

Thick WHOIS PDP Drafting Team

TRANSCRIPTION

Thursday 30 August 2012 at 1800 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Thick WHOIS PDP Drafting Team on the Thursday 30 August 2012 at 1800 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

Attendees

Wilson Abigaba - NCUC
Elisa Cooper - CBUC
Avri Doria - NCSG
Keith Drazek - RySG
Ray Fassett - RySG
Alan Greenberg - At-Large
Frédéric Guillemaut - RrSG
Tony Harris - ISPCP
Caroline Hoover - RySG
Susan Kawaguchi - CBUC
Steve Metalitz - IPC
Mikey O'Connor - ISPCP
Tim Ruiz - RrSG
Carlton Samuels - At-Large
Jonathan Zuck - IPC

ICANN Staff

Marika Konings
Berry Cobb
Barbara Roseman
Gisella Gruber
Glen de Saint Gery

Apology:

Volker Greimann
Susan Prosser - RrSG

Coordinator: Thank you. I'd like to remind participants today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. Thank you, you may begin.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much. Good evening everyone. Welcome to the first meeting of the Thick Whois Drafting Team. Gisella, would you be so kind to do a roll call?

Gisella Gruber: Absolutely. On today's first Thick Whois PDP Drafting Team on Thursday the 30th of August on the phone bridge we have Frédéric Guillemaut , Mike O'Connor, Elisa Cooper, Avri Doria, Keith Drazek, Susan Kawaguchi, Ray Fassett, Steve Metalitz, Alan Greenberg, Carolyn Hoover. From staff we have Marika Konings, Barbara Roseman, Berry Cobb, Glen de Saint Géry, and myself, Gisella Gruber.

And we have apologies today noted from Volker Greimann. We also have a few people who are on the Adobe Connect room who will be joining us shortly on the phone bridge and I will advise everyone via the Adobe Connect room when they have joined the phone bridge. Thank you. Over to you, Marika. Oh, apologies, if I could please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you, Marika.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much, Gisella. And this is Marika Konings. I'm a member of the ICANN Policy staff and I will be the Policy staff support person for this drafting team and if you agree until the time this group has selected a chair or a co chair or a vice chair I'll hope to take you through the first couple of agenda items and just take care of some of the administrative stuff for this group.

So the first item we just covered, the roll call. And there's a note of the statement of interest. As you can see on the screen most of you have already completed your statements of interest. I think there's a couple of people that

need to do it but it's mainly because they're still waiting, I think, for the login information.

As you may be aware it's a requirement for any GNSO working group to complete your statement of interest. And at the start of every meeting there will be an opportunity to indicate as well if there have been any changes to your statement of interest that you might want to share with the group.

So with that we might want to move on to Item 2 of the agenda which is the introductions. As part of the GNSO Working Group Guidelines there's a recommendation that at the start of any working group or drafting team members of the drafting team are invited to actually share some information about themselves, you know, regarding their interest, background, skills and experiences especially as it relates to the drafting team so everyone can get to know each other a little bit better as the - as we'll all be working together for a while.

As we still have people joining on the call maybe it's easiest if we just go through the list of people that have already joined for now and then maybe go to others as they join.

So maybe if I can ask Frederic then to start off just a couple of words who you are, what you do and maybe your interest in this effort.

Frédéric Guillemaut: Yes, my name is Frédéric Guillemaut. I'm from Mailclub (unintelligible). And I'm a member of the Registrars' Constituency. And I (unintelligible) and also act as a (computing) company for some people with new gTLDs so we have some interest in knowing what's going to happen with the Whois in the future.

Marika Konings: Thank you. And next we have Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Sorry, this is Mikey. I was on mute. I am in the ISP Constituency. And I was on the IRTP Working Group that made this suggestion so I'm part of the continuity group. Been doing a lot of ICANN working groups. Most of you know me. I guess that's it.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Mikey. Next we have Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: Hi, this is Elisa Cooper. I am a member of the Business Constituency. And I also work for a company called Mark Monitor and we provide brand protection services to Fortune 1000 companies. And our clients are very interested in obtaining complete Whois information; Whois is very important for them. So I am very interested in finding out how we can draft this charter so that we ultimately end up with a thick Whois which is complete.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Elisa. Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay. I'm Avri Doria. I am a member of the Non Commercial Stakeholder Group. I'm also a employee at DotGay LLC part time and as such observe in the Registry Stakeholder Group and the new applicants - whatever the group is - the new applicants group.

I think I've been in the Whois trenches since my birth at ICANN. I'm very concerned with privacy issues of Whois especially thick Whois. I'm very concerned with the parity of thick Whois over any registries that are forced into doing thick Whois. And so it's that sort of concern I'll be looking for in terms of people's privacy. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Avri. Next is Keith.

Keith Drasek: Hi everybody. This is Keith Drasek. I'm an employee of VeriSign and also the alternative chair of the Registries Stakeholder so I guess you could say I'm an interested party. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Keith. Next we have Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: Hi, I'm Susan Kawaguchi. And I'm currently the Domain Name Manager at Facebook. I have been involved with ICANN issues for - since about 2005 and participated on the Whois Review Team until this past May. I'm a member of the BC. And I'm very interested in the availability and accuracy of a thick Whois record for all domain names.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Susan. Next I have Ray.

Ray Fassett: Hello. Ray Fassett. I'm with the DotJobs Registry and also part of the Registries Stakeholder Group. And for those that aren't aware the DotJobs Registry today does operate under a thin Whois model so the outcome of this group may or may not impact that particular part of our operation. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Ray. Next I have Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Hi, this is Steve Metalitz. I'm - I'm a lawyer in private practice in Washington DC. I represent the Coalition for Online Accountability which is a group of associations and other organizations and companies whose primary concern in ICANN - or major concern in ICANN is access to and accuracy of Whois data.

And I - as their representative I'm a member of the Intellectual Property Constituency and have been involved with the Whois issue within ICANN since 1999 I think. And I see Marika disconnected herself so if someone else on the staff has - is still on and has the list that she was working from maybe you could call on the next person.

Gisella Gruber: Yes we have Alan Greenberg. Sorry, this is Gisella for the transcript. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Gisella. I am the ALAC liaison to the GNSO. And I'm here representing myself, not formally the ALAC. But the ALAC and At Large has generally been very supportive of thick Whois for all Registries. Thank you.

Steve Metalitz: According to the chat room it looks like Carolyn would be next.

Gisella Gruber: Carolyn Hoover next. Thank you.

Carolyn Hoover: Thank you very much. This is Carolyn Hoover. I'm a member of the Registries Stakeholder Group. I'm the CEO of DotCoop, an existing sponsored top level domain. And we use the thick Whois.

We are also very interested in ensuring that that availability of that data continues because we're very interested in how that impacts the verification aspect of our ICANN charter. We need that information in order to be able to ensure that our registrants meet that criteria so that's the perspective I'm looking at it.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Carolyn. This is Marika. I'm back again. Sorry, I disconnected myself. I have Wilson next on the list.

Wilson Abigaba: Yeah, I'm Wilson from Uganda. I manage the Uganda ccTLD and I'm also a member of the National - of the (unintelligible) Non Commercial Constituency. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thanks. Next I have Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes, this is Jonathan Zuck from the Association of Competitive Technology. We're an IT industry trade association representing small and medium-sized IT companies whose interest in Whois is twofold; one is brand protection and the other is effective enforcement of consumer protection laws around the world in, you know, that helps build trust in their online businesses.

And I guess as a bunch of geeks we're big fans of storing comprehensive and accurate data and then as a secondary effort publishing the policies for getting to that data but we have to start with good data to begin with.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Jonathan. Next Tim.

Tim Ruiz: Hi. Tim Ruiz with godaddy.com who is a member of the Registrars Stakeholder Group. And I guess I'm - my interest isn't so much in the eventual outcome of the PDP as it is in just being sure that we, as a drafting team, develop a charter that will lay a good foundation for success for the eventual working group that will consider this subject.

And that's been an issue that I think we've had in the past and so I want to make sure that we create a charter that's actually useful and won't create issues and problems (divisionally) within the working group.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Tim. And the last one on the list I have Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Hi, this is Carlton. Thank you. I am representing the At Large but for what it's worth I am Vice Chair of the ALAC and I'm also the Chair of the At Large Whois Working Group. The ALAC is on record with respect to Whois and it supports a thick Whois as all gTLD registries. The ALAC statement in the last couple of years has been very definitive about our interest in Whois, accuracy and accessibility of Whois data to end users. Those are all on record.

I am interested in ensuring that we conserve the ALAC position with respect to the drafting this working group charter. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Carlton. And I think that covers everyone that's on today's call. Did I leave anyone out? And I'll make sure as well that those that were not able to participate on the call today that they also have an opportunity to introduce themselves on the mailing list if they would like. So and that further

information about everyone can also be found by clicking on the click to the statement of interest on the drafting team wiki.

Then the next agenda item is basically just a reminder to everyone that as standard within the GNSO drafting teams and working groups all our calls are usually recorded and transcribed. The mailing lists are publicly archived so please be aware when you send information to the list that you ensure that you don't include any information that you don't want to have publicly posted on the Website.

And as said, you know, transparency and openness everyone is required to provide a statement of interest and as well at the start of any meeting indicate if there are any changes to their statements of interest.

And so the next agenda item is an election of drafting team leaders. The practice is that someone is selected at the first meeting and that might be on an interim basis if the group feels that others that are not on the call want to have some time to either declare their candidacy or, you know, further discussions occur on the list.

But I hereby would like to invite anyone that's interested in chairing this group and as noted here as well that the drafting team might also elect to have a system of co chairs or a chair and a vice chair where the workload can be shared so that's something for the drafting team to discuss on how to manage that.

I see some people have already nominated someone in the chat but I'll let Avri do the further talking here.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I suggested it - this is Avri Doria speaking. I suggested it in the chat but in listening to all of our intros Tim's stood out as basically being about getting the charter right. I mean, we all want to get the charter right; I want to get the

charter right. But his really stood out as that being the primary interest in being here.

And so I suggested Tim Ruiz is - I'd like to nominate him if he's willing to accept it - to be chair of this group. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Tim, would you like to respond?

Tim Ruiz: Yeah, this is Tim. I truly appreciate the nomination I'm going to have to respectfully decline. But that doesn't mean I won't be fully participating.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Are there any other nominations or volunteers that would like to take the lead here? I just want to, you know, reassure everyone as well, I mean, staff is here to help you as well.

It's really about, you know, chairing the meetings, helping - setting the agenda, making sure that the drafting team stays on track but, you know, Policy staff is there as well to really try to, you know, do some of the heavy lifting for you as well. So I really hope that will reassure and hopefully someone will want to come forward and help us out here.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: No one's coming forward. Yeah, go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: Yes...

Tim Ruiz: Marika, this is Tim if - and I'm sorry I'm not on the...

Marika Konings: Yeah, go ahead.

Tim Ruiz: ...Adobe right now so I don't have a way of getting in the queue otherwise.

Marika Konings: Go ahead, Tim. And I think I heard Steve as well. Tim go ahead and then Steve.

Tim Ruiz: Yeah, what I had thought and also I didn't know if I should do it at this point given the - what just happened. But my feeling was that Avri would make an excellent chair given her past experience and the excellent job that she did on the Council. I have every confidence that she could chair this group very effectively.

Marika Konings: Steve, you want to go first and then maybe Avri?

Steve Metalitz: Sure. Yeah, I would like to put forward Alan Greenberg's name although I haven't talked with him about this beforehand and I don't know whether he's available. But I think Alan has the good strong background on, you know, he's got his feet in both worlds because he's both on the GNSO Council and he's in ALAC; he's the ALAC liaison to the GNSO Council.

So I think that helps to give some more breadth. You know, frankly we've had, over the years, a very polarized situation on this issue within the GNSO. And I think having someone who is not simply from GNSO might be conducive to moving forward.

I would agree with Tim's remark that of course the job of this group is to just to draft the charter; it's not to do the working group. So I think that's something that we all need to keep in mind. I think from the many years that I've known Alan he could certainly carry out this task very well so I'll put his name forward.

Marika Konings: Avri and then maybe Alan.

Avri Doria: Yeah, this is Avri again. Perhaps I should let Alan answer but I definitely want to endorse the idea of nominating Alan. In terms of myself I don't want to be neutral in doing this so I really don't think - plus I also think I'm just doing too

many chair-ish and vice chair-ish things in other places that at this point I really don't think I should or could take this one on. But thank you. And I do heartily endorse the notion of Alan.

Marika Konings: Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Well that puts me in an interesting position. My position is very similar to Avri's. I joined this group because I do have very strong positions. And I'm not sure I would do a good job in the chair role and would be taking off my hat perhaps more often than I had it on. I'm also vice chairing another PDP right now which, you know, is a - not a large load but is a factor in it.

So I'm not going to refuse right now but my inclination is to say no because I don't think this group will be that well served by a chair who is on a regular basis weighing in on the discussions. So I thank you all for your flattering statements you made but I'm somewhat conflicted as is Avri in terms of actually participating in the group. So my inclination at this point is to not accept. I won't formally refuse because I'll want to (unintelligible) with some other people but my inclination is that I will not be able to do it.

Tim Ruiz: And this is Tim, if I can get in the queue again?

Marika Konings: Yes, please, Tim, go ahead.

Tim Ruiz: Yeah, I just wanted to, you know, express appreciation for, you know, the fact that certain members are busy and they may not be able to do it and I can understand that myself. But if, you know, as far as remaining neutral or not I think I just want to remind everybody that the purpose of this drafting team is to create a charter.

And of course I think the charter needs to focus on the issue and how to develop that issue appropriately within the eventual PDP working group. And that's where, you know, our feelings or opinions one way or the other are

really going to matter the most. So I think chairing this drafting team isn't really going to negate the ability of that chair to later participate in the PDP working group and express their views and feelings wholeheartedly.

So this is the drafting team for the charter where we will eventually - that'll eventually be used by the working group that will actually develop potential policy. So I don't think being neutral as a chair in this case will necessarily be a - it shouldn't be a problem.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Tim. Alan, are you back in the queue or is your hand...

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, no I'm back in the queue.

Marika Konings: Go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: I disagree I guess with Tim because I think the task of this group is going to be, among other things, to decide how narrow or wide the scope of the PDP is which I think will lead to whether it is successful regardless of the outcome. You know, although I have an opinion of what the outcome will be what I most want is to see this completed in a reasonable timeframe and address the original questions.

And I think there is going to be significant controversy regarding the scope. And that, you know, that's what I would like to be able to weigh in on not necessarily on whether it should be thick or thin in the long term. So I think my original position stands.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Maybe we can just, you know, give everyone a couple more days to think about it. I'm happy to take you through the rest of the agenda for this meeting. And maybe that will also give us an opportunity to encourage people on the list for those that are not on the call today to just think about it.

You know, and as I said before, you know, we're here as staff to support whoever decides to come forward. And hopefully, you know, not make the workload, from that perspective, too hard.

So I don't know if there's anyone else that wants to step forward at this stage or whether people feel comfortable by thinking about it a couple of days and, you know, we continue that discussion on the mailing list and hopefully at the next meeting we'll have some candidates that are willing to take up the chair's task.

Okay if no one else has anything on this topic - Alan, I presume your hand is still up from before?

Alan Greenberg: My mistake. It's down now.

Marika Konings: No problem. So then we move into the next item which is the items for review. As part of the agenda I sent you a couple of documents that I thought would be useful to review as we kick off this effort.

What I've done is put together a couple of slides to take you through the main parts of that to really, you know, set a bit the stage for where we are in the policy development process or as well what, you know, the drafting team is tasked to do at this stage.

So I do apologize for those of you that already read all the documents inside out and for who this is old news but I think it's really helpful maybe to just go through this briefly.

So first of all I just want to - especially for those that are new to - or relatively new to the GNSO policy development process just quickly touch upon which stage of the process we're currently in and what has already been completed so it hopefully gives you a better picture of indeed where we're going with this

drafting team and what is going to follow next because of course we hope as well that many of you will continue in this effort.

Then briefly looking at the issue report that was the starting phase of the policy development process, then looking at the drafting team's mission and then also looking at the working group charter template.

So as some of you might be aware actually the GNSO policy development process was recently revised and the revised version was adopted by the ICANN Board in December of last year and it now applies to all policy development processes.

So on a - at the high level you'll still see very - a lot of familiar elements that also exist in the old PDP but there are some nuances that have been introduced that make the process more flexible and more reflecting the reality of how PDPs were being run already.

So basically, you know, the issue and verification we've already passed that stage. It's looking at, you know, are we looking at something that might result into consensus policies (unintelligible) was definitely yes; this is something that might result into a consensus policy so we need to move into the PDP stage in order to go down that road.

So the first step there is the request of an issue report. That was done already a while ago and I think come back to the issue report in a little bit on the recommendation of one of the working - or the Inter Registrar Transfer Policy Working Groups there was a recommendation to initiate a policy development process on this topic.

Based on that request staff then prepared the preliminary issue report that was put out for public comment allowing the community to provide input if all the issues were covered in there also allowing them to express an opinion on

whether a PDP should be initiated or not. And as a result of that a final issue report was developed which was then submitted to the GNSO Council.

So on the basis of that issue report the GNSO Council then decided to initiate a policy development process. And following that - and that's the stage where we are now with the big red arrow - this drafting team has been created to develop the PDP working group charter.

So this is not the working group yet that's trying to, you know, solve the question or provide recommendations on, you know, whether there should be thick or thin Whois, no, this drafting team is really focused on developing a charter for the PDP working group which then will be tasked to actually look at the questions and within the scope that this drafting team has set.

So basically once this drafting team completes its work it will need to be submitted to the GNSO Council which then needs to vote on adopting the charter so it's not the drafting team itself that decides this is the scope and this is how it should go; there's still an intermediate vote from the GNSO Council following the submission of the charter and in certain cases the Council might come back with questions or if there are concerns it might just ask the drafting team to make further changes if needed.

So only once that charter has been adopted then is when it moves into the working group stage. And I think some of you are already familiar with how that works and I don't want to belabor that now. And I think I'll share the slides with you as well so you can look at that - look at this at ease.

But, you know, following that we go into the working group phase where the working group, you know, dives into all those issues, does the research, has the discussions, reaches out to the different communities and stakeholder groups for their input and eventually hopefully comes to a final report with recommendations which are then submitted to the Council and after that to the Board for their consideration.

So with that I won't go into the details here. I'll make these slides available for you if you're interested. And as well there's some further reading here for those that really want to go into the details of the policy development process.

So maybe briefly looking at the thick Whois issue report. As I think Mikey already referred to as - in the context of the discussions of the Inter Registrar Transfer Policy Part B Working Group - it's a PDP that's being run in different phases looking at the transfer policy.

That working group basically realized that from the perspective of transfers thick Whois would make a lot of sense. It would solve a lot of issues and really would have some significant benefits.

But the group at the same time realized that of course thick Whois don't only impact transfers; there are many other issues that might be impacted by a requirement for thick Whois. So they suggested that an issue report should be requested to actually consider the - any other positive and/or negative effects that are likely to occur and would need to be taken into account when deciding whether a requirement of thick Whois for all gTLDs would be desirable or not.

So basically on that basis staff started working on an issue report which the preliminary version was published in November last year. Several comments were received; some of them focusing on issues that were included but needed to be amplified or needed to be changed.

Some expressed some views on whether there should be thin or thick; others provided input whether they thought a PDP should be initiated or not. And there were also comments in relation to the scope of the PDP.

Based on that we revised the issue report and really tried to incorporate all the comments received and submitted the final version to the GNSO Council on the 2nd of February.

The report itself, for those of you that have reviewed it, describes basically the (type) of the aspects of the differences between thick and thin, looks at the current situation of gTLDs I think as Ray already mentioned like DotJobs for example is under a thin model now. I think DotCom is another one and DotNet if I'm not mistaken. Then there are also some that have a tiered kind of access and the other ones all operate on the thick model so it looks at those aspects.

And then it also looks at an initial list of issues that from the staff - from a staff perspective should be considered when looking at this question whether it's a good or a bad idea of requiring thick Whois. For example looking at the fact of a consistent response, enhanced stability, enhanced accessibility, impact on privacy and data protection including consideration of course the transfers of registrant data.

Also looking at what are the cost implications of a transition to thick Whois for registries, registrars but also registrants. Are there any potential issues related to database synchronization between the registry and registrars? Consideration would also need to be given to thick Whois registries that currently provide tiered access and whether exemptions might be needed should there be a recommendation for a thick Whois.

What are the links with possible changes to registry and registrar separation and access to customer data? What might be the impact on competition and registry services should all registries be required to provide a uniform Whois service? What might be the impact on existing Whois applications and users of those applications? What might be the impact on data escrow and registrar Port 43 Whois requirements as thick Whois might make this redundant.

So there's already a whole list of issues that from a staff perspective we believe should be considered as part of the PDP in answering this question of whether it's a good idea or a bad idea of requiring thick Whois or, you know, if there's an answer somewhere in the middle or how some of these issues need to be considered or addressed depending on where the recommendations go.

In addition looking at, you know, some of the specific items that would need to be considered we also highlighted some other issues that would need to be considered if a PDP would go forward. Looking, for example, at, you know, that a relationship with other Whois activities. As you're all aware there are many other Whois activities going on so any working group should probably need to be aware and make sure, you know, provide regular updates to make sure that there's no overlap or contradiction into efforts that are going on.

What some already mentioned one of the discussions this group probably will have is the scope of the PDP. And there some of the comments we received as well in the public comment forum was like should the PDP be limited to considering thick Whois or could one of the potential outcomes also be a recommendation to require the thin Whois model? Should the scope be that broad?

You know, are there any other models that would need to be considered? You know, is thick Whois the only answer or are there other - you know, is there something in between thick and thin that might be need to be given consideration?

You know, probably there's also be consideration of a transition should there be a requirement for change; what would need to be considered as part of a transition plan and, you know, updating systems?

Looking at the overall potential impact on registrants, registrars and users from requiring or not requiring thick Whois and also looking, you know, the resources required, you know, is there any research that is needed in order to help answer some of these questions.

But based on looking at the scope of itself, you know, this is related to gTLDs and within the scope of the GNSO we did recommend that a PDP should go forward.

And as a result of that the PDP was initiated on the 14th of March. As some of you may be aware the formation of a drafting team was initially delayed for a bit because some wanted to wait a bit the outcome of the DotCom negotiations as there was discussions that maybe thick Whois would be covered in those negotiations as well.

Some were as well worried about working with issues because there were a lot of other activities going on at the same time. By the end the Council decided at its last meeting to move forward and a call for volunteers for this drafting team was published on the 23rd of July.

So as several people - several have already remarked the real objective of this drafting team is to develop a charter; it's not to dive into the substance of the issues and try to answer any of the questions. It's really to develop the scope and the - develop the charter questions that the working group will need to look at in order to answer the issue at hand.

In order to help the drafting team doing that the GNSO Working Group Guidelines that were developed some time ago actually developed - included a specific section that is titled Charter Guidelines.

And it basically takes through all the different elements a charter should contain. And on the basis of that a charter template has been developed

which basically serves as a starting point for most drafting teams when they start developing a charter for working groups.

And as you'll see - I'll pull it up in a second - most of the sections are actually prefilled based on the GNSO Working Group requirements. What we've done is basically left some of the language, for example, decision making methodology which is a, you know, standard and required as part of the GNSO Working Group Guidelines, we've just listed that and put that already in the charter.

There are some other elements which are pretty standard and, you know, it's probably not too difficult to look at what previous groups have done and borrow some of the language there.

But I think where you'll see - where the real, you know, meat and potatoes will be and the real - probably hard work will need to be done is the section on the mission purpose and deliverables, right, it's really spelled out what the task of the working group is, you know, what its scope is, within which boundaries it's expected to work and what topics it's supposed to look at.

With that I think I've covered the main items that were included in the document I sent you for review. And I'm happy to take some questions now. I see Avri's hand is already up.

Avri Doria:

Yeah. I had a question - this is Avri Doria. I had a question which was in terms of the filling out of the template of all the things that you mentioned were working group requirements I wanted to see if I remembered things correctly that in many cases those things we're calling requirements are actually guidelines.

And if the charter writing group felt that there was a reason to do something other than that - and I'm not recommending that in any case at this point but just trying to say - am I remembering correctly that for the most part those

requirements are really guidelines except for have a review and do a this and do a that?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Indeed the GNSO Working Group Guidelines are guidelines although I think if you look, for example, at the decision making methodology I think it does spell out that, you know, the group and especially the Council would, as well, need to have a really good reason to change that.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Marika Konings: Because I think it's expected that that is, you know, certain parts are, you know, more firm than others. But you're absolutely right. And I'll pull now the template so you can see what is in there. I think for now there's very little prefilled in apart I think from the standard decision making methodology. But I think, you know, based on previous experience some parts are more standard or easy than others are.

So now up on the screen - and this was something as well that was circulated and is posted on the wiki - is the charter - the working group charter template. And the first part you see the instructions. And I would encourage everyone to read through that so you really know, as well, what is being expected of the different sections in the work in the template and eventual charter.

So the first section really looks at the working group identification. It's actually a part where many of the elements are, you know, probably not able to fill those in yet because it includes some, you know, links and the chair and the, you know, the link to the approval date and things like that so that's, you know, more the administrative stuff.

As said I think we're, you know, the real hard work lies is the Section 2 which is the mission purpose and deliverables. As I said before I think, you know, in the issue reported we tried to align many of the elements that we think should be considered as part of a PDP but, you know, it's up to the drafting team to

look at those and determine whether you think, you know, we've covered them all, whether there's something mission, whether you want to take a different tack.

So that's in principle the basis for this PDP starting with the issue report. So I would encourage you, as well, to look at the questions that have been outlined there and then see how they, you know, fit with a potential charter.

So then it talks about formatting, staffing and organization. And as said I think I these are more of the standard parts because a GNSO PDP does follow specific rules on, you know, who can join, how the working group is formed, the roles and responsibilities - again there is some flexibility although, you know, most working groups tend to have, you know, a chair, a vice chair and a Council liaison. So - and it talks about there the policy staff role there.

Ray, go ahead.

Ray Fassett: Thank you, Marika. Two requests on what you were saying there. It would be helpful to me, and maybe others, but could you send me a link to the revised issue report or send it to everybody? And then also the link to the comment period that actually produced that revised issue report? It's just hard - there's so many Whois things going on it's hard to find exactly where that is.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I can send it around. And the final issue report is also posted on the drafting team wiki. But what I can also post is the redline version so people can actually see what was changed based on the public comments because we do have a redline version as well.

Ray Fassett: Okay.

Marika Konings: I can include that too if that makes it easier.

Ray Fassett: And then as long as I'm on the line here just a question. Is there, today - I think I've seen discussion on this in the past. Is there, today, a policy on Whois?

Marika Konings: I think there are some parts that are considered policy. I mean, we have the data reminder which - I don't think - and maybe I'm - have to put Susan on the spot here who's I think a member of the Whois Review Team. But if I recall I think one of their recommendations is actually to bring all the different parts of Whois together. But I don't think - and there is one and only Whois policy as such.

Ray Fassett: Okay.

Marika Konings: Susan, are you able to help me out?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yeah, this is Susan. We looked hard and reviewed everything and could not find a clear policy. So one of our recommendations that the Whois Review Team was that not to draft a new policy but to create a document that outlines the current policy so it's easy to find and understand.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Susan. So this is Marika gain. So then looking at some of the other sections, rules of engagement, that talks some more about decision making methodologies and it's mentioned that standards - standard methodology is included here. It does say, "The chartering organization wished to deviate..." and that would be that the GNSO Council - they are able to do so and it should be affirmatively stated in that section.

It looks at status reporting, problem and issue escalating processes; again those are elements that are part of the GNSO Working Group Guidelines and relatively standard language although, you know, as Avri said, you know, the working group is free, as well, to enhance or make changes there if they think appropriate. And then add a section on the charter a document history.

So if you look there most of the sections are blank for now. As said Section 4 has been prefilled in but again, you know, feel free to look at that and if you feel there are any things that need to be changed there, you know, that's something that can be discussed.

So basically this is the task you have ahead of you, completing this document. So I don't know if there any other questions on the specific items that I circulated for review or if people feel that there are any other documents or information that the drafting team should review before as it gets started on its task.

Again people should feel free to circulate information on the mailing list or suggest documents to read. We have a section on the wiki space as well with background documents where we can post that information so it's at a central location and people should have a - shouldn't have any difficulty finding it.

The next item on the agenda is looking at development of a work plan to develop the charter. I think it's probably a bit too early to maybe go into that now but it's maybe something for people to think about. Does the drafting team want to set itself a goal as to when it would like to deliver this to the GNSO Council?

It might want to look at the GNSO Council calendar and maybe set a fictitious date trying to work towards that and delivering it - I think it needs to be delivered like eight days in advance of a GNSO Council meeting for them to be able to consider it. And maybe think about what discussions or information the group thinks it further needs in order to, you know, complete this charter.

So with that I think that's everything I wanted to cover from my side. I think, you know, the homework is for everyone to look at the documents, think about the chair position because we really need someone to help move this group forward.

And I think then the question is when would we like to meet again? Is this a good time for people so we can schedule a meeting for next week at the same time? Do people prefer a two-week interval, so have time to look at the document and take some time to think about the chair role? Should we send out a new Doodle poll to find another time? Are there any preferences there?

Steve Metalitz: Marika, this is Steve Metalitz. Could I just make a suggestion on that?

Marika Konings: Yes, please go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: I do think - I think as Tim and others have pointed out the role here is simply to - simply may not be the right adverb - but our role here is to draft the charter not to do the work of the working group. So I hope we can set an ambitious timeframe and try to get this drafting done as expeditiously as possible.

And in that regard I guess I would suggest that we try to meet weekly. I do think it would be useful to have a Doodle poll so that since this time was set just for this first meeting it might be useful to have a Doodle poll but I would encourage that it be done in a way - maybe you can propose, you know, a series of meetings or say, you know, Thursday at such and such a time for the next three weeks or something like that or give that as an option and Friday at such and such a time.

In other words let's use a Doodle poll but let's try to be as efficient as possible and end up with a set of meetings that can move us quickly toward our limited goal of this drafting team. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Steve. Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I - this is Avri Doria. I'm not all that happy about yet another Doodle poll. I think we did one that found this slot. I mean, if you have to do one you

have to do one. But certainly I would like to minimize Doodle polls as much as possible.

I think aiming meetings towards the Wednesday and end of the week is probably good since everything seems to be crowded into Mondays and Tuesdays these days. So I think that's good.

I think another meeting next week to get started is probably a good idea. I would tend to think that - I would recommend a biweekly schedule after that just to give people time to get the work done and such.

And while I totally agree with expeditiousness I think since, you know, the charter is not only identifying the scope it is identifying the questions to be answered that we not rush our expeditiousness too much. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I guess my comment is picking and choosing from both Steve's and Avri's. I do support working weekly. We can always cancel a meeting if whatever task we have is going to take more than a week. But doing things every two weeks just stretches it out and, you know, guarantees we won't get it done by, you know, Christmas or Toronto or Christmas or some target like that.

So I would plan on every week and, you know, give people a vacation if we, you know, find that in any given case it's not necessary. This particular time slot I don't think I've ever seen this many people participate in a meeting and have that many of the people who responded to the Doodle said they could make it. So this one I think is pretty good.

If we have to do another Doodle, you know, let's certainly include this time as one of the possibilities and try to get that done really quickly like within the next couple of days. I tend to agree with Avri, though, that maybe we really

don't need another one. But, you know, I can't speak to that; we may need to ask. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Yeah, and this is Marika. If again I maybe make a suggestion that indeed we send out an email confirming the same time for next week but basically in the email say like if the intention is to continue on this schedule on a weekly basis but if this is impossible a time for people please let us know off list. And then by next week we'll hopefully know if, you know, if there are a lot of people that actually find this a difficult time then maybe we can consider doing another Doodle poll.

But maybe in that way we, you know, find a bit of a compromise where we stick with the time but still allow people to tell us if this is really a hard time for them.

Alan Greenberg: That works for me.

Marika Konings: Great. I see one green tick and no red ones so maybe we can stick with that one then and I'll get a note out to the mailing list. And again, you know, please consider chairing the working group because we really need some help here. And hopefully speak to you all next week.

Avri Doria: Thank you so much.

Marika Konings: Thank you.

END