

**ICANN  
Transcription  
Thick Whois PDP Working Group  
Tuesday 27 November 2012 at 15:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Thick Whois PDP Working Group on the Tuesday 27 November 2012 at 15:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-thick-whois-20121127-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Marc Anderson – RySG  
Titi Akinsanmi – At Large  
Roy Balleste – NCUC  
Don Blumenthal – RySG  
Amr Elsadr – NCSG  
Ray Fassett – RySG  
Christopher George – IPC  
Alan Greenberg – At Large  
Volker Greimann – RrSG  
Frederic Guillemaut – RrSG  
Caroline Hoover – RySG  
Susan Kawaguchi - CBUC  
Evan Leibovitch – ALAC  
Marie Laure Lemineur - NPOC  
Steve Metalitz – IPC  
Ope Oodusan – At Large  
Mikey O'Connor – ISPCP  
Normann Ritchie – RySG  
Tim Ruiz – RrSG  
Jill Titzer – RrSG  
Rick Wesson - RrSG  
Jonathan Zuck - IPC  
Omar Kaminski-At-Large

Apologies:

Wilson Abigaba - NCUC  
Avri Doria - NCSG  
Susan Prosser – RrSG  
Carlton Samuels – At Large

ICANN staff:

Berry Cobb  
Marika Konings  
Julia Charvolen

Julia Charvolen: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the Thick Whois PDP working group call on the 27th of November. On the call today we have Marc Anderson, Titi Akinsanmi, Roy Balleste, Don Blumenthal, Ray Fassett, Christopher George, Alan Greenberg, Volker Greimann, Frederic Guillemaut, Carolyn Hoover, Susan Kawaguchi, Marie Laure Lemineur, Steve Metalitz, Ope Oodusan, Mikey O'Connor, Norm Ritchie, and Jill Titzer.

We have also apologies from Susan Prosser and Carlton Samuels. From staff we have Marika Konings, Berry Cobb, and myself, Julia Charvolen. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Julia and welcome all. Sort of a (unintelligible)...

Mikey O'Connor: (Crosstalk)

Mikey O'Connor: (Unintelligible) just joined as well.

Mikey O'Connor: Phone number's changed, so people are having trouble getting in and - there's a little bit of feedback on the line. Operator -- Ricardo -- if you're watching the lines can you figure out the one that's talking to us? You can hear it in the background there. See if we can get that (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: (Unintelligible) or something.

Mikey O'Connor: There we go, okay. Well, welcome all; we are off to a little bit of a rugged start and so periodically if somebody could remind me -- Julia or Marie if you could remind me periodically through the call -- we'll just check and see who else has joined late because we had a completely new set of dial in numbers that we had to get out to people. And interestingly enough, Marie is without a number in that list so we'll have to see if Costa Rica can get added for next week's call as well so that she can dial in.

Anyway, taking a look at the agenda we're going to do several things. We'll do the roll call -- and this is sort of the one more last chance on statements of interest -- three of us still don't have statements of interest and we're going to really put the pressure on this week to get those in and otherwise drop them from the list. We're going to take a look at the request - the template to reach out to other ACCs and SOs for information and then we're going to dig into the topics and start assigning ourselves to topics so that we can get underway.

And I sure hope that Don gets on the call, he's having trouble dialing in. Can somebody type in to the chat -- Don asked me privately and I can't multi-task to type him back -- but he would like audio on the Adobe room and my guess is that's hard to put together right now because that usually has to be done in advance of the call. But I can't type all that to him.

So anyway, off we go. If Jessie, Joe, or Rick are on the call -- if you roll down in the list that's on the screen in front of you you'll see that those three folks are still missing statements of interest -- and if any of you are on the call this is sort of your last chance. Glenn is going to send out a note letting you know the same thing and then if we don't hear from you this week we're going to drop you off the mailing list. It's not that you can't rejoin, it's just that we have to sort of keep all that paperwork tidy. So strongly encourage folks to get those done.

For the rest of you are there any changes to statements of interest? I would imagine not since we're pretty new at this, but we'll check every week.

Man: No changes.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Let's see. Marika, do you have that template that you sent out? If you do, if you could pass that up on the screen that would be cool. I think we all had a chance to review this and so I'm hoping that this is a pretty short agenda item. But this is a chance -- if people want to very quickly read this if

you haven't had time to read it before. This doesn't diverge very much at all from the charter and the issue report and we'd really like to push this out so that the various constituencies have time to get us comments on this.

So I'm not going to drag us through it unless someone really wants to get dragged through it. I'm just going to sort of encourage you to read it and get us, you know, a heads up if there's something that you want to change. Oh, Ray, go ahead.

Ray Fassett: Yes. Thank you Mikey. And unfortunately I wasn't able to be a heavy participant on the last call, which I apologize. But anyway, I read through the document and I just have a couple of questions regarding its purpose. The primary on is are we looking for stakeholder constituency consensus positions when we say you're view? Is that intended to be a stakeholder constituency position?

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, that is good. Marika is right there. Go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. This is one of the required steps of the PDP and as I understand it's indeed intended this is a constituency or stakeholder group statement so it's their view. It's not to be seen as a, you know, one member of the group submitting that. So if it's submitted it's considered by the working group as a position by the specific stakeholder group or constituency.

Ray Fassett: That's great, thanks. I'm sorry.

Mikey O'Connor: If that's a question that Ray has we might want to amplify the language in this document just a bit to make this clear. Because if Ray was confused by that then others will be as well.

Man: Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Marika, can you sort of take an action item sort of to just drive a little clarification in wherever the appropriate thought is in this document?

Marika Konings: Sure.

Mikey O'Connor: Cool. Ray, keep going. I didn't mean to interrupt you; I just wanted to sort of put that on the pile while I was thinking about it.

Ray Fassett: No, that's great, thank you. And then a second question I have is it appears, you know, we're asking for opinion. We're doing outreach. And I think that's a good step. Is it - would it be more helpful to this working group if we clarified that we're looking for - you know, we're - you can provide evidence to your opinion it might be more weighted. For example, you're view on stability. "Yes, I think the (unintelligible) is more stable." Okay, that's kind of a conclusory sentence -- for example -- or it can go the other way.

"No, I think the (unintelligible) is less stable." So - or accessibility. Should we request that if you have empirical evidence or quantitative evidence that you can provide to support your opinion it might be given more weight?

Mikey O'Connor: I like that a lot. Because I think that that's going to be the puzzler for this group. You know, we're going to circle around to that same topic right after this one which is how are we going to gather this evidence? Where are we going to get it? Who's going to provide it? Who's going to do the work of gathering it and so on? And so if we can get documentation from this cycle as well I think that will help the group a lot. So again, I'm going to sort of toss that one to Marika and see if she could add that to the clarifications pile.

Marika Konings: Yep.

Rick Wesson: Rick Wesson has joined the call; sorry I'm arriving late.

Mikey O'Connor: No worries, we had a lot of trouble with phone numbers. Rick, welcome to the gang. Anything else Ray?

Ray Fassett: Yeah, last question would be is there a deadline that when we go back to our stakeholder groups or constituencies we say, you know, we need this input by X date?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, that's in the to be determined first sentence.

Ray Fassett: Ah, there it is.

Mikey O'Connor: 35 days from whenever we kick it off. There's sort of a standard interval for that. Even I can answer that one.

Ray Fassett: Okay, sorry I missed that one. That's it from me.

Mikey O'Connor: Cool. Nice job, thanks. Anybody else got ideas? Those are good ones; I like those a lot. I think those'll help - I think both of those will help us in the work that we're doing and it puts a little bit more pressure on the stakeholder groups but there you go.

And I think that part of is that that's our job as members, you know, we are pretty well represented across this working group. I think we as working group members are going to have to pull a little bit harder on the or's on this particular working group than we normally do. And that's okay. Volker, go ahead.

Volker Greimann: Yeah, I'm just asking myself at this point if it really make sense to have this on the stakeholder group level as a requirement. We should be allowing the minority opinions of stakeholder groups to also give their opinions in that forum just to make sure that all voices are heard. Because not all stakeholder groups are unified block that always have the same opinion on everything.

Mikey O'Connor: I agree and I think in this particular case it's also useful because we may get more documentation that way. And so - oh, Marika's - go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I think I - that is covered as well partly by the first few bullets on process. Because there we say as well, "Please describe the process by which your stakeholder group/constituency arrived at this perspective." It's the fourth below. (Unintelligible) there as well as a place to say, "Well, this part of our statement is, you know, a consensus view, however, you know, this is a view that was only supported by a couple of members or this was a minority statement that was submitted."

So we're asking specifically for stakeholder groups or constituencies to identify their positions. For example, look - I think it's something that the registry stakeholder group always does. They always include the vote on the statement with their submissions. So they put, like, so many people voted, so many voted in favor, so many voted against and, you know, in our voting rules this is considered a consensus position or this is a -- I don't know exactly which different thresholds they have -- but they basically identify themselves - the level of support it has received or identify if it didn't receive that kind of support.

So we hold that stakeholder groups or constituencies make that qualifications themselves in the statements but if not I think it's assumed that it's a - that is the view of the stakeholder group or constituency. If they don't qualify themselves that there are certain parts that weren't unanimous or that the whole statement shouldn't be viewed as their official position but it's just preliminary input. I mean, it's just all for the groups have to qualify if it should be taken anything different than a consensus view.

Mikey O'Connor: You know, I think that the thing that we might want to do on this particular one, though, is encourage - you know, in certain circumstances, there's a fair amount of pressure within the system to arrive at a consensus view. I don't think there's quite as much pressure in this case and we might want to make

that clear that we are really in an information gathering and position gathering mode right now and it would be useful not to struggle quite so hard to come to a consensus view in this particular circumstance.

And so I'm wondering if we could put a note in that series of process bullets that says something to that effect. Because I think Volker's raising a slightly different point which is one that I agree with in that, you know, in his constituency he's likely to have a fair amount of dispersion in the points of view and we actually want to hear those because that information may be useful for the rest of us. And so rather than putting a lot of pressure on the registrars to come to a consensus view -- in this particular case -- there's actually less pressure to do that and those different views are actually quite useful.

And so I'm just thinking that that's another one of these amplifications that we could drive in. Volker, have I got sort of the right of what you were trying to get there? If I put words in your mouth I didn't mean to do that.

Volker Greimann: No, you're right on, Mikey, you're right on.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. So I think, you know, Marika that's sort of the third action item for you is to put that slight change to the process. Either in those bullets - but if those bullets are written in some policy document somewhere then maybe some sort of explanation right behind it that sort of says, "Look, we're really very interested in diverse points of view here." And then folding back to Ray's comment and then documentation of those points of view. Because I think that will give us a much better base on which to build our conversations.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay, the queue is clear, any - oop, not quite. Omar, go ahead.

Omar Kaminski: Hi, two quick questions. First did you - I joined the call late; I wasn't sure if you picked up on the link to the working with work space? That's actually pointing to the UBR procedures (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Oops.

Omar Kaminski: Yeah, okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Where was that link? Was it in the e-mail or was it in somewhere else?

Omar Kaminski: It was in the documents that we got over e-mail, just on the stake holder group constituency input template.

Mikey O'Connor: Ah.

Omar Kaminski: It's not on the other one for the SO's issues.

Mikey O'Connor: Great catch. Way to go Omar.

Omar Kaminski: I also wanted to ask about the minimum 35 day deadline for feedback. I just want to make sure that we're all aware that the holiday's coming up and just the (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, the minimum is 35 days. I think we've got a little flexibility as a working group to extend that and the holiday season is right in the middle of all of this. Is that right, Marika, that we can extend it a bit to accommodate that? Go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. If I may make a suggestion there because even though we send out these templates it doesn't necessarily mean that all stakeholder groups and constituencies will provide input. So maybe what we can do is -- and we have set that deadline at 35 days -- but include as well in the template something like, "If you need more time, please let the working group

know and, you know, tell us by which time you expect to deliver it so we have an idea." Because, you know, we can set a later deadline but if no one is planning anyway to submit anything, you know, we don't need to extend it.

So maybe that's a bit of a compromise just saying we set a specific deadline, but indicate clearly that it is possible to ask for an extension if groups indeed are still - need more time to work on it.

Omar Kaminski: Okay, that sounds great.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, that's -

Omar Kaminski: You know, because that does including one of the documents but not the other, so we will want to put it in both.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. Alright. I love it when people read this stuff carefully.

Omar Kaminski: Thanks Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: I sort of have two modes. Most of the time I'm at like 70,000 feet and I don't review stuff very carefully and then my other mode is unbelievably granular, which you don't want me to do because then I get us in the weeds. So I'm glad that other people are reading this stuff carefully.

Two really good points. Anything else? Well, I think we made a lot of really good improvements, so thanks; that was nifty.

Marika, you clear on what needs to happen? It looks like you are and we're on to the next. Okay, so the next topic I think I might grab the screen here.

Marika Konings: Mikey, we still have them on the number two as well, the outreach message.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, I think Omar - I'm assuming everybody was commenting on both, but yeah, let's take a quick look at this and see. Is there - certainly Omar's points were on both and I think that points that Ray and Volker made also apply to both. That we probably want to reshape both of these messages to encourage diverse views and documentation and so forth. So I'm going to leave that action with you to drive into both of them rather than rewrite them here on the call.

I'm going to grab the screen now and go into Mikey screen sharing mode. I started a mind map on this stuff and I sort of want to have this conversation - I have to do a little fiddling to make so that I can make sure that it looks okay. Hang on just a minute while I do that. Yeah, that's mighty small; nobody can read that. Let's make that a little bit bigger.

So all I did is I took our topic list and I broke it into an outline and I've stapled in -- hidden in the outline -- little description that's in the charter. But I've hidden them for now. I'm not exactly sure how to do this. I'm not sure we'll be able to get through this on the call, but what our next agenda item is really all about is right in sync with what -- especially what Ray and Volker and Omar were talking about -- which is how are we going to collect the information and start building the research that we really need to do?

And it's clear that this is sort of like when we were in school and the teacher says, "Alright, divide up into groups and, you know, work it out amongst yourselves." I think that we're going to have to do that and the only trick to that is that it may become sort of a logistical nightmare because if we divide into 11 subgroups we're going to have e-mail flying about - oh, somebody's typing and Chris is hearing it. So whoever's typing maybe mute.

So I'm sort of - you know, before we just dive in to this. I mean, one way to do this is just go through this list one at a time and see how we do. I'm not sure that's the best approach but that's certainly an approach. I'm - maybe just spend five minutes asking if that's the best way to do it or do we do, you

know, one of the things that we could do is use some sort of a doodle poll where we - it's not a dates poll but it's a poll to let people express the topics that they're interested in and also suggest information sources and we could sent that out.

The nice thing about that is that it would let people do a little bit more multi-tasking; however, I note that Marika is all by herself in the wiki - the only person who's posted anything to the wiki so far is Marika. And I worry that we would go off into poll land and come back with no responses. So that's a drawback to that one. But I'm curious if other people have run into a situation like this and done something particularly cool or interesting that we could do ourselves to sort of move this forward.

This is clearly work that needs to get divided a bit because there's quite a lot of it. So it's just a question of how do we do that? Any thoughts? Don't all speak at once. Steve, go ahead.

Steven Metalitz: Yes, thanks. This is Steve Metalitz. I think the doodle poll is a good idea because then you have a little time to think about which ones you want to sign up for and which ones you know some possible data sources. I wouldn't be too concerned yet about the lack of input on the wiki because -- at least in the United States -- it's really only been like two business days since -- or at most -- since Marika posted it, so - you know, I think we should, you know, I think if we have a doodle poll with a pretty short deadline that asks people to express preferences for which ones they want to be actively involved in maybe we will get most of them covered.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Steven Metalitz: If not, we can, you know, go to plan B.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. Well, and that's, you know, that works for me. I'm going to give Marika preference on this and then I'll get to Mark and Carolyn. Hang on a second, folks. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I think - just to remind everyone that was on the call this week that the idea is that people -- through posting comments on the wiki -- can make submissions on, you know, information that they would like to see included as - you know, for the different topic areas. But if people feel uncomfortable using the wiki or, you know, don't have access to it for whatever reason, they can always as well just send it in an e-mail to me and I can, you know, post it for them. So just want to make sure that, you know, either way or the other and we'll just make sure that the information gets posted there if you have something you think is important to include.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. Absolutely right. Carolyn, you're up.

Carolyn Hoover: Hi, this is Carolyn Hoover. I was looking at the topics and one way that might be more efficient in handling this is there's some overlap -- for instance on data escrow issues and cost issues -- so there might be some efficiency by, you know, reducing the number of items by looking at, you know, common areas.

Mikey O'Connor: Now that's another thing that occurred to me is that some of these kind of clump together and maybe we can take just a minute to sort of do that. So I'm going to write that down after we get to Mark and through this (cue) and then maybe do a little bit of clumping before we get off the call today because that might help structure the (poll) a little bit too.

Mark? Go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Hi. This is Mark Anderson. I actually had the same exact comment but Carolyn beat me to it so I've been through the list and I think there's definitely some natural clumping that can be done here to use your term.

Mikey O'Connor: Cool. All right that sounds like a next thing to do. Anything else? So it sounds like we're sort of leaning towards a (doodle poll) that is - I like (Steve's) idea of having it on a pretty short turnaround and agree that, you know, last week was pretty much a lost week for me that's for sure. But let's - if people are okay with that - why don't - (Marika) and I will take an action to put a little (doodle gizmo) together right after the call and...

...Meanwhile let's do some clumping. Now can people read that okay? Just give me a shout out in the chat if you cannot read because I can make it bigger. Let me see if I can fit the whole thing on. Oh, look at that it fits in the bigger size. Let's clump these. So people who have clumping ideas jump in the (cue) and tell me what you think they are and we'll just start pulling things closer together to each other. I'm kind of looking to Carolyn and Mark since you guys came up with that idea.

Carolyn Hoover: This is Carolyn. I would suggest as a first one the stability item which addresses the data escrow as a good way to provide (visibility) because you have the four different ones and then the data escrow item itself, you know, down at the bottom where it talks about, you know, the related expenses.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay, so I'll put - I'll start - (open) these like this so...these two go together and I'll make a clump out of them. Okay...like that. Any other ideas? I'm sort of doing what you all are probably doing, I'm sort of looking at them myself with that idea in mind. I could do a clump out of the next two. Let's see what these are. I could clump those, let's clump those for starters maybe change our mind later. This is all something we can change at will. I think maybe we could clump these two.

Marc Anderson: (Unintelligible) this is Marc can I...

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, Marc go ahead I'm sorry, I'm busy looking at the wrong screen. Sorry about that. Go ahead.

Mark: If you - I think those two are actually not very related if you read through the description.

Mikey O'Connor: All right. I'll back off.

Mark: And actually the (Port 43 who is) requirements, you could probably put those in clump one. It's almost an extension of the stability one.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Mark: And then for clump two, I would probably include impact on privacy and data protection. I think those three items are fairly related.

Mikey O'Connor: All right.

Mark: And I might leave I think some of the remaining ones are significant enough in their own right, you might start with that.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. I'm just wondering - sort of interested in this one. What's this one? No. Those aren't really related much at all, nevermind. Well that's not bad, we've got our list a little bit shorter. Now another thing that I was curious about is whether any of these go first. Is there any order to these? When we're looking at clumping, in addition to clumping are there either ones that need to go first or need to go after others? So you can think about either direction.

Marc go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Hi. This is Marc Anderson. I just like to throw out - so I think authoritativeness really needs to go at the top of the list. I think some of the other subcategories are dependent on what comes out of that authoritativeness discussion.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Okay. Well it seems to me that cost implications has to go a little bit later than synchronization for sure. And our two clumps here...is there a sequence in these? This is more of the technical clump, this is more of the content clump and as a technical clump, I'm wondering if we could put synchronization into clump one?

Steve go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, yes Mikey I'm not sure what you mean by when you say what comes first or what sequence they should be in, are you saying we would - this would be the sequence in which we would discuss them or this should be the sequence in which we would seek people to provide data? I thought we would - were going to try to at least identify information sources and so forth on all these. Because we're asking the...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, no, no you're right. I'm more looking forward to the actual analysis but, you know, the thought I had was that we'd do the (doodle poll) and get everybody doing - working on them all at the same time in this (poll) to get information sources and so on. I'm just sort of thinking forward to when we're actually doing the analysis. If there's stuff that needs to come first because then what we could do is sort of pressure ourselves a little bit that - work on the first ones a little bit harder right now. But that's all, nothing beyond that.

Is that okay (Steve)?

Steve Metalitz: Yes, yes I guess so...I guess...

Mikey O'Connor: Okay, your hand was still up, I didn't want to make - I didn't want to roll right over you. What about this idea of putting the synchronization one up in here as sort of a technical thingy. That - (Marie), oh (Marie) you're on the phone hurray! Welcome to the...

Marie Laure Lemineur: Hey, Hi I just want to say that I can see three different categories of issues. Some are more technical and you mentioned some are more maybe management related like calls from competition and others would be more legal issues like the privacy and data protection. So I don't know whether that would be a good criteria to, you know, clump to them together.

That would be one way of doing it.

Mikey O'Connor: Maybe a new clump...sorry these collapsed. I didn't mean to do that. And if we were to do that...this one would go in there for sure. This one probably goes in there. Let's read that one again. Third party who is related...that's probably a policy issue. Authoritativeness is all by itself. So what is this all about? Oh that one's the one that's both. We already had that discussion on the drafting team and said that it was both a technical and a policy issue. We could do one of two things.

We could either stick into clump one because clump one is first and then remind ourselves that its also got a policy component or we could split it or we could leave it on its own. And we don't have to get this absolutely perfect today either. We're actually quite a bit further through this clumping than I thought we'd get so maybe we'll leave it for now because it's a puzzler.

(Don)? Go ahead.

Don Blumenthal: Yes, had to find the mute button. I guess right at the top I'm wondering about response consistency being in that legal policy grouping. That more of a technical issue? Oh, okay no that helps clarify.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, sorry - sorry that I don't have quite enough screen real estate, I mean I could make this incredibly small but then I don't think you'd be able to read anything.

Man: Don't do that please.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. For us elderly folks it's helpful. Well I think this is kind of good enough. I'm not a big fan of letting perfection become the enemy of progress. So why don't we take this as extreme tentative clumping clearly open to revision at a whim by anybody. And to amplify the point that I think (Steve) was making, there's no implication to these clumps except to see if we can get the work flowing well. There's no implication in terms of importance or inclusion or exclusion or anything like that.

It's just to break the work up into manageable chunks and what this very preliminary chunking would do is say that we better get to work P-D-Q on this stuff and this stuff because knowing these two things will help us with this stuff and this stuff. But again I do really want to amplify that this is not cast in stone. It's just a work division thing and we'll take - (Marika) and I will take a crack at a (doodle poll).

(Marika) and you're in meetings the rest of the day so maybe I'll take that action item because I'm not and see if we can get a (doodle poll) out fairly quickly, but I presume that your retreat stuff starts pretty soon there in L.A. right?

Marika Konings: Yes Mikey that's right, we're starting immediately after the end of this call with meetings so it'd be great if you can start on that one and I'll try to help as I can.

Mikey O'Connor: No, no I'll take that action item, it's no problem.

(Marie), go ahead.

Marie Laure Lemineur: Yes, sorry one last thing. Isn't competition more of the commercial/management issue?

I don't know how...

Mikey O'Connor: Let's see what it's talking about, I can't really remember. Competition and registry services is a code word, it's a policy phrase.

Marie Laure Lemineur: So then, okay, okay...

Mikey O'Connor: So, you know, I could be persuaded either way but I'm okay with it being in policy. This is something that we have to be fairly careful in dealing with because (unintelligible) policies get folded into the contracts of the registries and (registers) and so I think it's okay to leave it where it is there.

Okay, I think that's enough on this. We sort of jumped the gun on agenda item number four, next steps in which order to manage topics. We'll fix this as an extremely preliminary try at that with all the same (caveats) again. The same drafts, super draft, ultra draft, ultra changeable. And so the next steps and the next meeting is our final agenda item.

Oh (Jonathan's) correct when talking about (survey monkey) versus (doodle). Yes, you may be right, it may be much better than (survey monkey). I'm sort of using (doodle) in the generic sense, but right.

Ray, go ahead.

Ray Fassett: Thank you Mikey. Before we jump to the last part on the agenda, I had a comment about the (Wiki) page. Can we do that?

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, okay go ahead.

Ray Fassett: So I went there for the first time admittedly as we were talking and I clicked on the accessibility just to click on one, I just want to make an observation here, under the relevant section it starts out with an approach of proponents requiring (thick) who is (argue). Now that approach indicates that if you want

to counter it - counter what's being said, then you are an opponent and I don't know anybody that's right now today an opponent to requiring (thick) who is.

Obviously we're in a data gathering mode, we want to be able to make objective decisions or judgments based on - I'm just wondering are we putting those - that - how else can I say this - on the defensive or are you, you know, people don't want to post something on this (Wiki) page because if I do, I'm going to be labeled as an opponent...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Ray Fassett: ...which is really not the case. I don't know what the answer is.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I think that's right. I know where those words came from and I think the easy, correct response is we should probably go through and neutralize that language.

Ray Fassett: I thought about that. I thought as a quick way I came up with because I don't like to say just the problem and maybe come up with a solution as well. Just, you know, supporters of registry operators that operate in a (thick) who is in environment believe that rather than argue and proponents, you know.

Mikey O'Connor: Well and we could probably and I'll have to look at sentences but in many cases I think we can probably just lose that clause all together and make it quite a bit more neutral.

Ray Fassett: Okay. So that was my observation.

Marika Konings: Mikey, Mikey if I could...

Mikey O'Connor: (Marika) go ahead, sorry didn't mean to cut you off there.

Marika Konings: If I could mean to clarify because here this is not an interpretation this is just copy and paste from that exact document and maybe what we need to make clear here as well that whoever has submitted it doesn't necessarily mean that, you know, they are supporting what is in that code. I think that the idea here is to find sections or relevant sections that help inform the discussion.

So if the other document's (unintelligible) says opponents argue this, I think we can put that in here. I think we just need to make sure that, you know, that it says submitted by, doesn't mean, you know, my personal position. It's just information I have found on a certain position trying to explain why, you know, some people would be in favor of that approach or why others feel that it's not a good idea.

So I'm, you know, I'm finding people want to - I would be hesitant at starting to reword this because this is just copy/paste and maybe that needs to be clearer. Maybe, you know, putting it between quote marks to make sure that people understand that this is a quote, this is not, you know, me trying to interpret the language or whoever puts it in there. Or alternately the working group from this information and then start rewriting it in it's (repour) and say, you know, this is just one position, the other position is this one and this is why the working group feels, you know, we said based on our review of the information.

So maybe that's a bit of information of where this comes from.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, let me take action to just go through and read the stuff that's in there with Ray's comment in mind. We could certainly put it in quotes, you know, much of this (unintelligible) came from the charter and I think even more of it came from the issue report and, you know, some water has passed under the bridge since we wrote the issue report. And I am quite sensitive to the point that Ray made that we don't want to put people in camps. That's not the plan so I'll take an action to spin through the (Wiki) and either put them in quotes or edit them or something.

And to just back that language down a little bit. I think that's a good suggestion. Okay, we're getting close to the top of the hour. I think the plan for this week is some combination of survey (gizmo), survey (monkey), (doodle) sign up genius - I love all these new toys, I love these toys. And I'll rummage around in the next hour or so and get something out. I'm pretty familiar with survey (monkey) so I may use that one but I'll take a look at those other ones too.

And I'll also take an action to spin through the language in the (Wiki) and just see if there's some minor (tweaks) that I can make that don't disturb the intent of the issue report but at the same time leave us less, you know, with less (divisive) language in some cases. And I think our next - this is the (alack) conflict in meeting call which we would have normally have held four to six hours later, I can't remember exactly when but because of the situation in L.A. with (Marika) there we sort of trampled over the (alack) folks.

But next week we will be at this time meeting and have lots of stuff to report I think. Well (Marika's) keen on the one that (Jonathan), - oh boy I've got all kinds of stuff to...

Marika Konings: Yes this is (Marika) I just want a quick look at it, I don't know it but it looks like it's going to be assigned volunteers and even sends automatic reminders, I really like that one so we actually don't have to do it because the system does it.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, cool. Oh, boy. So when we're all mad because this thing is pestering us we can blame (Jonathan). Okay, I think that's it for today and any final comments that or things that I've left hanging that are bothering people? Otherwise I think we'll wrap this call up and see you in a week.

(Jonathan) says, I can take it. Cool. All right. Thanks gang. See you in a week.

Woman: Thanks Mikey.

Woman: Thank you.

Man: Thanks Mikey.

Man: Bye-bye.

END