

**ICANN
Transcription
Thick Whois PDP Working Group meeting
Tuesday 19 February 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 19 February 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-20130219-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Marc Anderson - RySG
Roy Balleste - NCUC
Don Blumenthal - RySG
Avri Doria - NCSG
Alan Greenberg - ALAC
Volker Greimann - RrSG
Caroline Hoover - RySG
Susan Kawaguchi - CBUC
Steve Metalitz - IPC
Mikey O'Connor - ISPCP
Tim Ruiz - RrSG
Jill Titzer - RrSG
Rick Wesson - RrSG
Evan Leibovitch - ALAC

Apologies:

Iliya Bazlyankov - RrSG
Susan Prosser - RrSG
Amr Elsadr - NCSG
Marie-Laure Lemineur - NPOC

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings
Berry Cobb
Lars Hoffmann
Nathalie Peregrine

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening.
This is the Thick WHOIS PDP working group call on the 19th of February, 2013.

On the call today we have Mikey O'Connor, Alan Greenberg, Steve Metalitz, Mark Anderson, Volker Greimann, Tim Ruiz, Don Blumenthal, Rick Wesson, Carolyn Hoover, Jill Titzer, Evan Leibovitch, Susan Kawaguchi, and Roy Berg.

We have apologies from Amr Elsadr, Marie-Laure Lemineur, Susan Prosser, and Iliya Bazlyankov.

From staff we have Marika Konings, Lars Hoffman, and myself Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind all parties to please state their names before speaking for transcription purposes.

Thank you very much and over to you, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Nathalie. It's Mikey, and one of the interesting things that just happened on my screen is that the presenters just went away, and the trick to that is I won't be able to see Marika's hand if it gets raised. What's - oh, never mind. Never mind.

Alan Greenberg: There's a little triangle you can click on to change the direction and see the presenters.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Never mind. Thanks all for joining. As you can tell, just prior to the call we started having all kinds of fun with the Adobe Connect room.

On the right side of your screen is the agenda, and sort of - and we have a request from Don Blumenthal to add an item to decide on a system for taking advantage of the knowledge of our experts. And let's just stick that in - as Number 5 and - of 6. So we'll just put that second to last, right after the next call, because it would be nice to have sort of a way to start channeling some of these questions and ideas to them and start thinking about that.

Anything else people want to change on the agenda? Or, are there any statements of interest that have changed that people want to tell us about?

Okay. Well with that, why don't we - I know that we've got folks from all of the subteams on the call, I think. Yes, Don's on too. So, why don't we just quickly step through a little round of updates on those?

Alan, your name starts with A. You can go first.

Alan Greenberg: Well, thank you. In this case, I'm actually prepared so I...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I know. It's pretty exciting. I think everybody's prepared, so this is going to be kind of fun.

Alan Greenberg: Two things. Number one, I sent out an email which none of my - none of the people on my team responded to. Now that we have all of the inputs in, we're likely to get - I tried summarizing them in terse words to make it easier to try to see what the pattern was, and I received no input back. But, I'm presuming I will.

One of the questions I asked my group is whether we need a teleconference or not? And once they answer, we'll either schedule one or not.

The other thing that I'll mention is it dawned on me that the question of do we need registrar escrow or not? In my mind, it's probably not within scope

because it's not one of the items in the RAA that's subject to consensus policy. So that's one of the items I think that reverts to negotiation or discussion between registrars and ICANN. As I understand, it is being discussed right now anyway perhaps.

But, I don't think we're in a position to make a recommendation on that unless perhaps it was absolutely mandatory to implement any other recommendations, and it clearly isn't.

So I - you know, I've asked Marika, and she's checking with other people, so that item may come off of our agenda altogether if it's clearly not something we're empowered to make recommendation on.

Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Alan. And you know as I read your summary in the email, I was thinking sort of the same thing. So I was going to ask you whether you want to spend time on this call talking about that, but it sounds you've got a better plan in place to...

Alan Greenberg: Well, if anyone wants to, you know, give their thoughts on it? But I think this is really a matter of whether it's something a PDP can recommend? And if not, then we don't need to spend a lot of time debating it.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. And I think - either way, I like the idea of going out to check first before we devote time to it on the call. So unless anybody else is really excited about talking about that today, I think what we'll do is wait for Marika to come back with some thoughts on that.

Alan Greenberg: I mean at this point, there are two clear camps in answers, and you know there's the majority of people who have answered one way and others who have answered another way. In a significant amount, the divergence is not

something that is really related to the questions that are being asked in those - in that subgroup, but contingent on the answers in the other subgroups.

So as the other subgroups come to a closure, if they do, that may make the situation with the two questions that are in my subgroup clearer.

Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Good deal. Thanks, Alan. Anything else that people want to comment on, on the - on Alan's stuff before we move on?

Okay. Don, you want to go next? I'm doing this in alphabetical order today. I don't know why. Just arbitrarily.

Don Blumenthal: Works for me.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Don Blumenthal: Yes. We - the privacy - data protection and privacy group had a conference call last week when we decided to meet weekly. Last week, I think we I think deliberately had something of a free-for-all just to try to get general ideas. See where - to see what people are thinking about? How we should concentrate? How we should proceed.

I think the next step will be - I've got to do this today, and I'll say it publicly so I actually may go ahead and do it, kind of synthesize -- as Alan just suggested for his group -- responses that came into the template. And then, just decide what we need to focus on. Whether we should be limiting ourselves to the responses or be doing independent research, and how to go forward.

One of the reasons I raised the issue about the experts group is I think they would have some very clear - might have some clear recollections of how the

issues played out in the VeriSign PIR transition, both for data security within the databases and - not data security. Privacy within the databases as they fit, and also just issues about cross-border transfer of the - of registration information during the transition.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Anybody got any thoughts or questions for Don? Sounds like things are perking along.

Let's see. One of the things that Amr mentioned in - Amr and I had a sidebar email conversation and the folks - Amr and Avri, and I think Roy - is that right Roy? Am I putting you on the spot unnecessarily? It looks like you may be the only person in that trio that's on the call.

With an effort to come up with some of those specific examples of the privacy issue, do you want to chime in at all on that? Or, have I just shone a spotlight on you in an embarrassing way? If I did, I apologize for that. But...

Roy Berg: No problem. The - there is an annex that has been prepared. Right now, is with the NCUC, and I believe it should be ready for review tomorrow with Don at the next meeting that we have in the subgroup.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, great.

Roy Berg: And so what I - so it should be ready for the whole working group next week. That's the - that will be my best projection. But I don't want to get into the details today because I haven't heard from everybody yet. And as...

Mikey O'Connor: No. No. That's fine. I wasn't expecting anywhere near that speedy. I just wanted to sort of alert folks that this was going on, so that's fantastic.

Roy Berg: Yes. We're moving quick, so we'll have it ready very soon.

Mikey O'Connor: Great. Well thanks for that.

Roy Berg: Sure.

Mikey O'Connor: Anything else on Don's subgroup before we move on? That sounds like that one's working along well too. Thanks Don.

Let's see. STU. I'm relearning my alphabet. So Steve, you're next. You want to fill us in on how your gang's doing?

Steve Metalitz: Sure. The authoritativeness subteam - actually, my report is somewhat similar to Alan's. I circulated a summary of what we heard from the various stakeholder groups, constituencies, et cetera, on this topic, and posed two questions really.

One is do we actually need to take up this topic, or is it necessary to have a policy on which database is authoritative since we seem to have functioned pretty well for 10 or 12 years without one, while there've been many Thick WHOIS systems, so that was one question which was raised by some of the participants - by some of the comments.

And then the second is if we do want to have a policy, most of the commenters seem to think that the registry database should be considered authoritative, but there was a - sort of a caveat there that of course the data is actually collected by the registrar.

And so I asked whether that would disqualify the registry database from being considered authoritative, which one commenter seemed to think it did. And the others I think not, but maybe they hadn't thought about it, so I was trying to surface that question. If in fact the consensus was that we did need to address this issue in this working group.

So that just went out yesterday. I've got one response from Volker, which was very helpful, and I'm still awaiting other responses.

Mikey O'Connor: That's great. Somebody's typing and not muted, so I'm just giving you a heads up that whoever you are, we can hear you pretty well typing.

Again, this sounds great. Sounds like it's moving along. Do you, Steve, need any help from us today, or are you feeling like, you know your week ahead is pretty well plotted and planned, and just want to get...

Steve Metalitz: No. I'm just encouraging others on the subteam to react to...

Mikey O'Connor: Great. That sounds great. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I'm not on the subteam, but I was one of the ones - perhaps the only one, I don't know, who raised the issue of authoritativeness and do we really need to look at it? It's one of those issues there is a large number of registries that have Thick WHOIS. I don't know whether we understand who is authoritative in those cases. The number is growing. Why do we need to settle for the ones who are going to be transitioning if it is not already settled for all those who exist right now?

And if it is settled, then we already have the answer. If it isn't known for the others, why is it important that we know?

So I raise those questions because I think it's of some importance to all of us. And in my mind, it's - you know, it's - like a lot of the questions we've asked here, they're peripheral to our question because there is such a body of Thick WHOIS registries already, and I think we're making our life more complicated than we need to.

Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Well - and maybe what it is, is we're identifying sort of a whole category of things, and that we ought to start keeping track of those things. And, that

category is things which apply to all Thick WHOIS registries, not just the ones that we're looking at. And you know, we might want to write that list down in our report and say, "Look. These are interesting topics, but they're outside the scope of what we were chartered to do."

Alan Greenberg: Yes. To paraphrase something from the Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy, maybe we should be passing on notes to those groups which will come after us. But it's not clear it's ours to solve.

Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, that's lovely. Oh, my. Look at the queue. Okay, Steve go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: No. I was just going to say that Alan's correct. The ALAC comment raised this, but others came up with others as well, and I think he's well summarized the basis for question. Whether it - and this may be a solution in search of a problem is I guess my way of putting it.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Tim? Tim's probably going through the mute/unmute cycle.

Tim Ruiz: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: There you go. Now I hear you.

Tim Ruiz: Forgot all about that. The - I was going to mention that I think - I don't disagree with any of the comments so far, and I just was going to mention that I think there is something about the authoritativeness with the existing Thick registries. If not - and in most if not all of the agreements - and I'm not - I don't mean agreement between the registry and ICANN, but the agreement

between the registry and registrar, so that might be something that - to look at.

And if I remember correctly, in at least some of them, it does specifically state that you know the registrar's agreeing that the registry is the authoritative depository or whatever - repository of the data. If there is any disagreement between what the registrars have and the registries have, the registries data prevails.

That might be - if that exists in all existing agreements, then maybe as Alan says, we're - and then Steve, you know in search of a - you know, we really not - don't need to spend a lot of time on it. So that might be something to look into.

Mikey O'Connor: Great thought. But, that's an action item looking for a home. Steve, do you want to take that action item as something for your group to take a look at?

Steve Metalitz: Sure.

Mikey O'Connor: Terrific. Volker, go ahead.

Volker Greimann: Yes. I will chime in what Tim said. The - I don't think that we need to define as a reality of how it's done and how it works. Already it defines authoritativeness in today's marketplace. So, we might just recognize the current circumstances and how it is operated in current Thick TLDs, and refer to that in our statement.

We should recognize it in some form, but I don't think we need to define it ourselves.

Mikey O'Connor: Well, this is moving along nicely. Alan, I think you get - oh, wait - what is going on here? My screen is doing - Mark, you're next. Sorry.

Mark Anderson: Oh, no problem. This is Mark. I just wanted to chime in. You know, I'm a little nervous about us saying that, you know, authoritative or - you know, I think a couple people mentioned things potentially being out of scope. You know, I think - you know, authoritative is - you know, is clearly - you know, it's in the charter for what this group will do. It may be that our conclusion is there are no impacts, all right, but we're - you know, we're specifically chartered to look at it and consider the term authoritative in both technical and policy perspective, right.

So - I mean, I get nervous when people talk about it not being in scope. I think it very much is in scope. I think what people are really arguing is whether or not it's an issue at all. You know, there may be no implications whatsoever, but you know I think it most certainly is in scope. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. I like your distinction, Mark. The distinction between out of scope, which is a pretty broad bludgeon to hit things with, as opposed to not an issue, and here's why. And I think that's really where this conversation is headed, and I like that direction better.

Mark Anderson: Yes. That's a - thank you. That's a good way of putting it.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Yes, I agree. Thanks. Alan, I think you may have last word on this one.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, thank you. Just for the record, I don't think I said it was out of scope. I used those terms...

Mikey O'Connor: No, I may have done that.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I used those terms in the previous thing. This one may well be in scope. I don't think it's something we need to worry about, and that was just giving an opinion.

I will note however, there are either benefits or detriments of working on multiple PDP working groups. The UDRP treats registrars as being authoritative on (unintelligible).

Now of course, UDRP was written before there were two kinds of registries. The only registries at that point were Thin.

Mikey O'Connor: Interesting.

Alan Greenberg: So - but it never got changed, and it still tells the UDRP providers that the registrar is to be treated as authoritative. That's a policy issue. Not something we can fix. But...

Mikey O'Connor: Right. But you know, it might go into this newly designed...

Alan Greenberg: (Unintelligible) to be clear, it's one of the areas that needs to be cleaned up over the years. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. And it might go into that newly defined pile of things we've identified that are interesting but not in our - you know, that we've - like you say, that we want to hand on to the future generations. Little notes to pass to the future generations.

Well great. That sounds like everything's moving along. Susan, you get to go.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. I'm actually on the call, so that helps.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, that's exciting. That's great.

Susan Kawaguchi: (Unintelligible) lately. So I had sent out questions to my subteam in December, and actually we had a discussion of those questions on the call - on a call in December and talked it through. But the subteam hasn't responded a whole lot.

And so I'm sort of taking that as there's really no currently identified issues with synchronization. And in my mind, the authoritativeness is more crucial. So if someone knows which one, registry or registrar is authoritative, then they would go there and look at the records.

In my personal experience, I've had never seen any - not that my personal experience sees that much, but you know I just had a lot of WHOIS records and I am thinking - you know, I'm not seeing a difference between a registrar record and a registry record in a Thick WHOIS. But then, most of what I look at is .com, which is (unintelligible) anyway.

So you know, I sort of feel like maybe synchronization is not a problem because we normally come up with a problem, and maybe we should move on and focus on the authoritativeness.

Mikey O'Connor: One of the things that's sort of emerging as a theme with the other three folks was this notion that they went ahead and took a look at the responses, now that they're all in.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: And sort of summarize them. Do you want to sort of take your idea and run it up against the responses and see how well those align? And then circle back to us...

Susan Kawaguchi: Sure. Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: ...in the group maybe over the next week?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes. I haven't gotten - I have glanced at some of the responses, but haven't - I've had a lot of WHOIS background material to read recently, so I will do that and get back.

Thought because of my - I'm also on the expert working group now, so my participation in this group may be more varied because of the time constraints with that group.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. And feel free to throw up a hand if it turns out that this one is got to get thrown overboard for you and we'll...

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: ...we'll cover for you. But if - you know, if you want to hang on for a week and just take a look at those responses, we have a pretty good, very rich set of responses now, and you know I think running through those for your area of interest will give you a sense as to whether what your thinking is pretty well aligned with what everybody else is, or whether there's some issue in there that you think we should bring forward.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. Yes, I hear that. Either maybe not on the call next week, but via email.

Mikey O'Connor: That'd be great. Okay. Mark, any thoughts?

Mark Anderson: Yes. So this is Mark. So first Susan, I want to apologize for not responding to your email. I did see it. I just haven't had a chance to respond to it yet. And I do agree with Susan's point that authoritativeness you know sort of naturally precedes synchronization and migration.

But I did want to bring up - I definitely have some - I don't think concerns is the right word, but you know, I think I'll use it for lack of a better one. I have some concerns around the migration of Thick WHOIS data. I think we're talking about migrating over 100 million records from you know over 900 different registries, or registrars to a single registry. You know, I have - you

know, I don't know that that is going to be a problem, but I have some concerns about that.

So, I think it is something that we're going to have to look at in the synchronization and migration sub working group, but I thought I'd bring that up here.

And again, I apologize for not responding to your email yet, Susan. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Well you know, another thing to think about is that as - and you know, I'll pick on privacy and data stuff for a minute. You know, if it turns out there's an issue that needs to be resolved, the resolution to that issue may be in the way that the migration is done.

And so there's another dimension to migration that - it's the place where if we find things that are needing to be addressed, it's during migration that, you know, we have a pretty good chance to address them. And I don't want to lose sight of that either.

So - you know, I tend to agree that we probably don't want to step back all the way from the migration issue. It's certainly not as fast as we might want to step back from the synchronization issue, which may be easier to resolve than some of the stuff that's got to get done in migration.

Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I think certainly it's within our mandate to want to convince ourselves that migration is possible. The actual details I think are in implementation issue. And again, we may want to issue some cautions or things to consider during the implementation, but planning the implementation is not our concern other than to do a sanity check of make sure we're not asking for something which is clearly impossible.

Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. No, I think that's right. I wasn't thinking of going that far for sure. Rick, go ahead.

Rick Wesson: All right, yes. So good morning everyone. I just wanted to raise a point about the transition in the Thick registry from our team, which was one of the protocols that we started off with when ICANN was formed, to EPP, which was what we designed in the ITF to facilitate the mechanisms between registries and registrars.

And when the common net registry was transitioned from the RFP protocol to the EPP protocol, there were new capabilities that were not available under RFP.

And so there was a transitional period where a domain status is and this thing called an authentication code, or Auth ID, was now available to be populated and also was a requirement for transfer.

And so by looking at how that transition occurred, and how long it took and that kind of stuff, might inform you more about just in general transitions, synchronization, and how you adapt changes in EPP, whether it's about Thick transitions or new capabilities, just how long those kinds of things take. And another data point that we had a successful transition from one kind of thing to another.

And, I don't think that there were any major implications that were raised throughout that, but we did have millions of records that had this new capability and you know thousands or at least hundreds of registrars that had to do it.

And so, it might be interesting for our report to at least enumerate that some of things happened before and it did take time, and it was successfully done.

Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: That's fascinating. Is there - can you think of some places where there was any kind of a narrative that described what happened and how it went, Rick? I mean, I think that would be a huge resource for the subteam to take a look at if you can think of a place to go look for that stuff.

Rick Wesson: You know, I would look to (Scott Hollenbeck) at VeriSign Labs.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Rick Wesson: I think he was instrumental in having - in how that - you know, and since VeriSign was in largely the position that they had to execute that thing, they had you know a number of activities with registrars, meetings, and educational materials, some of those marketing materials on - of new capabilities.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Rick Wesson: So you know, I think maybe (Steve) or someone that works at VeriSign could probably dredge up some of the documents that they used for that transition.

Mikey O'Connor: Susan, this is in the purview of your subgroup. Do you want to take on that...

Mark Anderson: Mikey, can I but in?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Sure, go ahead. This is Mark, right?

Mark Anderson: This is Mark, yes.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, go ahead.

Mark Anderson: I do work at VeriSign, so I think - Rick made some excellent points. Actually, thank you Rick. I think those are great examples and great data points and things I do have access to, so that's a real good point. I agree entirely with what Rick said. All of those things are great examples of things we can look at in the past, as examples of you know this is doable. It's not a trivial effort, but something that we've shown is possible in the past, so you know real good point. Thank you Rick.

Mikey O'Connor: Mark, can I saddle you with the action to go chase that stuff down and talk to (Scott)?

Mark Anderson: Yeah, that's...

Mikey O'Connor: Very cool. Thank you.

Mark Anderson: Yeah, very good. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: That's great. Thanks Rick. That was a great idea. Okay, I think with that, we are done with the queue. Rick, I assume that's an old hand. Do you want to make another point or is that just left over from your previous one? I'm assuming it is left over. Okay, well I think that's it. This is pretty good progress on the subgroup front. I'm pretty perky about that.

The next item is beginning a conversation about what we should think about doing in Beijing, and I don't want to spend a whole lot of time on that today, but I think it's useful to start the conversation. Because if we want to do anything in Beijing, we do need to start elbowing our way into the schedule and so on and so forth, and so with that, I will hand it over to Marika to sort of bring us up to speed and throw it open to the rest of you for ideas. Go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. From a logistical standpoint, we've been requested to fill in forms to request meetings by tomorrow, so I have already actually put in a form for the Thick WHOIS Working Groups. I think at this stage, I have requested Wednesday from 11:00 to 12:30. Noting that you know the schedule is still in flux, I will of course do my best to make sure that we get a time that doesn't conflict with any major meeting that working group members are involved in, but as you all know, that may not be entirely possible.

So what I've done at this stage is just fill in a very general description saying you know this is the working group, that the working group will provide an update to the community on where its work stands. And I have created a separate Wiki page where in due time, once you decide what you want to do at that meeting, you can you know fill in further details or provide more a more detailed agenda or any questions you want to discuss there.

Just a note as well, of course, if you should decide not to have a meeting, you know we cancel that meeting at any time, but as Mikey noted, it's harder to get a meeting on the schedule after the deadline than actually just taking it out if it's no longer needed. So at this stage from a logistical perspective, I've just gone ahead and put in the request.

So if you have any concerns at this stage on the date and time requested, let me know and we still need to discuss at the end of the day how everything fits together so there is still room to change that around, and I will leave it up to the working group to decide how you want to use that time during the meeting.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Marika. I love the beg forgiveness rather than ask permission approach and stuff like that, especially when the deadline is tomorrow. Let's presume that we have a meeting -- I think that's a good assumption -- and talk a little bit as a group about what we would like to accomplish there. I have some ideas, but before I would throw mine out, I would be curious to

see what the rest of you would like to see happen in Beijing in a meeting like that.

This I think is going to be a bit unusual in that this meeting will be a meeting of a working group that's still working. I don't think that there is any chance that we are going to be ready to present conclusions, and so this is a little bit different kind of meeting to plan than the normal deal where there is a report to review or something to get public comment on.

So before I rattle on, has anybody got any ideas of things that would help them in a meeting like that? Steve, go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah Mikey, just picking up on your last comment, I think because we were so far behind in what we all - I mean many of us thought should be a process that would move faster. I would be reluctant to devote a lot of time to planning a meeting in Beijing unless we have a very clear expectation of getting something concrete out of it that would help us complete our report.

You know I can see that if this was an agenda item on every meeting for the next six it is time taken away from...

Mikey O'Connor: Doing the work, yes. No, I get that you know and well I will let the queue play out before I opine. Rick, go ahead.

Rick Wesson: Thanks Mikey. I'm not going to be in Beijing, but something that is usually helpful to the community is allowing them at some time to present comments, questions, to the team of people that will be there, and sometimes that makes it easier for the community to digest the outcome of the report. They have that opportunity to you know send up questions and get a feel of where things are, but like I said, I'm not going to be there and it's just a suggestion.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I think it was Alan. I saw the green circle go away, so I'm not sure if it was Alan that agreed with you there Rick or if it was someone else, but it was

Avri. I'm in the same camp. I'm sort of thinking that this could be more of a session where I agree with Steve.

I don't want to spend a whole lot of time building a giant complex presentation, reviewing it, and editing it down to the jiffies, but rather, some very broad strokes of questions in areas that we would really like to hear from the community about.

And I think that we could mine the charter and some of the comments and maybe some of these summaries that people are doing to arrive at that really fast, but have it be really something on the order of just a page or two of bullets that you know we could sort of step through with the community, and sort of stop with each one, and let people just stand up at the microphones and tell us things that they think of that we might not have, and have a little bit of dialogue around that and use it really as another form of information gathering and maybe try to get as many of the expert group that we can get there as well and use it as sort of an interactive opportunity to also bounce ideas off of them.

But really, make it more of a working session and less of a review session, and so put the kind of time into planning it. Maybe a bit more than the agenda planning than what we do for these calls, but not a huge document amount of time thing. Because I agree with Steve that we are - actually I think the comments help us. We've moved forward, but we are a little bit slow out of the gate and we need to keep focused on working.

Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Something that all of the working groups have done in the past is for example really making a working group session that's open to others to attend or participate in. so typically, they wouldn't just kick off with five minutes of you know this is what this working group is actually about and actually starting working their way at what could be you know their regular or

continued agenda from previous meetings. and then at the end, set a certain amount of time aside, which then is open to anyone who has showed up to listen or ask questions to come and do that and have more of an interactive session.

So there are different ways that you can build this up, but you know having some of these sessions in the past, some have been really successful. These people come to the table that otherwise probably wouldn't have either spoken up or provided information that's really relevant to the working group.

But again, sometimes it's also a challenge if there are many other things going on. You know you may end up with just the working group, but that may still be valuable time if it means you can make more progress on some of these items that you may be able to do on a conference call.

Mikey O'Connor: I think we are all sort of headed in the same direction here. Why don't we treat that as sort of the tentative plan? We will sort of postpone the detailed planning of it until we are a lot closer to it and maybe mostly do our regular agenda with a few extras thrown in, but not a big pitch and certainly not a document that we've edited. It seems like that's sort of where we are headed.

Let's treat that as done unless anybody goes crazy. I don't see anybody going crazy. All right, next on the docket - let's see how we are doing on time. We've got about 15 minutes left. I'm a little hesitant to dive into the public comment review tool itself, but let's spend just five minutes updating ourselves.

It's my understanding that we now have a complete set, including registries and registrars and I think both Volker and his team and Keith and his team to getting those in. And so, we finally have a complete corpus of comments to really zero in on and review.

And I'm delighted to hear from Roy that we are going to get an annex from the NCUC, so you know we are very close to a complete set of everything we need. It's almost like we've finally assembled the toolkit, but in so doing, I think we've actually produced an awful lot of terrific material. So for all of my grouchy status reports, I'm actually pretty tickled with the results that came out in this.

I think the question that's on my mind at the moment is we've got four groups that are working pretty intensively on their pieces of this feedback. How do we want to handle the rest of it? You know there is a whole bunch of it that - you know I've read them all, but I wouldn't say that I've initially reviewed them. Anybody got any ideas on how to sort of take a look at the rest of them?

I'm a little worried about doing that as a group because these conversations tend - especially when the comments are this rich. The conversations tend to go pretty slowly and we could spend a pretty long time going through them in order, but I'm sort of stuck on what to do about that. You know more subgroups. Is that the way to go? I'm sort of really looking for ideas here. Mark go ahead.

Mark Anderson: Firstly, this isn't an idea so much as a request for clarification. Do you mean like how do we tackle other items such as like cost implications, and existing WHOIS applications that we haven't touched on so far?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Mark Anderson: Okay, that's what I thought but I wasn't sure. Sorry, I was just asking for clarification.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, no, it's sort of like right at the beginning, Marika put up the list of the subgroups that we've got or the subtopics and you know we've put the mechanics of the subgroups in place, but we haven't populated them with

people. and one way to do it would be to - you know if we did a poll where people said well these are the ones I'm interested in and we could circle back to that poll and say well ta-da you are now a subgroup carry on and try to split the work out, but I'm not sure if that will work.

Let's see. Rick was first and then Marika. Rick, are you maybe muted?

Rick Wesson: Mute. Yeah, (unintelligible). Nobody wants to hear that.

Mikey O'Connor: No.

Rick Wesson: On the point of existing WHOIS applications, I can take a crack at dealing with that, particularly the comments and addressing the concerns. I have some experience with WHOIS applications and know the survey of the land pretty well.

Mikey O'Connor: Cool. Do you want to - Marika can probably circle around and let you know who else signed up for that. Do you want to sort of be the lead person for that little subgroup and carry on? There is an email list all set up. You could chatter away on the email list for a while.

Rick Wesson: I do not do well as a lead in anything. And so, I would be happy to provide my comments to that group and then they could use that as they wish.

Mikey O'Connor: Well maybe that's the way to do it. Maybe somebody else could step up and kind of nudge that along. That works for me. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. This is actually to confirm that for all of the topics, we've now set up sub teams, and on the Wiki, you can actually see who is a member or subscribe to the mailing list. Just a note for that one existing WHOIS application, I was actually in the process of confirming who has subscribed to that list, but it's already the set group that identified itself as a part of a survey as being interested in this topic.

And again, of course it doesn't prevent anyone to you know tell us if they want to be added to any of these subs teams because we can just add them to the mailing list without any problems.

Mikey O'Connor: So here is a - I don't know if this will make people crazy or not, but one thing that seems to have triggered a lot of conversation is this notion that you know a quick summary of the comments -- you know Alan did it for example in his area -- is a great conversation starter. And you know if somebody wanted to volunteer, that would be great to do one for each.

Another way to do it would be to have Marika and Barry and - I just blanked on his name. The third staff person assigned to us quickly do those summaries to kick things along, but you know I don't know whether that would make people nuts or not. Anyway, you know maybe seed the remaining groups with some comments, sort of the way that Rick is going to seed the WHOIS application one just to kind of get a conversation going and see if that yields anything.

Now you know the chat has been pretty busy and Avri raises an important and I'm not sure the answer to point, which is we may wind up slowing ourselves down, but I'm pretty keen on the success of the four groups that have been moving so far to sort of divide the work and move the ball forward. So I think I'd sort of like to stay with the divide strategy for the moment, because I am quite fearful of doing all of these end to end. I think that could take us a really long time if we do them on one shared call like this.

And the chat has got lots of good stuff going by on that. We may want to make a point of copying this chat transcript off to the list when we are done with the call, because there is a lot of information that is getting put in there.

Rick, is that an old hand or is that a new one? I've been all over my screen here and I'm not sure whether - if you have another comment, carry on.

Otherwise, I think that's what we are going to do is keep working on that. And unless somebody goes crazy, I'm going to ask Marika and Barry to take a crack at a very brief summary of the comments sort of on the lines of what Alan and others have done.

Just to - and drop those into the respective subgroup mailing lists just as conversation starters to see if that is enough to sort of trigger the people that are in that subgroup to go read the comments and think about them and offer some more. And let's see sort of what we wind up with in a week with that approach, and then if it spins into the ditch, we will figure out something else to do.

I - and Mark is asking about the chairs of the sub teams. I'm not sure we've got chairs for those sub teams. I think what we've got is lists of people who have volunteered Mark, but I don't think that we've named them. I could throw darts, but it might be better to just let the sub team have a chat amongst itself and see if anybody would be willing to sort of step up and carry that forward. Let's see. Yeah and Marika is sort of saying the same thing.

Okay, time is drawing short, so I'm going to leave this topic unless there is anything else -- we've just got a few more minutes -- and get onto Don's question. I'm not sure that anything associated with Mikey has ever been described as a system, but you know we could try. The question is designed on a system for taking advantage of the knowledge of our expert group.

One - well anybody got any ideas on that before I throw out something? Steve is typing. Steve is asking who are the members of the expert group, and to that, I have to turn to Marika, because I'm not sure. It's sort of - or maybe Don. Don, are you raising your hand for the list or should I go to Marika for who it is?

Don Blumenthal: No, I'm raising my hand on your does anybody have any ideas.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, Marika could you just rattle off who is in that group right now or at least describe the kinds of people that are in it?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. The people that we have confirmation from said that they are willing to participate, although I have to note that some of them did ask how much time would it take and it would be dependent on how much time it would require from them. Although, I reassured them all that they could step out at any time they would like.

Confirmed we have (Howard Ailand) from affiliate and Michael Young ex-affiliate, Greg Aaron also ex-affiliate. Andrew Sullivan, Chuck Gomes, Christopher Brown. Also from affiliates, (El Chico Dinitch) from Tucows who was involved in the 2003 move from a registrar perspective. (Unintelligible) from affiliates, and (Hashish Luthra) from affiliates, and then id did reach out to some of the other registrars involved at the time, but I haven't received confirmations yet. I am still working on those.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Marika. So you know a pretty solid group. That was sort of my impression of sort of veterans of the process, so I think a good group to lob ideas and questions at, but we do have to be a little careful about their time. So now to Don. Go ahead.

Don Blumenthal: Well I am sorry. I was distracted there for a second. I mean I think we need to be respectful of time, but I wouldn't want to hold much longer trying to figure out exactly how to do that. What I had in mind was -- and I raised this offline with Marika -- is just having an email group that includes all of the members. and at least each sub team should be able to send - say come up with a list of questions and send them maybe at one time with necessary follow ups to see what kind of answers we can get.

I hate to say centralize just the working group, because then, we wind up with just a laundry list of issues, but we...

Mikey O'Connor: Well here is an idea. Why don't we set up a mailing list for the experts? Why don't we channel our questions to them through Marika and why don't we make read only access to that list available to anybody who wants to see it you know so it gets archived and all of that good stuff. But also, so that if you want the correspondence to show up in your inbox, you can do that. Glen DeSaintgery and I have come up with a scheme as to how to do read-only access and we could try out that scheme on that mailing list. How about that for an idea?

I will let Marika digest that while I go on to Rick. Rick go ahead. This is the pause for the unmute button cycle.

Rick Wesson: Thank you. My suggestion would be that before you pass all of those questions off to the expert group that we actually go over them. I think it would actually inform all of us as to what the hard problems are and those are ideally going to develop into discussion points that will be in our response for this whole PDP. And so, the one request that I have is that integration be that we all get to see the questions before they are organized and produced for your expert group.

Mikey O'Connor: That's a fair thought and I would take that as a friendly amendment. How about that Don? Does that work for you? Sort of a round of conversation cross the whole working group after the sub group? You know the subgroup comes up with questions, send them off to the full working group, pick up any refinements, comments, pull them back in, and then drop them on the expert group. Does that kind of process work okay for you?

Don Blumenthal: Yeah, just real quickly, because I haven't had a lot of time to think about it and I've got to jump off. I appreciate the idea of getting other - a broader input than just from the sub teams, but I really just don't like the idea of building another layer of delay. You know we had some thoughts I think ready to go to the expert group. We could have passed them along last week.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I am sympathetic though to Rick's request, which is let's - I mean we've delayed enough already that another bit of delay doesn't bug me a lot because we are not pushing right now real hard for Beijing, so we are really pushing for South Africa. And you know I am feeling the momentum growing and I think it would be useful to let the whole group see the issues that the sub groups are finding puzzling.

Some of the discussions on the list have been really productive, so I'm kind of keen on Rick's idea. You know, it's not a showstopper for me, but I like the idea. Rick are you...

Don Blumenthal: I - let me - because I've got to go.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Don Blumenthal: I agree with the idea of airing the issues that we are looking at, but again, I just think the sub team should have the expertise and the interest to come up with the issues to go forward and try to get them clarified. To me, it's the opposite. We are running behind and I hate to add anymore to (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Mikey, it's Alan. Could I get in before we end?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, Alan why don't you jump in real quick and then I think we are nearly (to the end).

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...we are so process oriented. We are making this process about as difficult, complex, and convoluted as we possibly could.

Mikey O'Connor: No, get out of here.

Alan Greenberg: If we want the issues aired, whoever wants to propose them or whichever subgroup wants to propose them, send them to the mailing list? If anyone has any major concerns that this isn't something we should be asking the experts or they have some input that would modify the question, they have a day or two to respond.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: We don't need to add weeks.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I think that's right. I don't think we need to put weeks into this.

Alan Greenberg: Air them a day or so. If anyone cares enough, they will respond. If they don't have the time, then so be it. They go to the experts anyway.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: And let's get on with it.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I didn't have a timeframe in mind.

Don Blumenthal: My intention was not to derail anyone's process. It was merely to help inform the entire group of what the issues are in the subgroups we are needing advice upon. It was merely something we could (form our own discussion).

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. I wasn't implying that we are deliberately trying to slow things down. The net result is though that we are making this process rather difficult.

Mikey O'Connor: Or I described it badly.

Alan Greenberg: I didn't mean this process; I mean the whole PDP.

Don Blumenthal: And I think posting it to the wider list is entirely appropriate. That's all I was asking for.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah and I think I'm the one that turned it into something that sounded convoluted. Volker is on me now. Listen to him. Let's vote on the process. Yikes. Now we are into polls; now we are definitely heading into the end of the call. It's after the top of the hour and (Aaron) is saying vote too. Okay, I think we are done. We have a plan and with that, I thank you all. I actually think it's moving along pretty well, so thanks for everything.

Man: Thanks and everyone can take their tongues out of their cheeks now.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay, Tim, Nathalie I think we are ready to end the recording. Maybe we should have ended the recording a few minutes ago, but there you go.

Man: Thanks Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: See you all in a week. Bye-bye.

Man: Thanks Mikey.

Woman: Thank you very much. Bye-bye.

END