

**Vertical Integration Analysis Sub Team
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 26 April 2010 at 18:30 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Vertical Integration Analysis Sub Team meeting on Monday 26 April 2010 at 1830 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-vi-analysis-20100426.mp3>

On page:

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

Jothan Frakes
Volker Greimann
Berry Cob
Mikey O'Connor
Richard Tindal
Alan Greenberg

Staff:

Gisella Gruber-White
Mike Zupke

Absent Apologies:

Jean Christophe Vignes
Roberto Gaetano
Margie Milam

Absent:

Rahman Khan
Phil Buckingham
Jahangir Hossain
Keith Drazek
Steve Pinkos
Ken Stubbs
Brian Cute

Coordinator: Thank you for standing by. Today's conference call is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. If you need assistance during your call, please press star then 0. You may begin.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you, sorry about that, Mikey, I'll just quickly go through who's on the call and then I'll leave it all over to you.

Mike O'Connor: Gisella, at the end of that, if you want to drop off the call and just send me the meeting view gizmo, I can do the meeting view stuff.

Gisella Gruber-White: No worries, (unintelligible), I've got another call that starts in 15 minutes, so I'll be monitoring this in any case if anything happens...

Mike O'Connor: Okay.

Gisella Gruber-White: Just to let you know that on today's Vertical Integration Analysis Team on Monday, the 26th of April, we have Berry Cobb, Volker Greimann, Mike O'Connor, Richard Tindal; from staff, we have Mike Zupke, myself, Gisella Gruber-White. We have apologies from Jean Christophe Vignes, from Margie Milam. And Roberto Gaetano might try and call and if he doesn't, he sends his apologies over to you, Mikey.

Mike O'Connor: And really over to you, Berry.

Berry Cobb: Okay...

Mike O'Connor: Let me just do that little spiel that I did before we started the recording, just to get that on the recording.

Berry Cobb: Yep, go for it.

Mike O'Connor: So the goal of the VI Working Group to get the consensus around something. And I've been brainstorming with Roberto on lots of different vehicles to get

us there. That's where the poll came from, that's where the proposal stuff came from, the matrix - Mike, it's great to have you on the call - came from.

And this analysis team is another one of those ideas. The thought behind the analysis team was to come up with a framework that's outside of the advocacy framework by which we might be able to shed more light on the consensus stuff.

So if this works, terrific. If it doesn't, you have the ever-present option of blaming me for it not working, so this is sort of my idea. And so I don't want you to feel a huge amount of pressure to live up to. If we can come up an additional lens by which we can evaluate consensus and ideas that are going into proposals, that's fantastic.

If it turns out that simply going through the chunks of the proposals the way Mike has started to break it apart and find consensus that way, that's fine as well. So consider yourselves sort of lab rats in way. You're part of an experiment and the sky's the limit.

So there was my rant; that was said before the recording started and I'll wind down. Berry, back to you.

Berry Cobb: All right, thank you, Mikey. I concur, you know, basically, you know, my whole goal for this was to definitely create some sort of analytical tool, if you will, by which we can evaluate these.

Mike O'Connor: You know, he was doing so well and then he dropped off the call.

Coordinator: It's (Alan) here, proctor in the call. Is there an Acrobat session for this?

Berry Cobb: Not right now.

Coordinator: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: Yeah, I put myself on mute because I'm in a breezeway and that's the only quiet place I can have around here without losing a signal. So anyway, I agree, I was, you know, we're trying to find some sort of method or tool by which, you know, we can put these - align these things right next to each other and see where the gaps are essentially.

You know, several of them all have components that address co-ownership, as an example, whereas others may not have areas that - I'm sorry, I'm going to put myself on mute again.

Mike O'Connor: While you're on mute, Berry, I'm going to throw a question to Zupke. And this is one for you to consider, Mike. What would the possibility of chopping off the columns on the matrix that you've built and just send us the categories that you've identified, so that you're not revealing the answers yet until you've had a chance to talk to proposers. But you could share the framework with us.

Mike Zupke: Yeah, you know, I think we could do that. You know, I think my own kind of personal concern is that showing, you know, having the columns that show each of the proposer's sort of alignment with each of the issues helps to show that there's consensus and where it is. I think if you just look at the columns or the main column with all of the different sort of - the concepts or the issues that each of the proposers puts forward, I - it looks a little daunting to me. I mean, because there are areas where there's sort of subtle disagreement.

And you know, I mean, I'm happy to that. The other thing is that, you know, I think that, what, three or four proposals came in in the last day or so and none of those were reflected there. So it could be that there's a lot less similarity than there was when I showed you the thing last week. So it's going to take me a little bit of time to add the extra rows for each of those, you

know, potentially new concepts or principals that are - that need to be reflected in it, if that makes sense.

Mike O'Connor: Yeah, it does. Do you have a sense of timing on when you think you're going to be able to get out to the proposers and back? Because you're suddenly kind of the critical path, you lucky dog.

Mike Zupke: Yeah.

Mike O'Connor: And I didn't intend this to happen but that's what happens on projects, is suddenly somebody gets stuck in the hot seat and I'm just curious as to what your sense in terms of timing is.

Mike Zupke: Yeah, well, you know, I don't - I mean, I don't think it has to take a lot of time, it's, you know, people would stop proposing stuff that would be helpful. You know, but actually in seriousness - and this is kind of, you know, I mentioned this to you in my email last week.

And I think there's kind of this sense among the large group right now that we're looking at proposals as potential alternatives and that we're going to settle on one and the group is going to sort of, you know, pick at that and try to tweak that one proposal.

And so you know, my own personal idea would be that instead of looking at these as alternatives, that we would, you know, take this matrix that, you know, that I've been working on and say, okay, here are all the individual concepts among all the proposals that have been put forward. Let's stop looking at them as individual proposals but instead say, here is a concept that, you know, me as a member of a working group that I can get behind and that maybe there's consensus around.

And so you know, I mean, I think - unless new things are being proposed - and it looks like actually, you know, this thing that came from Jon Nevett and

Jeff Neuman actually addresses some issues that I think, you know, we're kind of in the numbers before, talking about resellers and talking a little bit more in detail about backing registry offers. I think that those are things that are good to have, you know, good to talk about. But I think that - and to the extent that people are proposing things that are, you know, in alignment with previous things, I think that, you know, it will kind of slow us down or sort of bog down the processing of them.

So I, you know, I put the question in chat, sort of toward the end of the call. But maybe, you know, sort of - I'm not in charge of shutting the door. But maybe if there were a way to sort of say, okay, you know, speak now or forever, you know, put this in your, you know, in your discussions later but not in the form of a proposal. I think that might be helpful.

((Crosstalk))

Mike O'Connor: Well, I think the way out of this conundrum is that if we - I think what Roberto was talking about, he was better at articulating that than me, is that pretty soon the concept of proposal starts to disappear.

Mike Zupke: Right.

Mike O'Connor: And what we need in order to shift people from, you know, proposals is what's working at the moment and so that's the vehicle that people are using. And that's why I think the matrix is so important, is because I think once the matrix is there, then what people will do is they will start proposing rows for the matrix if they don't see one.

Mike Zupke: Right.

Mike O'Connor: And then they'll start lobbying for positions on the rows. And that's why you're in the hot seat, is because I think once your matrix gets out there, the proposals will stop.

Mike Zupke: Yeah, so it's kind of a vicious circle right now, you know, I'm trying to...

Mike O'Connor: Well, you know, one way to do it...

Mike Zupke: (Unintelligible).

Mike O'Connor: Yeah, I mean, one way to do it is not to go out to all the proposers, you know, I mean, I would bequeath upon you some co-chair privilege to go out to the proposals that came before this last flurry, get their approval. So that's the ones, you know, that are in your matrix already.

Get that as quick as you can, like, within the next few days, publish what you've got with the promise that you will add the rest of them PDQ and encourage those late proposers to simply fill in their own blanks as a way to speed that up. Because I really think it's going to be really helpful to focus the conversation on your grid rather than more proposals. And the best way to do it is just get the grid out there as quick as we can.

Mike Zupke: Right. So you know - and I think that's doable. The only thing that I think is a little bit harder, you know, I mean, we could put this thing on the Wiki as a chart that people could modify, but I think that - and so, you know, and for people who obviously haven't seen this, you know, the way that it's laid out is I just I went to every single proposal that was received by, you know, last week, Friday.

And I tried to pull out line by line every principal, you know, that I could sort of identify in each proposal. And I aligned them all up down the chart except to the extent that there were sort of things that I found were, you know, duplicates and so there was just one row.

And the columns represent each proposer or each proposal. And you know, I checked whether or not that proposal seems to agree with that principal. And

so, you know, the delay that, you know, that Mikey and I are talking about is, you know, we've talked about, you know, kind of getting the approval of people because I don't feel real comfortable trying to, you know, define what people are saying, particularly as staff. And you know, I don't want to be accused of putting words in anybody's mouth.

So the risk though I think is that adding new rows becomes hard because it's sort of organized by concepts. And so, you know, I'd like to try to keep it organized. And so I think in particular, you know, some of these things that came in recently do have some, you know, what I think would be new rows. In the chart, they've sort of identified new principles.

And so, you know, I think in order to not make this thing get, you know, really ugly and sort of cumbersome later, it would be good if we could try to put that out in a - at least, you know, at least get the first one out and make it look good.

Mike O'Connor: What? Quality of work? You're not hanging out with the right guy, buddy?

Berry Cobb: Mikey, this is Berry.

Mike O'Connor: Go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Yeah, Richard, hold on a second please. So yes, I - to what Mike was saying, I definitely believe what we'll wind up coming up with is probably a hybrid as opposed to individual proposals. I'd mentioned that last week and so enough about that.

Mikey, the question to you though in reference to, you know, what are we going to do about this analysis sub-team? Absent of the contribution we made last week in the sub-team performing analysis via a lens of the stakeholders registry, registrar, registrant consumer kind of stuff, I almost feel like we're duplicating work here from the effort that Mike's doing already.

And so I guess absent of not seeing any of that work, I almost feel like that I'm kind of at a loss for where we go from here, beyond the analysis component that we ended with last week.

Mike O'Connor: Yeah - and I think that's partly my fault. Well, it's mostly my fault. This idea came to - came up sort of at the same time as the grid idea came up. And it may be much simpler to just let the grid drive us for now. But keep the team together kind of with the skeptic's view that says, now, wait a minute, you're completely missing a gigantic point. And we, the analysis team are sort of the watchdogs to make sure that those gigantic points, either concepts that go into the consensus or other points don't get missed.

And I would be perfectly comfortable with that sort of a role, at least for a week or two. And then maybe as things get a little bit further down the line, it will become clear to us.

(Alan): Mikey, it's (Alan).

Mike O'Connor: Yeah, go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Hold on, (Alan), we had Richard in the queue. Just to respond, I agree, the analysis is - the matrix is the analysis at this point in that perspective. Okay, go ahead, Richard.

Richard Tindal: Yeah, good question (unintelligible). Mike, have we seen all those yet?

Mike Zupke: Say again?

Richard Tindal: Have we seen your rows yet? Rows, R-O-W-S.

Mike Zupke: No, no...

Richard Tindal: I thought I might have missed that, no worries. So you're going to send that out as soon as you're able?

Mike O'Connor: Yeah, well, Mike and I were debating - this is Mikey. What Mike Zupke and I were debating was sort of when. I think maybe what we should do is Zupke, why don't you and I have a chat about this after this call, either stay on the call or call each other?

Richard Tindal: I don't mean with the data included for each proposal, I just mean the actual headings.

Mike O'Connor: Yeah. And you know, Mike, that was sort of the suggestion I had at the beginning. I don't think that you have to worry a whole lot. It's a pretty solid list. I think that if you just stripped off Column A and shipped it out to us, that it would at least give folks a pretty good sense of where you're at, at the moment.

Everything about this working group is reiterative. People aren't going to be shy about encouraging you to tweak a concept or add a concept. So if you're feeling naked out there, feel free to hide behind me and let me take the bullets, that's my job as co-chair is to take the bullets.

Richard Tindal: This is Richard again, I've done a grid myself. And it's not really evaluation factors, it's just factors of, like, what is each proposal saying? So it's only got about eight rows, if you like. But I'll fly that off to everyone on this group shortly.

Mike O'Connor: Yeah.

Richard Tindal: But I don't...

Mike O'Connor: Mike Zupke, are you okay doing that as well?

Mike Zupke: Yeah, sure, I'm happy to do that.

Mike O'Connor: You know, I think ultra super draft with lots of iteration is a good thing. And it'll give folks on the analysis team something to chew on, which I think is very useful.

Richard Tindal: This is Richard again. I agree with the previous comment, that I don't think we're going to find bits and pieces from each proposal. I'm already seeing something of a consensus on the exceptions issues and how we'd handle the exceptions.

Mike O'Connor: Yeah.

Richard Tindal: And I'm seeing consensus on equivalent access to registrars. So (unintelligible) where we're clearly knocking at in my view have consensus, yet is just the very notion of what cross ownership limit for, like, standard DLDs.

Mike O'Connor: Yeah, yeah, I think that's right. But you know, you never know. I mean, it's kind of a matter of timing, so we'll see.

Richard Tindal: I agree with that.

Mike O'Connor: You know...

Richard Tindal: (Alan), you were in the queue?

(Alan): Yeah, I must admit, I feel somewhat like a voyeur listening to a private conversation, talking about something which I'm not allowed to see at this point. It's very difficult to comment on whether this group has the meaning or whether the concepts we talked about in our last meeting are covered without having a clue exactly what we're talking about.

You know, it may well be that that this matrix that you're talking about addresses everything and we don't have a purpose. I suspect that's not the case. But let's get something out there so we can talk about substance, not just about have 12 people or whoever's on this call, you know, listening to a discussion that we really have no ability to comment on.

Berry Cobb: Okay, thank you, (Alan). Well, in the absence of that, that's pretty much all I have until we just - to (Alan)'s point, until we kind of see what we're dealing with. I'm not sure I have anything else (unintelligible) perspective. Any suggestions or anything before we maybe go ahead and adjourn this call?

Mike O'Connor: Just one very quick question; there was talk of a mailing list being formed for this group. I haven't seen one if it has been?

((Crosstalk))

Mike O'Connor: Sorry, say that again?

Berry Cobb: Gisella created it for us and it should be - I think she sent it out this morning, so it should be in your Inbox.

Mike O'Connor: Okay, I haven't seen it but maybe I missed it.

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: Make sure I capture it in the meeting minutes when I send that out. You'll get it soon.

Mike O'Connor: Okay.

Berry Cobb: Mikey, Richard or Mike, any other comments? And then I guess we can just close the call because again, I don't have anything else to add at this point.

Mike O'Connor: Yeah, it's Mikey, just apologies for a little turbulence. That's typical on projects when you hang out with me. But I think in a week we'll be back on the beam. Thanks, Berry.

Berry Cobb: All right, no apologies needed from my perspective. So I think we're all after the same thing. All right, well, I appreciate everybody's time. Berry, this is short and a little misguided. So I'll send out brief meeting minutes and queue up for next week's call, if we do choose to have it over the list. At this point and time, let's still pretend that we are going to have it and I look forward to seeing some of the materials from the Mike clan. So thank you very much and I'll see you guys next week.

Mike O'Connor: Okay, thanks folks, see ya.

Mike Zupke: Thank you.

Mike O'Connor: Hey, Mike?

Mike Zupke: Yeah.

Mike O'Connor: Zupke, are you still on?

Mike Zupke: I am.

Mike O'Connor: I don't have your phone number, so do you - just pick off any one of my emails and call me on that number on the bottom. We'll carry on from here.

Mike Zupke: All right, sounds good.

Mike O'Connor: Cool, thanks, bye.

END