Thick WHOIS PDP Drafting Team
TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 20 September 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 20 September 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.

Attendees

Elisa Cooper - CBUC
Keith Drazek - RySG
Ray Fassett - RySG
Susan Kawaguchi - CBUC
Mikey O'Connor - ISPCP
Evan Leibovitch - At-Large
Caroline Hoover - RySG
Alan Greenberg - At-Large
Jeff Neumann – RySG
Ekaterina Dureva - individual

ICANN Staff
Marika Konings
Berry Cobb
Barbara Roseman
Nathalie Peregrine

Apology:
 Frédéric Guillemaut - RrSG
Susan Prosser - RrSG
Steve Metalitz - IPC
Avri Doria - NCSG

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much (Tanya). Good morning, good afternoon, good

evening. This is the Thick Whois call on the 20th of September 2012. On the

call today I have Mikey O'Connor, Alan Greenberg, Ekaterina Dureva, Keith

Drasek, Elisa Cooper, Ray Fassett, Susan Kawaguchi. We have apologies from Susan Prosser, Frederic Guillemaut and Steve DelBianco.

From staff we have Marika Konings, Barbara Roseman, Berry Cobb and myself Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind all participants to please state their names before speaking to transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Nathalie. And welcome all. It's Mikey here. Just a quick review of the agenda. It's very complicated. We're going to take a look at the draft charter. No, you don't have control over your screen. You're looking at my desktop. I'm thinking that we may be at a stage here where we can just make changes directly into the document.

But before we do that we'll just take a pause if anybody wants to change or add to the agenda or update us on changes to your statements of interest. Okay. Well as you can see on you screen hopefully that's big enough. Anybody having trouble reading the document the way I'm doing it now? Because if you don't have trouble it's - I think we're almost at the place where we're seeing such minor changes that it seems simpler to just edit them in on this call rather than...

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan speaking. Could we have scrolling ability?

Mikey O'Connor: No because you're looking at my screen.

Alan Greenberg: Ah.

Mikey O'Connor: So what you're seeing is my copy of Word on my computer. That's why it can't scroll. And what I thought I'd do is just take us through all the proposed changes and changes. What we're working off of right now is the draft that Keith sent to us just before the call where there's some comments from Jeff Neuman in there plus everything else that Marika did.

So I think this is the latest and greatest. And as long as people can see, I think I just want to kind of pick these off one at a time. The first one that - oh Jeff's going to join. Is Jeff on the - Jeff, are you on the call yet? Not quite yet. Well I think maybe - I'm going to go ahead.

I'm going to speak for Jeff until Jeff gets on the - oh he's on the call. Okay. Good, good. Jeffrey, welcome to the gang. I'm talking about your suggested change right off the bat. So if I put the wrong words in your mouth, feel free to correct me. But...

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: ...I think what Jeff was working on in that first sentence was that in Marika's draft in this place where I've now inserted just the initials RA, Marika had one registry agreement. You can see Jeff's comment over on the right, the very first one where he says I don't understand this reference to the 2009 agreement in the context of registries.

And Jeff would you consider just - I just sort of parallelized it and said well there's RAs and RAAs and took out the reference to the 2009 agreement. Does that work for you?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. I mean it's we've had in agreements and the other registries have had service tools - service requirements since the beginning.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Jeff Neuman: Whereas it's just the more recent development for the registrars. So...

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Jeff Neuman: ...yeah. I mean I think that just leaving it as a registry agreement is fine.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. Well that's - I thought that was probably just a drafting glitch. Marika do you - if I make a change that is substantive in your view, feel free to break in on me. I assume that that was just something that got vacuumed in from some other document and so I just backed that off.

Marika Konings: Yeah. That's fine.

Mikey O'Connor: So that's the first little change. So it - sort of speak now or forever hold your piece and I'll sort of go through all the rest of these the same way.

The next one again is from Jeff where - and it's - he's working on this part of the sentence. And his comment is that sort of surrounds all that is I would not refer to these as services. And then he changes it to models and rewords the sentence to sort of make that work.

And as a geek, I would tend to agree that the word services sort of wakes up all kinds of stuff about ports and technical specifications and so on and so forth. So again, I sort of viewed this as a friendly amendment. But I want to check with anybody to see if this causes any huge heartburn. I wouldn't expect it to but this would be a good time to talk about that. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: No, I like the word model instead of service. I'm just a little - I - not confused but I wonder what the implications are because those registries that have changed the model, you know, for privacy reasons or things like that have done it through the registry services process. So I'm wondering is there an interaction here or can we just ignore that and use the word model, which I...

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, yeah. I'd really ignore that...

Alan Greenberg: ...think (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: ...in this context just because the word services at least in this context to me it's pretty confusing. Oh Jeff, go ahead. I'm sorry. (Walked right)...

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. I was going to say something similar. I think - I don't view any changes that have been requested to date have been changes to the model. They've been - the model is still thick or thin. There have been changes as far as elements of the model and what to display versus collect and things like that. But I still think it's still two different models.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. That satisfies me. Cool. Okay. Anybody else on this one? Again, I didn't view this as earth shattering but a good clarification. Keith is in the chat saying ICANN recently - has recently used the RSEP as a broad funnel for processing registry requests for things that are not actually services. Yeah. I think that's consistent with where I was headed on this. Thanks Keith. Okay. Last chance on that.

   Then we'll move onto the next one, which was a comment from Ray and it's really about this paragraph here. So what I did is I just highlighted the words but Ray is talking about - what Ray is saying in his first comment is that we do tend to throw around the words stores, manages, maintains and provides a little loosely in this paragraph.

   And Ray, let me put words in your mouth and then if you don't like them, by all means correct me. But my guess would be that at least if I were in you shoes I'd like maintain and provide in both places consistently. Does that sort of meet with what you were trying to get at?

Ray Fassett: Well Mikey, this is Ray. You were supposed to put the words in my mouth.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah I did.

Ray Fassett: You did good. You did good. I don't know what I'm trying to say here. I think my objective here was to ask first whether others agree that the terms as

they're used are appropriate or not, get their opinion. Mostly just bring it out for discussion.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Ray Fassett: This - it could be that others don't have an issue with this at all. I do agree with you however when you say they're kind of loosely used. I do agree with that. Now with that said, do I want to sit here and try and word script it or wordsmith it, whatever; not really.

I think first I'm just looking at take a temperature whether others on the group see the same thing that I'm seeing and it could be they're not. So that was my intention.

Mikey O'Connor: Sounds like a plan to me. Let's do the aforementioned temperature taking. Is that an old hand or a new one?

Jeff Neuman: Mikey, this is Jeff.

Mikey O'Connor: Do you want...

Jeff Neuman: That's a new one.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: No, I - just as - and I know I didn't make a comment at it but just in listening to Ray and listening to you, I think store and manage is really not the words we tend to use when we talk about Whois. You really talk about collection and publishing. Right?

Those are really kind of the two words that we talk about because we don't have any managing of the information. We collect it and we publish it. We

don't alter it. We don't - you know, it's not like - I mean in general we don't do anything with the data except collect it and publish it.

But I don't know. Maybe some other registries disagree but to me that's really what we do. We don't have any manipulation of the data. And when you say manages, it kind of means you can (unintelligible) as well.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. Yeah. I like those words. Anybody else got thoughts on this? Because what I could do is just staple collect and publish into both places. Call it a day people.

Alan Greenberg: But isn't the - it's Alan speaking. Isn't one of the substantive differences where the data is stored? So (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: I think that's handled in other places in this paragraph. I think that the issue that Ray is brining up again cheerfully pouring words in his mouth is not so much because that next sentence is the one that says well, in a thin registry the registrar does a bunch of stuff and the registry does some stuff whereas in thick the thick reg is the very last sentence.

The thick registry collects and publishes both. So I think again if we did collect and publish, it would make sense in both contexts.

Alan Greenberg: I'm slightly uncomfortable saying the registry collects the data. They are the repository for the data but they're not actually doing the collecting.

Mikey O'Connor: All right. We'll let Ray chime in at this point.

Ray Fassett: Yeah. Thank you Mikey. And I do kind of agree with Jeff and more the registries speak their - these terms collect and publish. I might suggest to Alan's point as well -- maybe I'm getting warmer -- is what registries do. We do collect - we collect it from registrars. But then what we do is republish it.

So we're simply republishing the registrar data that they've collected. Does that help? Republish?

Alan Greenberg: Well the registrar doesn't really publish it in the sense that publishing implies the, you know, making it publicly available and they're really immediately dumping it into the registry who then publishes it.

Mikey O'Connor: Do you do this all the time Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I'm trying to understand, you know, are we patching the right concept here and I'm not sure.

Mikey O'Connor: I was pretty confident that we actually had the concept okay with the original words. Now I was in the I don't think it matters a whole lot camp but I am really convinced that we are now in the splitting hairs category.

Barbara Roseman: Yeah. This is Barbara. Can I ask what is it you're trying to - just (ambiguate) here. What is it you're trying to make clear? Who holds the data at any given point or who has responsibility for the accuracy of the data or what responsibilities are...

Mikey O'Connor: I don't think either.

Barbara Roseman: ...in publishing it. I'm just trying to get clear on what it is you're trying to make more clear here in this paragraph.

Mikey O'Connor: I think it's the duties. Essentially those words are all about what the responsibilities of the registries and registrars are. I think that the paragraph does okay at distinguishing thin and thick. Thin the duties are split between registrars and registries. Whereas thick....

Barbara Roseman: Right. So...

Mikey O'Connor: ...duties are together.

Barbara Roseman: Right. So I made a suggestion in the chat room...

Mikey O'Connor: Oh.

Barbara Roseman: ...which is that possibly a way to clarify this and it would need to be upfront at the beginning of the document that says here's how we're using these terms. Perhaps if you said a thin registry with a capital R, gTLD registry or just TLD or just TLD registry only stores and manages the information associated with the domain names. And then distinguish that from that set of data, which is also called a registry, right.

And so I think that that might help you make it clear that when you're talking that it's a difference between who holds which data or who is responsible as the primary manager of that data. And you're trying to distinguish here between what the responsibilities are for the - for those TLD registries that operate only at thin registries, lower case R and those TLD registries that operate at thick registries, lower case R.

So it's like there's two different things that use the term registry here. And I think we want to be clear when we're talking about what the responsibilities are of the organization that is operating that TLD and what the responsibilities are for having the datasets be called the right - you know, like it's called registry also, right.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Barbara Roseman: So I think that's partly where some of the confusion is coming here.

Mikey O'Connor: That's a good observation. I like that. Jeff...

Barbara Roseman: I don't know how much it clarifies it in here but I do think that you're, you know, what you're trying to distinguish is that there's this thing called a thick registry, which has a certain amount of data. Certain TLD registries operate a thick lower case registry. Other TLD operators a thin lower case registry.

And so I think if you pull those two things apart if you generally talk about what it is you're trying to get at here.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Barbara Roseman: We just keep using the term registry as if it just means, you know, a set of data when it also refers - we're trying to make that like the same as the TLD operator registry and I think (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: You know, another way to do this would be to say a thin registry operator only - well no. I see what you're...

Barbara Roseman: No, I think what you really want to distinguish the registry operator - capital R registry operator from the dataset that they maintain which also happens to be called a registry.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. And so then collect and publish goes with the registry operator whereas the lower case registry contains the information associated with the domain name.

Barbara Roseman: Right.

Mikey O'Connor: Right. So how about that as a friendly amendment folks? Where we would say a thin registry only contains the information associated with a domain name. This set includes data sufficient to identify the (unintelligible) blah,

blah, blah, blah. Or the registrars (unintelligible). So that's all fine. With thin registries...

Barbara Roseman: So I would - wherever you want to use the word registry to mean that operator to the TLD, I would use the term the TLD registry or TLD registry operator.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Barbara Roseman: And that way you're making it very clear that this - that there's this thing called VeriSign for instance...

Mikey O'Connor: Right.

Barbara Roseman: ...that is distinct from the dataset that VeriSign maintains with both of those entities are sometimes referred to as registries but they don't mean exactly the same thing.

Mikey O'Connor: So it seems to me that in this paragraph all of the words that Ray highlighted, stores and manages, Jeff's friendly amendment collect and publish, maintain and provide could all be substituted with the word contains. Because I think in this paragraph we're only talking about the data store. We're not really talking about the jobs that the registries do.

Barbara Roseman: Can you please call up (unintelligible) so we can see (unintelligible) just for the (unintelligible). Because this is all (introductory) material, right?

Mikey O'Connor: No, no. This is the main - this is the main deal.

Barbara Roseman: Oh, okay. Okay. I lost track of (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Mikey, Marika did make an interesting comment in the chat and Jeff has had his hand up for a while.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I know. I tried to get back to him. Jeff, go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: I'm just reading Marika's comment. I think I just got confused with that whole discussion. But I think if the reason - if we go back to the term that's the model - a thin registration model versus a thick registration model, then we get away from talking about registries and entities themselves.

But I don't like the word contains. And the reason - and the whole premise behind the question was why do we distinguish I think, you know, Keith points out in the chat and it relates to EU privacy law as well. Right. There's a distinction between someone that merely collects the data from someone who processes the data.

We don't process the data. We simply collect it and spit it back out. Right. So we collect it and we publish it. And the word manages implies some sort of processing or manipulation.

So it's again kind of why the distinction is really important. But I got confused I have to tell you with Barbara's whole distinction of the thin registry as the (unintelligible) versus the thin registry of the - as to (where it's at).

I think if you talk about the models without getting - as Mikey as done there without getting into the entities. So it's in the thin registration model only this information is collected and published. And the thick registry this information is collected and published.

And then there could be some distinctions with what's published, right. So a thick registry collects a lot more information or may collect a lot more information than it actually publishes and that's from the distinction of, you know, dot (unintelligible) and (cat). So there's a distinction between what is published. That's generally the speak that we use in the registry.

But I don't - I think Barbara it confuses me even though I understand technically but from a policy perspective it confuses me to distinguish between a TLD registry and the Whois registry. I don't think - to me that's going to confuse a lot of people.

Barbara Roseman: Why? Just because we've historically done it the other way?

Jeff Neuman: Well because I don't think - we talk about the entities but just the model. Right. Because in people's minds the provider of the Whois service is only the registry or its subcontractor but the registry is always responsible for collecting and disseminating information. And to distinguish between the two it's almost making it sound like two different entities.

Barbara Roseman: Well they are in a sense. I mean there's the TLD operator and then there's the model under which they operate. And that could change, right. Like you could have a TLD operator who moves from a thick to a thin or a thin to a thick.

Jeff Neuman: Right. So you talk about the model. One term is a model. The other term is okay, thick registration or thin registration model versus...

Barbara Roseman: Right.

Jeff Neuman: ...the registry as an entity. That's okay.

Barbara Roseman: Yeah.

Jeff Neuman: But yeah, that's fine.

Barbara Roseman: Yeah. That sounds good to me. I thought those changes were useful.

Mikey O'Connor: So I've saved a set of changes into the paragraph. How am I doing?

Barbara Roseman: I think it looks good.

Mikey O'Connor: What do others think?

Barbara Roseman: But I'm not - I'm just the staff person helping you clarify this.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, you know, I am weird duck. I don't really make a big distinction. So don't worry about that. You can talk to Marika and Nathalie about how strange I am.

Jeff Neuman: So that - but Mikey then let me get on to the next sentence. So the first sentence is good. Second sentence as part of the timeline (with this), the record was updated in a tree data store.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Jeff Neuman: It's not really - the record's not updated in a - I mean it sort of is updated in the Whois. But it's really updated in the registry database and the Whois just really reflects that. So...

Barbara Roseman: Yeah. That's a good clarification.

Mikey O'Connor: How about that?

Jeff Neuman: (Unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Mikey, going back to the first sentence. That implies in a thin model the other information such as contact information is not collected and published period because you're not saying by whom.

Mikey O'Connor: Ah. Good catch. In what?

Alan Greenberg: By the registry.

Barbara Roseman: Yeah. By the registry.

Mikey O'Connor: Capital R registry?

Barbara Roseman: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: I would guess so.

Mikey O'Connor: That's a good one. Any more of those?

Barbara Roseman: Where you updated - where you updated in the registry database, I would make that a capital R.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, okay. During that - oh, Ray, go ahead.

Barbara Roseman: So then the last sentence needs to be clarified. In a thick registry model, both sets of data...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: Are published by a registry.

Barbara Roseman: Right. By a - through the registry Whois. How about that?

Alan Greenberg: That works for me.

Jeff Neuman: And then I think in the sentence before you need to ask registrars but I don't know if they'll like the word manage either.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Maintain?

Barbara Roseman: How about maintain or publish?

Mikey O'Connor: Not there. Here.

Barbara Roseman: Yeah. Because they provide it via their own Whois services (unintelligible) publication (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. Ray, you've been patient. Go ahead.

Ray Fassett: Sure, sure, sure. So along these lines, right, so we're clarifying the notion of published by the registry, which I think is a good clarification that Alan brought forth. Now what about, you know, where is the - where is this data collected from? Right.

So we're saying is collected and published by the registry and I might say from the registrar. That's true in either a thin or thick model, either model. In both cases the registry is collecting and publishing data from the registrars - from the registrar.

Mikey O'Connor: Ah, in the first sentence.

Ray Fassett: Right. So I'm actually working through my head how to get that in there?

Mikey O'Connor: Well how about this.

Ray Fassett: Yeah. I think that's - yeah, it might have to be singular registrars because we're talking about singular domain name.

Mikey O'Connor: Ah, good point.

Ray Fassett: Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: That's a good one. Barbara, go ahead.

Barbara Roseman: I was going to say that in the paragraph above you have the term manage there that I think was causing some confusion and I think if you change that to maintains there as well that would probably be a good friendly change.

Mikey O'Connor: Good catch. Pull - (pile on there).

Barbara Roseman: Well I love doing line-by-line editing. It's so much fun.

Mikey O'Connor: Well yeah but we're so close to the end. I think...

Barbara Roseman: Yeah. That's...

Mikey O'Connor: ...the only way to do it. And we are actually doing something that would take weeks and would probably drive us crazy by the list, so. At least for me I'm gaining a deeper and better understanding. So I'm pretty comfortable with this. How we doing? Are we close enough for government work on this one?

Carolyn Hoover: I have one final thing Mikey. I had my hand raised. This is Carolyn Hoover.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh Carolyn, go ahead. I'm sorry.

Carolyn Hoover: Yeah. This is just a minor detail. The reference after RAA 3.3 for those domains they sponsor, this is talking about the registrars sponsoring. And since that might, you know, for those registries that are actually sponsors, I think I would prefer that that say for those domains they support or some other word other than sponsor.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Within the RAA the term that is used is sponsor though.

Carolyn Hoover: Oh it is? Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. I understand the confusion --it's Alan speaking -- with the other definition of sponsor we have.

Carolyn Hoover: Well if that's within RAA, I guess I can go with that. I hadn't read that in detail to see that they were sort of crossing boundaries there as I would see it.

Barbara Roseman: Would that be worth a footnote as an explanation?

Mikey O'Connor: No.

Carolyn Hoover: I mean I don't feel strongly about it.

Mikey O'Connor: (Unintelligible).

Carolyn Hoover: I was just if we're...

Alan Greenberg: The they is registrars, so.

Carolyn Hoover: Yeah. And that's okay. I just wanted to make that, you know, make that note.

Alan Greenberg: I have a question. Is the - it's Alan speaking. Is Section 3.3 of RAA 3.3 mean RAA 3.3.3.3 or is that redundant?

Man: Yeah, that's a good...

Alan Greenberg: I should have memorized the RAA by not but I haven't.

Mikey O'Connor: So Marika, do you remember what that was about or is this...

Marika Konings: This is Marika. This is from the final issue report. So I would have to check back to see if that reference is correct. Unfortunately don't know it by heart. I will go and memorize the RAA tonight.

Mikey O'Connor: Well what's the dang matter with you? You know, you do brain surgery, you play in the rock and roll band, huh. You don't have the RAA memorized. Well.

Marika Konings: Well it's next on my list.

Mikey O'Connor: All right. I guess we'll give you a pass this time.

Alan Greenberg: I have faith that it will be corrected if it's wrong and left if it's correct.

Mikey O'Connor: How about insert the (reg) to reference? And then maybe put in a footnote about this sponsor.

Jeff Neuman: It's just I'm looking at the RAA - it's Jeff. It's just Section 3.3.

Mikey O'Connor: Is it? So I can get rid of that first...

Jeff Neuman: There is no 3.3.3.3.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. So it...

Alan Greenberg: It's either as required by Section - by RAA Section 3.3 or as required by Section 3.3 of the RAA, so.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. Okay, so.

Alan Greenberg: Pick whichever one you like best.

Mikey O'Connor: I took out one of those at random. And then we'll think out - I like random. Okay. Now I do feel like we're getting down into the weeds here. Carolyn, is that an old hand or a new one. Probably old, right?

Carolyn Hoover: Yes it's old. I will take that down.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah. So I think we're - we have a sentence now that says something that we don't mean and it's the sentence that says in a thin registration model only the information associated with the domain is collected from the registrar. And that's not true. The registrar collects all the data.

Mikey O'Connor: Which sentence are we talking about?

Elisa Cooper: It's the sentence that starts off in a thin registration model only the information associated with the domain name is collected from the registrar, which is not - which is...

Alan Greenberg: By the registry.

Mikey O'Connor: Right.

Elisa Cooper: And published by the registry. But that's not true. All the data is collected by the registrar in either...

Mikey O'Connor: No, no, no.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: It's collected from the registrar by the registry.

Man: Correct.

Mikey O'Connor: The registrar does indeed collect all kinds of good information. But the thin registration model only - at the registry level, which is where this model exists, the only information that passes up to the registry from the registrar is the information associated with the domain name.

Alan Greenberg: Mikey, may I make a suggestion?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: I think what this needs is what we're doing is we're starting off looking at the details without a lead in sentence saying what information is contained in Whois. That is the sum total of it. And I think that's something Marika can...

Mikey O'Connor: Is that a siren in the background? Whoever it is, mute your phone.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. I think that's something Marika can do offline. That is if we prefix it saying Whois contains two sorts of data, this and this, the rest of it will flow a lot clearer. I'm not sure I want to wordsmith it on the phone but I think that - it may have said that when we started but right now it doesn't.

Mikey O'Connor: Right. Yeah.

Elisa Cooper: But Mikey, even in the thin model the registrar contains both sets of data. I mean the...

Mikey O'Connor: Right.

Elisa Cooper: ...registrar collects both sets of data.

Mikey O'Connor: Correct.

Elisa Cooper: But you're saying that sentence says only collects the data associated with the domain name.

Alan Greenberg: No. It says collected from the registrar.

Elisa Cooper: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: That's the key word. It's not saying anything about what the registrar collects. It's what the registries collect...

Elisa Cooper: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: ...from the registrar.

Jeff Neuman: But I...

Alan Greenberg: A lead in sentence will say that and I think it will make it a lot clearer.

Jeff Neuman: But I think what you can say though to alleviate - because I kind of see what Elisa is saying. You can say in thin registration model, the registry only collects. You kind of...

Mikey O'Connor: Ah. Capital R registry.

Jeff Neuman: Only collects the information associated with the domain name or collects - the registry only collects the information associated with the domain name from the registrar.

Alan Greenberg: Mikey, it's Alan. If we're going to have another meeting next week, this sounds like something that can be redrafted by Marika and passed to us on the list.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: Instead of trying to...

Mikey O'Connor: We have gotten into the weeds (I think).

Alan Greenberg: We're getting to the point where every change we make is likely to have another impact somewhere else.

Mikey O'Connor: All right. We'll leave it at this point.

Ray Fassett: Mikey, can I...

Mikey O'Connor: I think we're all on the same page more or less.

Ray Fassett: Mikey. Mikey, this is Ray. Can I just interject one more time?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. Go ahead.

Ray Fassett: Thank you. I think this has been kind of productive actually. The very last sentence though look at the same thing. It's the same idea, just being consistent. So in a thick registration model you'd be basically doing the exact same exercise. In a thick registration model which the registry...

Mikey O'Connor: Right.

Ray Fassett: ...collects both sets of data.

Jeff Neuman: From the registrar.

Ray Fassett: From the registrar. And I think that kind of consistency. For those in the working group that may not be as familiar with this, it'll be easier for them to understand it when you have this consistency. So I think it's been a good exercise.

Mikey O'Connor: Take a gander at that last try there and see. I do too. Elisa, does that...

Elisa Cooper: Yeah. I think that is much clearer.

Mikey O'Connor: We made it before you had to drop off the call. I couldn't - I got half through that and realized we were getting to the end of your (time). Cool. All right. Let's call that tentatively done. And go on to...

Jeff Newman: Mikey, I think (Evan)'s got a comment.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh (Evan), go ahead. Sorry.

(Evan):   Hi there Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: On this part here I assume.

(Evan):   Well just in general to your comment about everyone being on the same page. I just wanted to be on record as saying I think this is a relatively massive exercise in wheel reinvention. There's plenty of definitions that exist all over the place including in the agreements. And the necessity to put that into this document to me unreasonably constrains the PDP and I'll just leave it at that.

Mikey O'Connor: Okie-dokie. Jeff, go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: (Evan), just to answer that. I don't believe any of the agreements contain definitions of what a thin registry is or a thick. There is definitions for what a thick and thin registry have to do but there's no definition of thin versus thick. It's kind of a vernacular that we've been using but it's not something that's defined.

So I'm hoping it does (impede strain) and I'd like to hear more about why you think it constrains because we're not making any value judgments as to whether something's good or bad or right or wrong or should be done in the future or not done in the future. It's just kind of a matter of what we do.

(Evan):   I guess my answer - sorry. I guess my answer to that is simply that the definitions have already been done. They've been done by the Whois Review Team. Even Wikipedia has its own ideas of that if there's inaccuracies. You know, I'm trying to look at things from At Large from the public facing point of view of this.

And I'm just saying that the level of detail I'm seeing in here, you know, are you - is this document - is this drafting team attempting to actually define something that's never been defined before. That strikes me as really, really strange.

So if there is a definition of Whois thin and thick that exists somewhere, we need to refer to it. And if we are actually the first ones in this team actually drafting the difference between thin and thick here, I think there's a deeper problem.

Alan Greenberg: I think that deeper problem has already been identified.

Jeff Neuman: Then we shouldn't just use the words thin or thick. I mean (Evan), I don't see a problem here. We're not - we're just describing what these registries do. If you want to get rid of the terms thin and thick and come up with something new, I mean I think it's counterproductive but...

(Evan):   Oh no, no, sorry. That isn't what - that isn't what I was saying. In fact I'm just suggesting that maybe those things are already defined elsewhere and we don't need to reinvent that wheel.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. But I'm not willing to rely on Wikipedia or, you know, we are those registries that do it and if we the registries agree that this defines what we do, not whether it's right or wrong or what we should do in the future, then I think that should have more authority than...

(Evan):   That the Whois Review Team?

Jeff Neuman: Exactly, yes. I do honestly.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm going to draw a line under this one and bounce this to the list. Because I - concerned that we are now starting to dive into the work of the working group and the battles yet to come. I think it's perfectly reasonable in a charter to have a short definition of what the charter is working on. And the fact that we didn't get the definition quite right and it needed to be edited seems perfectly fine to me.

But I really don't want to get into who defines is at this stage of the game. If you guys want to battle that out on the list, that's great, and we fold the result back into this document.

Susan, go ahead.

Susan: Hi. I just want - to (Evan)'s point, I agree with him in part of what he's saying. But having been a member of the Whois Review Team, we struggled with those definitions. And finding, you know, clear cut definitions and the policy in general. So that was one of our recommendations was to not create a new Whois policy but to sort of document it and put it all in one place.

So if we can give some definition - minimal definitions here, I'm comfortable with that because I think it will help the group when they start this work and won't send them down the rabbit hole that we felt like we were heading down. So I can understand not wanting to reinvent the definitions but I think it is important that we outline some of it here.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Susan. There's a lot going on in the chat, which I'm not going to replay. Nathalie, you may want to email the chat transcript to the list on this one. I'm not sure. But I really do want to push on off this one if we're feeling like we're reasonably close on this definition, which it sounded like we did.

Okay. I think the next substantive change - oh, it's another Ray one. The one in terms of the use of a uniform Whois service. Competition in registry services. This is one of the impacts that the group will have to take a look at.

Barbara Roseman: This is Barbara. You just to at the beginning of that paragraph, you want to clean up the registry language there to have capital Rs where appropriate.

Mikey O'Connor: Where are we seeing...

Barbara Roseman: At the beginning of database synchronization. So it's database synchronization between the registry and registrars...

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, (here we)...

Barbara Roseman: ...will be the impact on the (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: So we're going to capitalize.

Barbara Roseman: I'm just making note, yeah, you know, you just want to go through it and clean that up.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. Okay. So we'll just - good catch. All right. So then the one right after it is the one that Ray raised the question about the word uniform. And I would tend to agree uniform Whois means a different thing to me than thick versus thin.

Uniform means it's identical. And I don't think that that's really the intent in this sentence. I might say something like provide Whois services using the thick registration model as an alternate wording. Is that sort of where you were headed Ray? You want to jump in on this one? Oh, Alan got in first and then Ray can follow Alan. Go ahead Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. You scrolled over my concern but they're related. And that is in the lead in paragraph to the bullets, it talks about - and if you get just a little farther, it'll say the consistent use of thick Whois. And I don't know what that means. Consistent with what?

My perception is if one was ever to come up with a strict set of rules for what Whois is then all registries need to follow it. And that implies consistency. I mean is consistency because everyone is follow - is working from the same rulebook.

So I'm not quite sure what the word consistent spanning alone is, you know, without saying what its consistent with. And the same, you know, sort of implies with uniform. You know, who establishes which uniform is correct?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. I think that's right. Marika, would you take it as a friendly amendment if I deleted consistent or we just did this.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. The consistent wasn't an addition from my part. I think that was something that Keith had suggested.

Mikey O'Connor: Ah. Keith, you get to defend this.

Keith Drasek: Yeah. So this is Keith. Thank you. Yes, this was an addition that I had suggested - I don't know if it was two calls ago or before two calls ago but I mean basically again, the intent of providing that is that it was a consistent use for all registries and that it was, you know, not to single out one particular registry.

And I think that, you know, we've included the language by all both existing and future gTLD registries. I think that - I think maybe the key is that it's a consistent policy that we're going after, right. I mean ultimately the results of coming out of the PDP working group and the recommendations and assuming the recommendations are accepted is that we will have a

consistent policy. So I don't know, maybe - anybody have any further thoughts on that?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. I - it's Alan. I do.

Keith Drasek: Go ahead Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. I agree that what we want is consistent - a consistent policy. I think in this sentence the word consistent is out of place. And I think the sentence holds together without the word, you know, we want recommendations on a use of thick Whois by all existing and future registries is fine.

We were not charged with actually writing the specifications for thick Whois. I'm not sure, you know, one of the registries can - who operates thick Whois can tell me, you know, is it really document anywhere exactly what the thick Whois means or is it partly folklore that's passed on from father to son? I'm not sure.

If indeed it is not written, someone should be writing it but this PDP was not charged with doing that. Maybe we want to take it on and, you know, request that Council allow us to include that even though it wasn't in the - I don't think it was in the issue report.

Mike O'Connor: No.

Alan Greenberg: So I think consistency has to come from everyone following the same set of rules. I'm not quite sure where those - whether those rules exist or where they would come from if they don't exist.

Mikey O'Connor: So Keith, what do you think of the change that I made here?

Keith Drasek: Let's - I think Ray has his hand up. Let's get Ray in the (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Oh go ahead Ray, sorry.

Ray Fassett: Sure. Thank you Mikey. Ray Fassett. I think we shouldn't be having - we shouldn't be struggling with this sentence. Isn't there a - I mean certainly the PDP Working Group is tasked with something and that task came from the GNSO Council. Isn't there language from the resolution that specifically states what the GNSO Council is taking the PDP Working Group to do?

Mikey O'Connor: That's a good point.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. For some reason I cannot raise my hand. But indeed there was original language that was inserted here. But I - some people I think commented. I think that basically the question was whether or not to require thick Whois. And I think then the questions on - I think we said all that just (unintelligible) and I think people want to make that clear. And that's why the addition was made.

But I think the basic sentence was basically, you know, whether or not to require thick Whois.

Ray Fassett: I think it might be productive -- this is just a thought -- to go back to the actual resolution and see what the instructions are. It's a suggestion.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. I don't mind adding both existing and future because I think that is a clarification. You know, since we don't spend so much of our (unintelligible) right now talking about new gTLDs or - and so to be crystal clear, that consistent was the word that was bothering me and that was added along the way.

Mikey O'Connor: Keith, you're sort of the one that's carrying the flag on this. So now I want to circle back to you again and see if the change that I've got in there now would work.

Keith Drasek: Thanks Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: (Mike) is...

Keith Drasek: Let me take it under - let me take it under consideration.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Keith Drasek: And I'll respond to the list.

Mikey O'Connor: Cool.

Keith Drasek: Thanks. Hey, just - this is Keith again. Just to note, I know we're sort of getting close to the top of the hour and...

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Keith Drasek: ...I think that in chat he may have to drop off right after the top of the hour. There's an additional point that we need that we really ought to get to and that's further down in one of Jeff's comments about, you know, thick to thin in the event there's a - not a consensus among the group. And I think we really ought to spend some time on that.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. Ray, if it's okay with you, I'm going to skip your second comment for just a minute and dwell on this one by Jeff because I agree. This is a substantive point. Marika, you're just testing your hand. Okay. Never mind.

So what you see on the screen is noted at the bottom in green and we are about five minutes from the end of the hour so we'll see if we can dispose of this or not.

What we're saying right now is should we reach consensus on a recommendation that thick Whois should be required for all gTLDs, the PDP

should consider a bunch of stuff. Jeff is raising I think a really interesting point which is should the opposite happen.

Should the PDP reach a consensus on a recommendation that thick Whois should not be required for all gTLDs then the workgroup needs to look at the possibility of those that operate a thick registry choosing to go thin and getting rid of their existing requirements to be thick. And with that, Alan, then Susan, carry on.

Jeff Neuman: Did you want - this is Jeff. I'll put myself in the queue.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh yeah. No Jeff, go...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Jeff, why don't you go first?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

Jeff Neuman: Well I mean I think it's pretty self-explanatory. So maybe I'll wait for the - plus I'll myself third in queue and then I'll hear from Susan and from - and Alan, yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: All right. Susan or Alan.

Susan: Well Alan's first.

Alan Greenberg: I wanted to ask a question because I'll ask it and I may want to be put back in the queue. Are you - Jeff, are you implying that we should do - answer similar questions to the paragraph above regarding thin or are you asking should - that we should make a statement - if we do not require thick of everyone, we should make a statement saying whether we bless the concept of a thick registry requesting to be a thin one?

Jeff Neuman: I don't think I'm asking for blessing. I guess the point is that - and it wouldn't be the same considerations like you wouldn't consider cost or transition or anything like that I don't think. All right. If, you know, there is, and again I don't want to jump too much into substance and I (unintelligible) objection to that.

But if the group comes to a consensus that you know what, thick shouldn't be required for all, then, you know, you have to look at the competitive situation - the competitive landscape from those that are required to spend significantly more amounts of money to actually maintain this service and the increased liability and other things that these registries take on and, you know, offer those registries the opportunity which they've never been offered to before to become thin.

I'm not saying anyone would or wouldn't but that should not be - it definitely affects or could affect competition to require some be thick and not all.

Alan Greenberg: Susan.

Susan: So I would disagree that I do not think this belongs in this document. I think this is out of the scope of the task at hand. And, you know, if this group comes to the conclusion that no .com and .net and whomever else is not required to become a thick Whois registry, then that's another PDP.

So I don't think we should confuse the issues here because this is a big enough issue. So adding that element of reverting all - allowing all the thick registries to revert to a thin I think would just open a can of worms right now and we should just focus on the task at hand.

Mikey O'Connor: Thank you. Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: On that I would say actually I - sorry Susan. I actually disagree with that. I think that we're looking at consistency. And if we're saying consistency is not as important, I don't think we would do a whole other PDP to find out whether an individual registry like dot (in the) future wants to become thin.

I think you're looking at - one of the elements you're looking at here - we were asked to look at was competition, the affects of competition if they're all now consistent. I think all of the same elements are present and it's certainly possible that the PDP does say look, com and net are different for whatever reason. That could be a finding.

Susan: Right.

Jeff Neuman: But if there's a finding that no, there's really no reason that it has - everyone has to be thick, then I think it is totally within this group's scope to kind of say okay, well you need to think of the ramifications of that.

Susan: I just do not think that belongs in this document.

Mikey O'Connor: We're getting really close to the top of the hour. So I think what we'll do is strike a line under the queue at Alan and Ray. Clearly we're going to need to jump this one out to the list as well. We're not going to get through this because we've only got about 30 seconds to go. Alan and Ray.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I'll be quick. I tend to agree with Susan. If this group agrees - if the PDP says that thick is not required by anyone, there is an open question of does that mean the thick ones could go thin and but I don't think it's a question for this PDP.

I think it's a reasonable thing that if a thick registry chose to do that, it could submit an RSEP. The Board may approve it, the Board may refuse it, the Board may open it up to a public comment, the Board may request an issue

report. But I don't think it is within our domain that we weren't asked that. We were specifically asked should everyone be thick, not...

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: ...the converse. So I would this is not part of our (quest).

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. I'm going to push - I'm going to push a little bit here as we...

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: ...are over time. Yeah. Ray, go ahead.

Ray Fassett: Real quick. I think I kind of echo Alan's thoughts. Right now whether thick or thin is under contract administration between the registry operator and ICANN. And what we're looking at is really removing it under that umbrella and turning it into a consensus policy. So what happens in the event that no consensus policy is reach?

I kind of agree with Keith. Keith has a comment in there that I agree. It's every unlikely that - well, it's how Keith says it. But there's a third option here, which is just simply no consensus is reached at all and then I think it's just a - falls back to what it is today, which is a matter of contract administration. It's not a policy today. It would remain not a policy and just fall back under contract administration.

But I'd like to hear Jeff's thoughts on that too if he has any. But that might be for next week.

Mikey O'Connor: Well we'll...

Jeff Neuman: If I can Mikey just real quick on that.

Mikey O'Connor: Give you the last word. Then we'll wrap it up. Go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: It's not the (chase) and I think it's really unfair to look at the competitive affects for forcing a thin to go thick without looking at the competitive affects of what would happen if VeriSign were to continue to be allowed to be thin and everybody else be allowed to be thick.

So if that competitive analysis includes both then I might be okay. But not if it only looks at the competitive analysis of VeriSign going from thin to think. So I - just I think that would be fundamentally unfair to the other providers out there. And, you know, I'm not saying - look, don't anyone take this to mean that Jeff believes Neustar should be thin. I kind of actually believe everyone should be thick.

But I just think when you look at competition, you ought to make sure you look at it from both sides and it can't be just, you know, what are we going to do to VeriSign if they have to go to thick. That's my main concern.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. Okay. Marika gets to speak incredibly quickly. And then clearly this is one - this is sounding almost (VIS). I think Jeff, could you kick off a thread on this on the list just so people can start cogitating about it?

Jeff Neuman: Sure. And I'll note for that question - I'll not for the record this is the first time I've heard (Evan) talk about what's fair and this is not. Usually he's the one advocating about fairness but now it's look...

Mikey O'Connor: No, no. We're not going there.

Jeff Neuman: I'm just joking guys.

Mikey O'Connor: We're not going there.

Jeff Neuman: I'll kick off - I'll kick it off from the list. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: Marika. (Unintelligible).

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Yeah. You know that I can speak very fast. I think just to make a point to Jeff's comment. I think that's something that the issue report pointed out and maybe can be emphasized in the charter here. Because I thin the idea can be not only look at what the consequences may be if you require everyone to be thick but also look at indeed what are the potential impacts or costs if you maintain status quo.

But I don't know if - because I think that was the point at least that Jeff was making to say okay but if you don't require anyone to change to thick Whois, what is the impact then in the current environment. And I think that's a question that is implicit in these different questions that need to be evaluated from both sides.

What happens if you maintain the current situation and what happens if you would require everyone to go thick and those, you know, balance those two against each other in the, you know, final determination of the working group and what the recommendations should be. I think that was the underlying thought and maybe that's something that can be easily emphasized in some part.

Mikey O'Connor: All right gang. Thanks for hanging in a few minutes over the hour. With that Nathalie, we're going to wrap this call up and we'll see everybody in a week and look forward to some conversation on the list. Thanks all.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you Mikey.

Woman: Bye everyone.

Woman: Thanks.

Woman: Bye.

Woman: Bye.

Woman: Bye.

END