

**ICANN
Transcription
Thick Whois PDP Working Group meeting
Tuesday 29 January 2013 at 15:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of THICK WHOIS PDP Working Group call on the Tuesday 29 January 2013 at 15:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-thick-whois-20130129-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Marc Anderson – RySG
Roy Balleste – NCUC
Iliya Bazlyankov – RrSG
Don Blumenthal - RySG
Amr Elsadr – NCSG
Alan Greenberg – ALAC
Volker Greimann – RrSG
Caroline Hoover – RySG
Marie-Laure Lemineur – NPOC
Steve Metalitz – IPC
Jeff Neuman – RySG
Mikey O'Connor – ISPCP
Jill Titzer – RrSG
Jonathan Zuck – IPC

Apologies:

Wilson Abigaba – NCUC
Susan Prosser – RrSG
Frederic Guillemaut – RrSG
Avri Doria - NCSG

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings
Berry Cobb
Julia Charvolen

Coordinator: Good morning and thank you for standing by. This is the conference coordinator. I would like to remind all parties that this call is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. Thank you you may begin.

Julia Charvolen: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the Thick Whois PDP Working Group call on Tuesday 29 January.

On the call today we have Marc Anderson, Roy Balleste, Ilyia Bazlyankov, Don Blumenthal, Alan Greenberg, Voelker Greimann, Carolyn Hoover, Marie Laure Lemineur, Steve Metalitz, Jeff Neuman, Mikey O'Connor, Jill Titzer, and Jonathan Zuck.

From staff we have Marika Konings, Berry Cobb and myself Julia Charvolen. We have apologies from Susan Prosser.

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

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Julia and welcome all. We can do an over under bet on how long - how many minutes my voice last on this call. So far I've gotten a minute in and I'm okay.

First agenda item is just to take a pause and take a look at the agenda and also if anybody has any changes to their statement...

Man: Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: ...of interest this would be a good time to mention it. Okay I don't hear any objections to the agenda or statements of interest so off we go.

Marika has mentioned that Wilson is also - has apologies and Volker's on the call.

Really only two big things to do today. So all of you received copies of the comments tool prepared by Marika and Berry -- fabulous job, 42 pages long. I thought we'd go through the whole thing today page by page.

I figure that's a minute per page with 10 minutes left over for comments. That was a joke. That's as good of a joke is you're going to get out of this kind of day. I have a terrible cold.

So the first part of this is to just check in with the sub teams. And let me remind you all as to sort of where we left this.

What we said two weeks ago was let's wait and see what comes in in the comments before really putting a lot of pressure on the sub teams.

And as a result we canceled last week's call and now here we are. I'm not really expecting a whole lot of activity to be reported by the sub teams. But I thought this might be a good chance for people to talk a little bit about what they might want to work on during this week.

We've had a little bit of commentary on the email list which I think is a good lead in to all that. And so with that I think what I'd like to do is just walk through the three folks who are leading subgroups. Let's see is Susan on the call? Can't tell, hold on.

Yes, Susan Kawaguchi's not on the call. We'll see if she joins.

But Steve and Alan given the comments that have come in and the beginning of the commentary on the list would it be useful for the two of you to have a conversation like that or would you rather just go off on your respective with your respective groups and sort of give it a try in your own?

Either way is fine with me but I offer you that choice. Any thoughts?

Alan Greenberg: Yes it's Alan.

Mikey O'Connor: Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. As I said on the sub team list -- and Mikey you saw it -- some of the others didn't -- is I'm a little bit at a loss to know how to proceed. I mean I know conceptually how.

We're stuck with a variety of inputs which in general some of them are consistent and some very crucial ones are diametrically opposed to each other.

And I'm not sure it's within the - unless we can get some clarifying information which I've asked for on the general list now -- and some of you might have seen my notice - my note and some of the replies are coming back to it.

I think we need to get - I'll be blunt, we need to get the discussion on privacy issues and the dangers of moving to Thick Whois with regard to individuals out of the realm of (thud) of uncertainty and doubt and into the realm of, you know, real case studies or real examples, not just the vague well, you know, horrible things can happen. I can't tell you exactly what they are but horrible things are going to happen.

I think we need to be - get more fact based or at least more based on scenarios that we can understand otherwise we're going to end up, you know, having a stalemate.

And it's an important stalemate because, you know, is says this is going to be disastrous for our users. And I think we have to factor that in given that we're talking about TLDs which have a few users on them. So...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes that's...

Alan Greenberg: ...I, you know, I'm happy for to have the sub teams manage the process. But as long as we have very different positions I don't think the sub team can resolve the process.

But I'm hoping we'll get more input so that will be an easier job to do. That's where I stand I think and anyone else on the sub team wants to speak then, you know, feel free.

Mikey O'Connor: Let me chime in and then I'll go to Jeff who's in the queue.

I think what I was trying to get through in my sort of lame note this morning was that clearly that's a hard puzzle. And I like the word puzzle because it's neutral.

And at least in my experience the way that tackle hard puzzle is to break them into smaller bits so that they're not quite so overwhelming.

And I am a little worried that I'm a hammer looking for a nail but I'm going to offer this anyway. In the DSSA we've come up with a fairly interesting risk analysis methodology which might apply in this case. I'm not sure.

And so one of the things that I would offer to the sub team is something to think about is what the puzzles are -- and Alan you've named one for sure and we may have others -- and what methods we might use to work through them. And risk analysis might be one.

There are others available as well. And I think this is a good chance to before we actually tackle these puzzles stand back from them and say well what's the best way to attack the puzzle?

And so that's what I was trying to get across in the note that I sent this morning. And it turns out the risk analysis is a good way to do it.

We could certainly dive into that a bit next week. Because what the risk analysis stuff does it sort of breaks this into smaller bets so that it's not quite so overwhelming to get through. Jeff go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes so I've got to considerably agree with Alan. And I don't think this is a really big issue. I think the problem is we're thinking of things more at a macro level and we've got to really narrow down the focus.

This Whois PDP is not about whether Whois in general or thick Whois violates privacy or creates stability concerns.

The question is whether the transition from thin to thick creates any privacy or security stability concerns above and beyond that which would ordinarily be in Whois in general.

And I think the problems that I saw in the comments is there's no distinguishing between the two that those who are worried about Thick Whois from the NCUC and the NPOC are talking about Whois in general and providing all this data in general as opposed to the very narrow question of whether the transition from thin to thick creates any new issues that would not otherwise be involved in Whois in general.

And this is something I said on the council level which I was really afraid of this PDP getting into.

I - for those of you who know I was not in favor of this PDP at all because I thought it was focused only on one registry. I didn't think it was necessary. I thought we could redo it and I was hoping that one register with voluntary do it.

Obviously it didn't happen. You know, we're doing this PDP. But I think it's very, very, very important that we focus on the transition element as opposed to Whois in general.

And if we do that the puzzle as Mikey said is a lot smaller than the overall ten million piece of puzzle that is Whois in general.

And I think we can do that. That's my comment number one.

Comment number two is that we really need to engage in fact based decision making I said that was the word of the day.

There are a lot of, you know, what ifs or I could hypothetically see this problem or I could hypothetically see that problem.

But we've been doing this. .biz .US .info .org .code .mean .tel .travel .xxx .post -- all of these (unintelligible) have been doing Thick Whois for well business for over a decade.

We need facts. We - you cannot make decisions based on what people are afraid of. And there is yes, so that's number two. And I saw a lot of that in the comments. So that's it, thanks Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Jeff and I think your comment came in two pieces so let me comment on both of those pieces.

I think your first piece is right in line with my idea of defining a puzzle carefully. And, you know, I think that's another one for us to work on is in risk analysis it turns out that you have to define the scenarios pretty carefully.

And there are some pretty good tools to do that. And at the end of the day we may come up with four or five different scenarios that need to be analyzed.

And defining those scenarios well and carefully I think is going to be important for us to do and your point is right on that one.

And then clearly in terms of basing this on facts the one exception I would take to that Jeff is that in some cases engineers come up with scenarios that have never happened but it could happen and they analyze them anyway even though they have never happened before.

That doesn't necessarily rule them out as scenarios to be evaluated. It may mean that their probability is very low. And I think you mentioned that in your note.

But I think it's okay to evaluate the scenarios even if they're likely just to make sure that we've covered all the bases.

Because that way when people come back to us and ask us about it we can say yes we did look at that and here is the analysis we made and this is the reason that we evaluated it the way we did. so I think I'm agreeing with you. I've built up quite the queue.

Steve you're next. Go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: Yes thank you. First I mean I agree with what Alan's postings and with the first Jeff's point, especially on the first point.

And I think it's worth noting that if we say that some of the issues that are being raised aren't appropriate for this working group that - with our micro focus on transition to Thick Whois it's important to recognize that there is going to be a place to raise some of those broader issues. And that is in the PDP that the board is going to initiate according to the board resolution later this year on overall Whois policy if you will.

So and I mean there are other four for this is what I'm trying to say.

So to the extent that we make - are able to maintain our focus on the micro issue that we've been asked to look at it's not to discount or to sideline those other issues. It just means that they're going to be discussed in a different form. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Steve. And my notes always this is a topic that came up when we were doing the drafting team as well. We have to always be careful to pay attention to scope.

At the same time when Alan talked about the transition to Thick Whois and the possibility that there are risks in that I think that that's fair game but at the same time for sure we don't want to solve problems and puzzles that are going to be addressed by others in other fora.

Amr go ahead. Amr did you intend to lower your hand or...

Amr Elsadr: No sorry about that. No I didn't. Thanks for letting me speak.

Well in the interest of staying focused on scope I'm a bit confused right now because according to the scope and our charter, the working group charter that we're supposed to make a recommendation based on they use of Thick Whois, not the transition.

And if we're talking about a transition then why are we addressing both existing and future gTLD registries?

I'm assuming that if we're talking about our transitions in future, future gTLD registries are going to be using Thick Whois to begin with the (unintelligible) transition either? Is my question making sense?

Mikey O'Connor: It's a fair question. I'm a little foggy on our charter there and I don't have it in front of me. When we were doing the charter we were...

Steve Metalitz: Mikey this is Steve Metalitz. Could I try to respond to that?

Alan Greenberg: Absolutely. I would and for any and all I am not at my best today so if I start to fade out like that just go ahead and jump in. Go ahead Steve. Thanks.

Steve Metalitz: Thanks. Amr I think the status quo is that every - all the three gTLDs are thick, all of the up to 1000 or so new gTLDs will be thick.

But the issue now is should the three thin ones be required to move to thick?
And yes in the future in the next round should it continue to be thick?

So I think you're right, it's a little bit of a oversimplification to say transition because we are being asked to set policy or recommend policy for the future.

But I think the point is just as I think Jeff put it are there risks associated with Thick Whois that would not exist in the Think Whois environment with respect to privacy?

So and based on the experience that all the registries that have been thick have had that's obviously a significant factor. And I don't know if that answers your question.

Amr Elsadr: I think so. But if what I - if I'm understanding you correctly then we are actually talking about use of thick Whois, not a transition to thick Whois. Therefore any concerns we might have on the use of thick Whois as opposed to transition are relevant to this discussion right?

Steve Metalitz: Yes I think if all registries were Thick Whois what would be the issues?

Amr Elsadr: Exactly all right thanks Steve.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes...

Steve Metalitz: Or gTLD registries I should say.

Mikey O'Connor: Right. Now just to be careful one of the things we talked about in the drafting team was a point that Jeff raised in the drafting team which was if we decide not to recommend a transition for .com et cetera to Thick should we evaluate the option of all the other registries going to thin?

And Jeffrey is that - and didn't get much traction. And so I want to be careful that we are not evaluating the value of Thick Whois or all registries.

So it's true that we will evaluate the use of Thick Whois in the registries that are transitioning to it if we recommend it.

But we are - it's outside our scope to evaluate the use of Thick Whois elsewhere because that is a very deep pit into which we would probably never climb out.

Alan is your hand left up from before or is it a new one?

Alan Greenberg: No that's a brand new one.

Mikey O'Connor: Brand new. Go for it.

Alan Greenberg: Been creeping up at the bottom of the list waiting to speak.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Go ahead.

((Crosstalk)).

Amr Elsadr: I'm sorry Alan - I'm sorry this is Amr again. Before we move on Mikey would you mind if I just read the first paragraph in the mission scope on our charter?

Mikey O'Connor: Sure go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: It's - all right it says the PDP Working Group is tasked to provide the GNSO council with a policy recommendation regarding the use of Thick Whois by all industries both existing and future.

As part of the deliberations on this issue the PDP Working Group should at a minimum consider the following elements as detailed in the final issue report as it moves on to the different topics we've been discussing. Thanks. Sorry Alan.

Alan Greenberg: That's okay. That's good I'm glad that's on the table. It will fit in well with one of the things I'm going to say. I've accumulated a bunch of comments so I'll make them all quickly.

Regarding fact-based decision making Mikey the wording notwithstanding I would believe this includes reasonable scenarios that haven't happened yet. I think it has to.

We are talking about the largest gTLDs which are not comparable to anything else around. And I think we have to use our imagination but it's got to be something which has some, you know, realm of possibility. So yes, risk analysis needs to be done but we need to have real scenarios to analyze not just fears.

Whether this is a transition certainly if we recommend Thick Whois for all there is a transition and we must address the transition.

So the transition is something we need to address and make sure that they are a viable path to get through it if we're going to recommend Thick for all.

Based on that intro into the charter it is conceivable that we could say thick Whois is not a good thing for all and a recommendation out of that could be thin for all.

I'll give you a very personal comment on that. Given the ten years of history of every new gTLD that has come out ICANN has required it to be thick including the 1000 plus that are now on the books but that will be on the books with the new gTLD process.

I cannot imagine a recommendation from a PDP that will more easily and readily be overruled by the board than saying move everything back to thick to thin now.

The boards have consistently recommended thick over a number of years. And I just cannot see that changing. And I have better things to do with my life than to make - than to spend weeks and weeks and months making recommendations that are then going to be ignored.

And yes that's a pragmatic reality but I decide how to spend my life reasonably I think. So I think that's something to keep in mind. You know, we can tilt that windmill but let's be practical people.

So I think we need to focus on, you know, not conceptually what we could recommend but what it what is reasonable to recommend at this point and what drove this PDP into existence? Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: You know, that gets me to another point. I think it's perfectly okay to and in fact better than perfectly okay I think it's very important that we get all the scenarios out on the table and evaluate them.

And even if they're a little bit improbable and maybe even extremely improbable I think it's still find to evaluate them and also come up with strategies as to how to mitigate those risks.

So I think we need concrete examples of the scenarios. I think we need to break that puzzle into the bits that it needs to be broken into to do a good job of evaluating them.

And then to the extent that there is a risk of some sort even if it's very small I think we also need to come up with ways that those risks could be mitigated.

Now in the security realm there are choices. Sometimes you take actions to mitigate a risk. You, you know, if I use whether examples let's use the tsunami in Japan. One way to mitigate a risk is to build your data center a little bit higher than the floodplain of the tsunami.

Another is to accept the risk and just say this risk is so small that we're simply not going to do anything about it.

Another is to ensure against the risk, et cetera, et cetera. And so I think in addition to doing a good job of analyzing these risks we also need to come up with ideas on how to mitigate them.

And, you know, that may be a way to noodle our way through this puzzle but I think it's critical that we come up with good scenarios.

Now I am a little worried that all of this risk analysis talk which I introduced in the email thread and then on this call has sort of preselected our analysis technique.

And I just want to step back from that and say that risk analysis is one of many ways to analyze these puzzles.

And many of you, you know, seem to agree that this may be a useful one. And so I will take an action to try and pull together some material for next week's call that steps us through the methodology that we built in the DSSA.

I think we're going to have to modify it a little bit. But since I was pretty involved in building it it's pretty easy for me to modify it.

But I want the rest of you to think about the way that you analyze puzzles in which ever discipline you come from.

So if you're a lawyer, you know, what analytical tools do you use when you analyze puzzles? And if you are an engineer what do you use?

And let's pick this topic up again on the next week's call with that in mind because I, you know, while I like this risk analysis a lot and I think it may be a very powerful tool I'm not sure it's the only tool that's available to us and I would hate to limit our discussion to that one tool.

So let's see just going to catch up on the chat because I realize that I haven't been paying attention to it. Hold on a minute.

Okay so Don is raising the issue of beware of VeriSign's centric analysis. And that's a point that's well taken from the Chartering Group as well is that this is a broader discussion then just VeriSign. There seems to be an agreement there.

But Alan is reason the point that there's an elephant in the room. And that's the biggest one that we have to deal with. And so we need to acknowledge it. Roy is acknowledging that.

And so and (Palmer) is agreeing with Alan that if we take a - if we are to recommend the VeriSign transition we do need to take a close look at it, et cetera.

Steve you're in the queue. Go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: Yes I just wanted to - I mean I know we've had this discussion that Alan kicked off about his sub team and I guess my first point is I obviously haven't been privy to every - all the postings on this sub team.

I've seen the few postings that have gone in the last day or so to the fullest. And I hope that discussion will continue because I think Alan raised some good points and (Palmer) and others responded.

And, you know, it may be that we - that that sub team could come to agreement on what to say on this, you know, again on the topic we've been asked to deal with as opposed to the broader topic so that's my first point.

But I, you know, I take Alan at his word that he based on the sub team discussions he isn't sure where - how to move it forward. But just saying from the standpoint of the full list discussions it seems like maybe it needs a little more time to play out.

The second point I wanted to make is since I'm the head of the - or coordinating the Authoritativeness Team we really have not - we've not been active sub team I should say.

We've not been active. Now I want to - I guess I have a question. Are we sure we have all of the - I think we have all of the stakeholder group constituency at cetera, statements that we're going to get.

I was frankly surprised to see the VeriSign statement. I didn't know whether that meant we we're now going out and asking individual companies and organizations to comment.

But then I saw a PIR statement that I guess that the registry the stakeholder group couldn't come to agreement on a statement. And therefore is that why there are two from VeriSign and PIR and should we be expecting any others or do we have the full set now?

Mikey O'Connor: It's a great question and I saw Marika's hand go up in the middle of it so Marika is that what you were going to talk about?

Marika Konings: Yes this is...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: I'm with the registry - yes I can answer that question now. I'll wait till after Marika but I can answer that specific question.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes hang on a minute Jeff. Let Marika get through her bit and then we'll jump to you.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I'll let Jeff address the registry stakeholder group statement. But I just wanted to mention that I know that the registrars are actually preparing a statement as well and they hope to get that to the working group later this week.

Mikey O'Connor: That's right we are missing the registrar one as well. Jeff do you want to jump in on the registries?

Jeff Neuman: Yes I think you're right. We were a little late to the game. VeriSign had submitted its statement to the Registry Stakeholder Group for approval and that was not approved. In fact many of the registries in the PIR filed one. You know, it was diametrically opposed to the VeriSign one.

NeuStar actually supports the PIR statement and I may submit some additional information. But I was also and also that our participation on this group would be - I'm always a little confused about statements made in writing beforehand versus statement made actually in the group.

So I didn't know whether it was necessary for me or for NeuStar to file a separate statement but I'm certainly contributing to this discussion but maybe that could be cleared up.

But I would say Steve you're right, the registries could not come to a unified position. And you'll see the diametric differences between PIR and VeriSign and that's where the split was.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Jeff and, you know, some of this may be my fault because unlike the, you know, this is sort of an unofficial round of commentary in a way. And so I've been a little lax in enforcing rigidly that these come from constituencies.

My view is that the more commentary the better at this stage of the game because back to Steve's question it seems to me the more we can assemble for either the sub team or the rest of us to review earlier in the game the better.

So I'd like to continue that but I will throw this back to you the group whether you'd prefer to have me sort of draw the line in the sand and say no just constituency statements or continue on in your haphazard way.

Anybody have any particular strong feelings one way or another on that? Steve go ahead. I'm sorry.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, yes I mean I think we do. I get that what happened. I understand what happened now on the registry group. And that's fine. I think it's good to have those two views.

But our sub team probably should look at everything that's come in and see if we can come to an overall conclusion or recommendation. There are different views from our authoritativeness which is our subgroup's topic but, you know, we need to start to discussing them.

And if we might get something else next week from the registrars and then some other company might decide to weight in I just think it's kind of disruptive to the process.

So if we can't indicate that once we get this registrar comment we're done for this phase, there's going to be multiple other opportunities for both the constituency stakeholder groups and individual companies organizations people to weigh in.

But we just need to kind of this is what we're looking at, this is what we've been asked to digest. And otherwise we could be sitting here a month from now saying well I hear somebody else might have a comment...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: ...(unintelligible). So that's - that would be my approach. And I'd like to get the - I mean I accept that the authoritativeness one. We had a couple of comments and it's really kind of petered out

So we need to get it back on track but I think it would help to say this is the corpus of comments we need to look at and try to see if we agree or disagree. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Voelker are you on the call? Is Voelker on the call? Can you tell us where the registrars are at? Are we're pretty sure that we're going to see something this week?

Voelker Greimann: We are currently in the process of drafting something so we have a task group that's putting something together but it hasn't been discussed at length yet. so we're way behind. Sorry for that.

Mikey O'Connor: Well that's all right. But, you know, I think Steve raises a good point and that it's that it's tough on sub teams to have sort of an ongoing rolling carpet of comments coming at them.

Do you think it's - Voelker do you think it's reasonable to set an expectation by the end of the week or is that an unreasonable expectation?

Voelker Greimann: I would have to get back in touch with the people but I don't think that we'll have something agreed upon by all registrars by the end of the week. Probably of next week rather than that yes, end of next week is probably more realistic definitely.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Steve what does that do for you?

Steve Metalitz: Well I'd like to, you know, Voelker's on our sub team so we certainly have a registrar perspective. And he's - and I think he's really helped move things forward.

I just, you know, if we want to wait for the end of next week then okay but it's just going to delay the process further.

If we think that we can - it will come in by the 8th I guess that's - is that what the end of next week is then we'll go from there.

Mikey O'Connor: Well and Voelker is there a way that you could maybe come up with a preliminary draft that could get fed into the process and then, you know, if it turns out it's just impossible to get it approved?

Voelker Greimann: Yes I can get something done yes. I'm not on the Drafting Team myself. I wanted to keep out of that so I have a more neutrality.

But I can see it. I will reach out to the others and try to get their preliminary draft out as soon as possible.

Mikey O'Connor: I think that would be really helpful for all of us but especially to the three sub teams that are sort of at the front of the queue here. As, you know, it is - Steve raises an incredibly important point which is it's awfully tough to get going without all of those perspectives. And so if you could try and get something in that would be fantastic Voelker. Thanks.

Jeffrey go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes I like to address the first part of the question which is should individual submissions be taken?

I think in every public comment period that we've had yes we've always allowed individual submissions. And I think that that should be honored in this one.

I think you may not get a unified viewpoint from all constituencies (view) or stakeholder groups (have received) from the registries. So I think that should be encouraged.

I do think we should set a cutoff date for external comments. But again I want to stress that that is not the substitute for other viewpoints that may be expressed by members of the review team or the sub teams as well.

So like I said NeuStar didn't submit a written statement although after this discussion we might.

But I'm carrying with me NeuStar's viewpoint and some other registry viewpoints that I'm expressing during the sub team meeting. So I don't want this to get lost in the - and I'm sorry I have to drop off but thank you very much.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks for joining Jeff. And Marika reminded me that the Working Group can essentially accept any kind of input that it wants.

And what I'm hearing is that we're interested in kind of pursuing my haphazard any and all approach because I really think the broader the input we get at the beginning the better.

The more points of view we can get incorporated into the analysis and the sooner we can get those points of view into the analysis the better we'll do. So I think we'll continue in that mode.

Anything else? We - I was sort of expecting that this might happen that the first agenda item the sub teams would really blend into a broader discussion.

One approach that we could take is - well we - there are several approaches. One is to continue on the way we are and essentially say look let's let the three sub teams dig into the material that's been assembled already. I think there's quite a lot for each subgroup to work on.

Another approach would be to pick a fourth topic that we take on as a workgroup of the whole. And I think at this stage in the game I'd like to spend next week's call on the risk analysis discussion.

I think that's a tool that everybody may find useful. And also have a conversation about other analytical tools we might be able to bring to bear and then take up that conversational thing.

And so what I'm getting around to is to say that maybe we wait on the constituency statements received agenda item for a bit partly because they're still coming in and partly because I'm not sure that I know the answer on the whether we should take up a fourth topic as a group yet.

And where that's getting me is to maybe cut the call off a little bit short today again partly because my voice is going to fail but partly because I don't think it's a real good use of our time.

Alan, Steve do you feel like you've got enough to work with over this week if we did that or is there something we can do this remaining 15 minutes that would help you as you work forward with your sub teams?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Steve. I'm going to have to drop off the call right now anyway so I think I'm fine. We'll work with what we've got and will hope to get more from the registrars shortly. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes that sounds great. Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes I think my sub team and this working group is going to need more specificity from the three submitters who have said there are significant problems and risks in the transition.

And those are the inputs from VeriSign, NCUC, and NPOC. Because as I said in my note maybe my imagination is not good enough but I can't come up with those scenarios.

We need the people who are warning us about the risks to give us some more I won't say facts but give us more scenarios examples of the kinds of risks and kinds of problems that can happen.

You know, I don't want to say I wanted - otherwise I have to discount the input but I don't see how I can use it if I don't - if I can't map it into real problems that I can describe and analyze.

Mikey O'Connor: I think that's where the risk analysis tool will help. I think it will help the people who are concerned about the risk sharpen their statement of what that risk is.

And I think it will also help those of us who are analyzing the risks sharpen our understanding of the impacts and probabilities of those risks.

So I offer that to the folks who are in NCUC, NPOC, and VeriSign as helpful tool for you as well as the sub teams.

And I will definitely do some work over the week and probably try and push something out to the list that sort of summarizes what I'm talking about.

There's a - if you want to preview of all of this go and dig into the DSSA phase one report and you'll pretty quickly come across the methodology that we built.

And what I'll try and do is send that out a bit because it's a pretty massive document and come back with a tool that we might be able to use next week.

Okay. Let's see, I've got to catch up on the chat here.

A lot of transition concerns will depend on the transition process. The situation was different in many ways but when do we engage our experts group?

That was from Don Blumenthal in the chat. And that's another point that I meant to make on today's call which is I think another resource and another analytical approach is to not forget that we have this experts group and pose these questions, you know, frame these scenarios and then pose some questions out of those scenarios to the expert group and get their reaction as well.

And I think that they can help us a lot with a couple of areas. They can help us with assessing impact, they can help us with assessing impact. They can help us with assessing probability and they could also help us with assessing mitigation approaches.

So and I'm still feeling pretty comfortable about risk assessment as a good tool here. But yes absolutely right Don, it's a huge resource that we don't want to neglect.

Alan is that a new hand or an old one?

Alan Greenberg: No sorry that's an old hand.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Well unless anybody else has got anything they want that they really want to contribute I think I'm going to do you all a favor in this call so that you don't have to listen to my voice completely leave me.

And we'll pick it up again next week. I think this is going to have a whole bunch of really interesting puzzles to solve. I bet we solve them. And I'm delighted with how things are going. Thanks all. See you in a week.

END