

Caroline's okay. She's trying to do...Chris can...Okay I think we've got enough checkmarks to go ahead and hold the call. We will do it knowing that Marika's traveling and that Roy can't join us and others probably will run into the same thing. But it's a whole week, it's a whole opportunity to talk that's otherwise missed.

So in answer to your question Marika before the call yes, we'll go ahead and meet next week. And I think given that it's two minutes till the top of the hour we'll call it a day for today but I'm liking this conversation a lot. It sounds like we're pretty much in agreement along the way here.

At some point we are going to have to circle back around to the state of protection privacy one. It shows up in the work plan last but that's just an artifact of the work planning. And I don't want to get all the way down to the wire and then find that we have a giant disagreement that's hard to resolve.

So the data protection folks on your call tomorrow if you could start thinking about at least describing the issues and places that you're finding it hard to arrive at agreement in a tentative way, I think that's important. So I'll leave that last action item with Don. And with that I'm going to wrap the call up.

Oh Marika's got her hand up. Hang on a minute. Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika, just a very brief point. On the last note of course something that will need to be considered as well what's on the agenda for the session in Beijing and maybe indeed the privacy and data protection topic may be a good one to discuss face to face.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh that would be good. Yes that's a thought. So all the more reason for the team to start framing up the issue as they it right now.

Okay that's it, see you in a week. Safe travels all. Bye-bye.

Woman: Bye.

Man: Bye.

Man: Have a good Easter or whatever.

Woman: Thanks very much (unintelligible).

END