

**ICANN
Transcription
Thick Whois PDP Working Group meeting
Tuesday 12 March 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 12 March 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-20130312-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Marc Anderson – RySG
Roy Balleste – NCUC
Avri Doria – NCSG
Christopher George – IPC
Volker Greimann - RrSG
Frederic Guillemaut – RrSG
Carolyn Hoover – RySG
Susan Kawaguchi – CBUC
Marie-Laure Lemineur - NPOC
Steve Metalitz – IPC
Mikey O'Connor – ISPCP
Jill Titzer – RrSG
Rick Wesson – Individual
Jonathan Zuck – IPC

Apologies:

Iliya Bazlyankov – RrSG
Don Blumenthal – RySG
Amr Elsadr – NCSG
Alan Greenberg – ALAC
Tim Ruiz – RrSG
Susan Prosser – RrSG

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings
Berry Cobb
Lars Hoffmann
Julia Charvolen

Coordinator: Yes please, go ahead. We're now recording.

Julia Charvolen: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the Thick Whois Working Group call on Tuesday, 12 March, 2013.

On the call today we have Marc Anderson, Roy Balleste, Christopher George, Frederic Guillemaut, Susan Kawaguchi, Marie-Luare Lemineur, Steve Metalitz, Mikey O'Connor, Susan Prosser and Jonathan Zuck.

We have apologies from Tim Ruiz, Don Blumenthal, Iliya Bazlyankov, Alan Greenberg and Amr Elsadr. And from staff we have Marika Konings, Lars Hoffman, Berry Cobb and myself, Julia Charvolen.

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

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Julia. And I note that Avri just joined the room so I bet she's going to be on the call as well.

Welcome, everybody. In addition to the usual review the agenda and update SOI things I have to apologize to you all. I think I'm the one that threw off - several people tried to call in an hour early and it's because I mis-described the way we were going to handle the time zone change. So for any of you who got faked out I apologize, that was my mistake.

Any updates to statements of interest or changes to the agenda that people want to put in? Okay.

We've got a lot to review. This is a pretty heartening week in terms of lots of good material being developed and plans being made. So I'm going to push us a little bit harder on the agenda. And if people feel I'm going too fast please slow me down. I'm not doing it to short-circuit anything I'm just trying to get through what I think is a lot of really good material in an hour.

And so with that the first one up is in front of you. Right now these are the two questions that we've got for the expert group. We've got a mailing list set up for them and our thought here is that we will push these two questions along to them.

So I mostly just want to force us to look at it. And these look fine to me. And I'm perfectly content to release them to the group. Is - and so I just want the rest of you to look at this, just take a moment to read it and presuming it's okay with the rest of you I think we'll release this one to the expert group.

The - and while you're doing that I just got a thought from Marika which I want to pass along which is we didn't get any comments on that summary Excel spreadsheet that Marika did all the heavy lifting on that I brushed up a bit. And we just want to throw that question at you as well.

It's fine if we did a good job but if we didn't do a good job we'd sure love to hear from you on that. So we've mentioned that a couple of times on the list. And I just want to remind you of that one too.

I'm not seeing a whole lot of hands up on the questions for the experts so I think we'll go ahead and push those along.

Rick Wesson: Rick Wesson joining. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh hi, Rick. Welcome. Volker is joining. A lot of people are just chiming in. Okay so Marie, go ahead.

Marie-Laure Lemineur: Yes I just wanted to know maybe - sorry if you have mentioned it before but these two questions seems very pertinent to me. But I have - I'm wondering they are all meant to be asked to people who were working for PIR at the time, right?

So I was just wondering whether in addition to PIR people are we going to have experts that are not - that were not PIR staff at the time?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. And the answer, Marie, is yes, we...

Marie-Laure Lemineur: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: ...do. We have a pretty good list of folks that were both at PIR and Affilius and then some others as well, people who were just, you know, involved in one way or another. We might - I thought we circulated that list but...

Marie-Laure Lemineur: I'm sorry, I haven't seen it. But it's probably my fault.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, but it wouldn't hurt to circulate it again. Marika, could you take an action - or Lars, if you're on the call - just to dredge up that list and push it along to the email list so people know who's in that group? There's no secret to it. I'm just not - I've seen it a bunch of time but I can't remember if it's gone to the general list and it wouldn't hurt to do that.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I'll do so.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Thanks, Marika. Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yeah, hi. Thanks. This is Avri speaking. I don't know to what extent it's - the expert group is the right but the question I would have on Question Number 2 would be an additional part of the question, as I say, I don't know if this is the right place for it - but to what extent have circumstances changed in the last 10 years?

In other words, you know, this was the privacy complaints a decade ago. So I'm wondering who is it that can give us the authoritative story on the circumstances having changed in the last decade therefore mitigating the applicability of this as defining information. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, that's a good question. I don't know the answer either. It wouldn't be a bad addition, do you want to pen a little sort of supplemental question?

Avri Doria: Sure, I can certainly write a sentence that says just that, to what extent...

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Avri Doria: ...has the situation changed in the last decade regarding privacy and data protection.

Rick Wesson: And so actually - this is Rick Wesson. I'm not sure that those people are in the same positions to answer that question. So applicability of the question of how is it different now than then they may or may not be able to answer. But we know...

((Crosstalk))

Rick Wesson: ...position to speak to the issues around what happened because that was in the past and they were there.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. Steve, go ahead. Well, Avri, is that a new - I don't know...

Avri Doria: I'm sorry, I'll put my hand down. Understood, that's why I said is this proper place to ask it but it needs to be asked.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I think that's right. And I don't think it's a terrible thing to ask them and they can always say well I don't know. But anyway. Steve, go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, I don't have a question with asking them but I do think - I think that's a question for this group.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, that's probably right. We're probably better equipped to answer it...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: ...about what happened as input to our deliberations about what should happen in the future. So it's not...

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: ...it's not to say that, you know, the past is (prologued) but it's not necessarily going to be, you know, going to be recapitulated. So that's for us to decide really.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, well I think there's three jars; I think there's the jar that's in this question which is way back when; then there's the jar of well what's happened between then and now; and then there's the one, you know, Christmas future, what's going to happen going forward.

And I don't think it's a bad thing. The nice thing about that expert group - and you'll see when you see the list - is that it's a very diverse group of people who've been over the intervening decade in lots of different organizations.

And so even though they may not be the perfect group they're not a bad group to start that questioning with because they may be able to say no I don't know that but here's the person who would.

And so, Avri, if you were to pen that question in such a way that it encouraged the people to either answer if they know or let us know who might know that would be helpful I think. That way we can maybe do a little research on the intervening time as well.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Will do.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks. Anything else on these two questions besides that? We'll take, you know, we'll sort of wait for Avri's additional language and then - then maybe just put it in as a separate question, I'm not sure that it's that big a deal to - as to how it flows but we'll work that. Anything else on these? Not seeing any hands go up. Okay, let's go on then to the work plan.

One of the things that I asked Lars and Marika to do either on the last call or maybe even the call before was to take a first draft at a work plan to get us to an interim report. And this is their draft. And I wanted to walk through it with you.

And one of the things that always startles me is the difference in the amount of time between ICANN meetings. You know, we've had a really long time between Toronto and Beijing; we have a relatively short time between Beijing and Durban. And I never really noticed that until you actually try and do a detailed work plan.

But what you'll see in this work plan is that in order to hit an initial report by Durban we're going to have to push along pretty quickly here. And so as you read down this list of basically tasks and milestone dates what you see is that we're going to have to start really bearing down on these issues, you know, the topics and the issues associated with them.

And you can - and you can see sort of starting immediately next week, you know, we have to take a look at the stability, data escrow, authoritativeness templates and start reviewing those with the goals of trying to get those in some sort of final form fairly soon.

Now that, when I looked at it in its first draft, scared the daylights out of me. But I'm really encouraged by the submissions from the groups that in many cases the groups have moved to a, you know, a point where they are almost ready to go. And so I'm less nervous about that but I do want to emphasize that the pace is going to be pretty brisk in order to hit that deadline.

And so I wanted to call that to your attention and get a sense from you all as to your reaction to that pace. I think it's a worthy thing to try and make this schedule because Durban would be a good time to be able to stand up in a public meeting and share an initial report and have a conversation with people about this.

And so with your permission what I'm going to do is try to keep to this schedule but recognize that circumstances may intervene and we may not be able to hold to it. On the other hand if this absolutely drives you crazy right off the bat this is a good time to talk about that.

Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. So if I can maybe add some additional information on how we put the work plan together because it basically follows the Excel sheet that we shared with you last week. So basically it goes from the assumption that on most of the topics a majority of those that provided feedback haven't identified any particular issues and are, you know, either as a result in support of requiring thick Whois.

So the focus would really be on working through those issues that have been raised as concerns so to focus on those, try to see, you know, are those really issues that indeed are specific to thick Whois or are there broader issues? Are there ways to mitigate or address them? Do specific recommendations need to be developed? And in that way work through the items.

So as a result, you know, as we have several sub teams those have been identified for the first two meetings and those groups have been very helpful in working on the template. But for some of the other topics we don't have sub teams currently working. We have identified members that have expressed an interest but they're not actively meeting or reviewing.

So the idea is that the working group as a whole or if indeed - or the sub teams feel that they do want to take on this work start working on those topics and follow along with the template.

And the idea is then that the template, even though, you know, I think Steve already indicated as well in his response that certain questions may have applied depending on the discussions you're having or basically feed them into the initial report where it makes it easier, as well, to draft that initial report.

And again I think the Excel sheet is a kind of a guide there or that's what we've tried to develop as a guide to help lead those discussions really trying to focus on what are the issues identified and then work our way through a number of questions to try to address each of these issues identified.

So that's why it's really important that everyone has a close look at that Excel sheet to really make sure that people's positions have been correctly identified as well as the concerns that have been noted if they've been accurately summarized or if there's anything missing.

And just a last point, the topics listed - the order is actually random so I think there as well if people have suggestions that we should, you know, start with those that maybe have less concerns or with the harder ones where more concerns have been expressed I think that's something that the working group may want to consider. But, you know, we just listed them as we saw them I think on the list and the wiki.

Mikey O'Connor: Great. Thanks, Marika. Steve, go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, I wanted to thank you for putting together this plan. I think if anything it's not quite ambitious enough in that it really provides no - there doesn't

seem to be any wiggle room if we're going to have something out for Durban. I think, you know, we come right up against the deadline there.

So I would encourage - let's look and see if there's anything we can compress a little bit earlier. And, you know, for example if we have two weeks on competition and registry services, we have two weeks on cost implications and I agree we should have - probably have two weeks on privacy and data protection. I think that's going to be an issue that requires some discussion.

But I'm just - would just encourage us to look at what - if there's anyplace here where we can reduce one or - one of these topics from two weeks to one week and that would help us give us a little bit of a cushion in case there are issues about the draft initial report.

And as it stands now, you know, we review it; we don't really review it until three days before the deadline. So I would hope that we could try to push that back a week, have a discussion of on it on June 11 and that'll give us a little more time to get things done. That's my only suggestion is just to review this and see if there's anyplace where we can compress a bit earlier on to try to arrive at that. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I like that suggestion. And as you were talking, Steve, another idea that I had was that maybe we can do some work in parallel. Marika, I don't know what your reaction to this idea would be but would it be possible to basically start building the initial report draft section by section so that at the end of each of these meetings you could add a section to the report based on the results of that meeting so that instead of having a whole draft come out at once, you know, we have sort of the standard draft framework basically out right away and then fill in the chunks as we go through this.

Go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. We could definitely already start working on, you know, the framework for the initial report and start sending some out in a, you know, the basic information like, you know, the background, you know, membership list, annexes.

But again I think the idea behind the template was indeed to do it in that way so that after each meeting either, you know, a sub team or someone would be assigned based on the discussions of that day, try to fill in the template with indeed the responses.

Like, you know, what did the working group discuss? What is the issue? You know, what does the working group recommend? What concerns have been identified? You know, are those valid concerns? And, you know, related to the specific issue? Are there broader concerns? Is there anything specifically the working group is recommending to address the concerns expressed?

And basically use that template then at the next meeting to review. And again, you know, to Steve's comment if that document goes on the mailing list and no one expresses any concerns, you know, it can just be a topic at the next meeting saying well we haven't seen anyone proposing any edits or, you know, disagreeing what has been proposed.

So we can just sign off on that in the first five minutes and then move on to the next topic. So I think the idea is I've tried to build in a bit of, you know, redundancy and additional meetings to allow enough time because I've seen work plans where we actually, you know, think we can be done in one meeting and then it turns out we actually need three or four meetings.

So I think the idea is here that if we move faster, you know, there's no problem in just adjusting as we go. And indeed if, you know, we only need one meeting or a half a meeting on a certain topic then to just jump into the next one. So I think there's a lot of flexibility here. But we did try to build it in such a way to, you know, ensure that all the topics do have sufficient time

and there is some flexibility there if more time is needed for some or less time for others.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. And so again I'm going to ask everybody's permission to sort of push these along a bit. But at the same time I want to make it clear that if people are feeling I'm pushing it too fast you should not be shy about letting me know about that because that's, again, the intent there is just to try and hit a pretty aggressive deadline; it's not to cut off debate.

Okay I don't see any other hands in the queue. I've already taken a pretty hard look at this work plan and I'm pretty comfortable with it. And so unless I hear cries of outrage this is the way we'll go.

And I do want to take a moment just to thank Lars and Marika for another piece of really good work. This is a very collaborative effort between the three of us to get these out. And it's been a joy to work with them on this. So I just want to take a moment to let you know about that.

Carolyn, go ahead.

Carolyn Hoover: Yeah, I was just checking - the time that we had scheduled for the meeting in Beijing, is that at all flexible? I was just checking on another meeting that's scheduled overlaps somewhat with that and confirm that that was going to be about the same time. I didn't know whether there was any flexibility on moving that to another morning.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm going to hand that one to Marika. My immediate sense is that the schedule is getting fairly frozen. But, Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I think it will be challenging because I think for now we've set it on the - on Tuesday. There is a constituency day and some groups I think start pretty early in the day. On Wednesday we already have another working group that's having a breakfast meeting. Someone already

said on Thursday that there is an SSAC meeting that starts I think as well early.

So I think we have a rather limited window of options here. And that's why we've opted for the Monday. So...

Carolyn Hoover: Well that's fine, I just wanted to ask the question and I'll work around that. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Carolyn. And I think that this meeting is more skippable in a way than the meeting in Durban because this meeting is primarily going to be a working meeting whereas the Durban is going to be a review meeting of the initial report.

And so Marika confirmed the sense that I've got; scheduling these meetings is, as we all know, very challenging. And I think we're sort of frozen on this one now.

Okay enough on the work plan unless there's something else on other people's minds. Why don't we go to the first draft templates. Let's see - I guess we could start with the one that was submitted by Steve since he's here. Alan's not on the call. We'll take a look at the authoritativeness one.

Marika, let's puzzle through how we want to handle this. This is their response to the - so Steve, pardon me while I turn you into a test case because I'm sort of learning how to do this at the same time everybody else is.

Is the thought here, Marika, that we would go through the material from the sub team and confirm it and then take that to the spreadsheet for summarization or the other way around or what was your thinking in terms of how this would play out?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think for the template at least my idea was that it was something that would basically be put back to the working group to confirm that the working group agrees with the findings of the sub team and ideally it would come with a recommendation.

I see here actually I don't think a conclusion has been drawn but I just quickly read over it. So I think if that's not there that's something the working group may want to consider adding or clarifying what the conclusion is for that specific topic.

We can then indeed feed that back into the Excel table but more as the, you know, what is the working group's position on that item as I think now we have a - we don't have an official consensus table we're just saying, you know, majority or most agree or almost all agree so maybe at that point as well there's a way of saying well, you know, we do have consensus from the perspective of this topic, you know.

There should be a recommendation to require thick Whois or there's a, you know, a recommendation that we shouldn't be requiring or, you know, so some alternative or variation of that.

But I think - but I think for this item I will need to pull up the actual Excel sheet because I don't recall that there were any specific items identified here so we may need to look back on, as well, at the Excel sheet to see whether there were any specific items identified as concerns in relation to this issue and address it separately if they haven't been considered yet as part of the sub team.

But I think, you know, as Steve should be able to probably provide us an overview there because I think most of the sub teams have looked at the comments and have tried to address those concerns raised. So we can actually translate this back again a well in the Excel sheet.

But (unintelligible) the Excel sheet is more a tool to guide us through the discussion but I think it's something we probably will import maybe as an Annex in the report to show, you know, how we've conducted our work. But basically the text of this is intended to feed into the issue report as a description of, you know, the working group deliberations and as well as the conclusions that the working group made with regard to the specific topic.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay so given the sort of complication of putting two documents on the screen at the same time let me play back what I just heard. Essentially what you're looking at on the screen is - well what you're looking at on the screen is the draft from the sub team filling out the template from their work. And they've built some questions in that we need to work through.

They'll take this discussion back. At the same time one of the things that we might ask the sub team to do is take a look at that Excel spreadsheet that is the summary and see if any of the issues identified in there, just in the brief summary that we've come up with, still need to be addressed.

And so sort of take today's conversation plus anything coming out of the spreadsheet back to the sub group for one last pass of editing. And then this would come back here next week for hopefully a final review and then I think that the habit probably would be if we - let me imagine a future that says we get through our final review next week pretty comfortable with the result.

We would then post that to the list saying this is our pretty comfortable result that we're putting out for a consensus call to get people to really look at it hard one last time. And then two weeks from today, presuming that that all went well, we would confirm consensus on this and release it for inclusion into the initial report.

Now I'm getting a sidebar from Marika. Oh, can you pull up the spreadsheet in addition to this, Marika, on the screen? If there's a way to get them both on

the screen at the same time that would be great. But I was assuming that might - oh look at this.

Marika Konings: It does mean that the parts will get a bit smaller so you may need to adjust your - the size of the document to be able to see it.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh that's not bad. I can read it okay. Meanwhile while that's all happening, Steve, have you got any sort of overview thoughts that you want to share with us about this? You know, I think this is a lovely draft and appreciate all the work that you guys have done on it. So with that I'll just throw the ball to you for a minute while that spreadsheet is coming up and then we can circle around to that.

Steve Metalitz: Okay, yeah, I think it is responsive to the spreadsheet because as I understand the spreadsheet that's a distillation of what the responses were from the stakeholder groups and constituencies. And we reviewed all of those. And in fact this draft really reflects that review.

So hopefully we've addressed this. And the problem came in really - I think - I noticed in Alan's draft he had encountered this too that some of what we're doing is - assuming that there is thick Whois, you know, what's the impact? So the last two questions may be a little bit - a little bit off point because they go into, you know, should there be thick Whois. And we were asked to really look at what would be the impact.

But what we did is we started out with a definition which - and I really need to thank Volker for a lot of this because a lot of the material in quotes is from him. We described what we understand the situation to be in current thin environments and in current thick environments.

And we were struck by the fact that there really has not - as far as we were able to determine there was not an authoritative ICANN statement on which -

in the thick environment where there's a registry Whois and a registrar Whois there's been no official pronouncement as far as which one was authoritative.

This made us wonder whether that was actually necessary in this - for this working group to tackle. And - or whether there was just - that the registry data was inherently authoritative.

I think the main question that we - that we found as we surveyed the responses from the - excuse me from the stakeholder groups and constituencies and as we - in the discussion we had on the list was that there's one fact here which is that the registrar remains the entity that collects the data.

And then in a thick - in a thin environment it holds most of that data. It sends a little bit of it to the registry. And I think everyone - I think we all agree that that is authoritative in that environment just those data elements.

But in the thin registry the registry - the registrar holds most of the data itself. And in a thick environment it passes all that data - or at least a larger set of that data to the registry.

And there was some question about whether if the registrar is responsible for collecting it can the registry data be authoritative or was there an inconsistency there? And we posed that question on the list and the only responses we got were that that isn't a problem.

The data doesn't become authoritative until it enters the registry database. The registrar collects it but until the registrar sends it along to the registry it's not authoritative. So that was a description of the status quo in the thick Whois registries that we have now.

So it seemed to us that was the point of difference - the main point of difference between the majority of respondents who were comfortable with

the registry data being authoritative and some thought that was inevitable and the minority of respondents who thought that the registrar data should be authoritative because they're the ones that collect it.

And if that's viewed as a problem then there is a - there could be a problem with the registry data being authoritative. But most of the people who discussed it did not think that was a problem. So I hope that's helpful as an overview of what our discussions were.

Mikey O'Connor: That's perfect as an overview. And it kind of walked us through the document, gave us I think all a chance to read it a bit more carefully than we might have on the list. I think at this point what I'd like to do is open this up to the group for comments, suggestions, reactions.

And I think that the way that you all should think about this is that they've asked some questions in this - and we probably need to take a stab at answering those. And we also need to react to the conclusions that they've arrived at. And with that I'd keep an eye on the queue and see if there are strong reactions one way or the other.

Certainly the direction that Steve is implying would be to essentially adhere to the status quo in other thick registries. Makes a lot of sense to me. I'm filling. I'm doing a radio thing waiting for the queue to build and not much is showing up which may be good; this may mean that we're in pretty much agreement on this in which case I won't belabor it.

Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I just wanted to point out that in the Excel sheet I did identify one comment, which I think is partly already addressed by what Steve was talking about, from the NCUC which basically said that the registrar holds the contractual relationship with the registrant and that relationship should be honored and maintained.

And I think as part of our draft response in the Excel sheet we already noted that thick Whois actually does not change a contractual relationship between the registrar and the registrant. So this is potentially not an issue as it's currently phrased. So just to note as well that that was one of the specific items identified as part of the public comments received or the constituency statements.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Marika. Marc, go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Yeah, I just want to jump in on that. And this document touches on that a little bit in Question 5. You know, but it points out there is authoritative but then there's authoritative for accuracy. You know, and I think that's an important point in that the registry itself doesn't have a relationship with the registrant.

So even if the registry itself is viewed as authoritative, you know, as the authoritative source the registry itself can in no way be authoritative for its accuracy.

You know, and I think that's what, you know, the point of the response there in Question 5, you know, is that, you know, and what Marika was touching on as well is that the registrar still maintained that relationship with the registrant. And that they're responsible for and have the contractual relationship with the accuracy of the data. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: I think that's a nice solution. That was certainly a big topic in the drafting team when we were writing the charter was the distinction between the different flavors of authoritative. And so that seems like a good start on language that sort of clarifies that puzzle so I think that's great.

Anything else that people have to say about this? I don't want to slow us down so if people are fairly comfortable with where this is going. Steve, is there any feedback that you want from the group on any of the, you know,

there's essentially a question posed in the middle in italics that sort of says, you know, whether it's necessary to recommend a policy on this issue does the sub team have a preference on that?

Steve Metalitz: Well I think most of the people who spoke up on (unintelligible) felt that it was not necessary to have a policy on this issue. So, yes, we would be interested in reactions to that.

Mikey O'Connor: All right. And I tend to understand and at least initially agree with that approach. Less is more in my view. So if that's okay with folks we'll treat that as - is there anybody who feels very strongly the other way? Maybe let me put it that way just to try and tease that out. And again I'm not seeing - Marc, I'm assuming that's an old hand? Yeah, okay it's an old hand.

Well okay this is the last call. I'm going to call this conversation done. I didn't hear any substantive changes being suggested so we might be able to push this one to Marika - no, let's see in our process what we were going to do is circulate this to the list...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, this has gone to the full list.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, this has gone to the full list and...

Steve Metalitz: But it was just before this call.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. And I'm sort of thinking that now we send it to the list again perhaps answering that question that you pose in italics in the affirmative that says the full group has reviewed this question and agrees with the majority of the members of the sub team that no new policy is required.

And send that out as an initial consensus call to the list. Let people read it hard, ponder it, converse on the list. Bring it back next week for final consensus at which point we'd release it to Marika and Lars for redrafting into the initial report.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I was just wondering if you already would like us to do a bit of redrafting at this stage as well adding, for example, in the point that Marc made on the, you know, authoritative for accuracy and maybe also try to already write up like the kind of conclusion or recommendation so we can already start that process at the same time.

I don't know if that's helpful or whether you want to do that more at a second stage part of looking at this draft.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve. I'm certainly comfortable with that.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah and I was going to agree that I may have invented a two-step process when really what we need is take one of those steps out. So maybe the next step in this - and, Steve, I apologize again for sort of making you the test case. But the next stage on - since we've got tentative agreement from the group is to release this to Marika to do a draft.

And then we finely edit - we really work hard on the editing of the draft that Marika and Lars develop rather than the one that you've developed. But use the sub group's input as feeding into Marika. That takes a bit of pressure off sub team groups and especially sub team group leaders for having to develop a finely crafted document.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: Well this is Steve. Yeah, that's appreciated certainly but also I think the advantage is that then we have some consistency of style so that...

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: ...you know, each of these doesn't look totally different from one another. So I'm certainly supportive of that and I would look forward to seeing the staff edits of this or the staff redraft of this on the list.

Mikey O'Connor: Great. This is great. I'm loving this. Anything else on this one, folks, before we move on? Okay let's see. Susan Kawaguchi, you're on the call.

Susan Kawaguchi: I am on the call.

Mikey O'Connor: And I salute you for that. I can't keep straight who's got which pieces in. Do you have a draft of this flavor in that we can take a look at?

Susan Kawaguchi: I do not.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Susan Kawaguchi: Unfortunately. But I do have some thoughts.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Susan Kawaguchi: I'm not getting a whole lot of feedback from the team so - but I did review the comments. And there seems to be three main issues that people have brought - highlighted in their comments. But there's no major issues that I could see.

So basically they're concerned with cost of the synchronization of the data, the stability and the number of records involved. So I sent that all out to our team again yesterday. And - but have, you know, haven't gotten any feedback. But I can put something together very similar to what Steve did and submit to the group this week.

So, you know, my recommendation would be that if the whole, you know, if we recommend thick Whois that these three criteria would be considered in the transition plan, that they would need to be - the plan would need to be mindful of those three issues.

But also I think that because there's other work going on with the Whois records in the ICANN world that the standardized formats would be really - extremely important in transitioning any data. So - and I think there is - I'm not sure where but I know that somewhere they are working on a standardized format that might be in the RAA, I'm not sure. And...

((Crosstalk))

Susan Kawaguchi: ...so it would, you know, that would definitely help with any synchronization problems in my opinion. So that's about all I have today. I'll see if I can...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Well it's great to have you on the call. And it's - I think would be really useful to have that draft come in front of us...

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: ...first on the list and then we'll pick it up again on the next call and sort of work our way through that so that's great. And...

Susan Kawaguchi: I can do that. I'll try to get it...

((Crosstalk))

Susan Kawaguchi: ...to the list by tomorrow afternoon.

Mikey O'Connor: That'd be fantastic. Volker, go ahead.

Volker Greimann: Okay. I think the standardized formal issue is now in public comment as part of that so-called RAA. I'm not very happy about the word agreement in that context.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: We're not going there on this call.

Volker Greimann: ...ICANN has posted the current state of affairs with the RAA negotiations. And part of that is the specification concerning the Whois data. And that contains also references to the standardized performance. And I'll just try to find the link for that and then I'll post it in the chat.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh that's great.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Anything else on Susan's thoughts? I want to circle back to something Avri posted in the Chat in a minute but just wanted to see if there's anything from anybody else on Susan's.

Okay one of the things that Avri volunteered to do and went ahead and did is posted proposed language to add to the list of questions for the expert group. And it's in the Chat now and - at least still visible to me. So everybody sort of refrain from posting to the Chat real quick - for just a minute while we maybe capture that and throw it off to the other side of the Adobe room so that we can give it a real quick read.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...in it but hey, it's something I wrote so it's of course got illiteracies in it.

Mikey O'Connor: It's hard to compose that stuff in the Chat so I get that. And so maybe, you know, correct for illiteracies. But I just want people to sort of take a look at that. I think what we're going to go ahead and do is forward that to the expert group unless somebody just goes nuts in the next couple of minutes. And so just take a moment to look at that and then we'll push along here.

Okay we've got another 10 minutes. I'm going to go for one more. Alan's group pushed - Alan pushed a summary out to the list as well. And I don't believe Alan's on the call today. Is there anybody else from his group that wants to sort of step into Alan's shoes and essentially be the rapporteur for this or shall we just stumble through it as a group? Not seeing a huge lunge at the gate but give it a try.

This is the question of stability. And so what Alan's sub team has come up with is sort of, you know, what's the definition. It's the availability of Whois data in the case of a business or technical failure and goes on from there.

And I think that this - Steve is right, this is one of those ones sort of similar to Steve's where - well no, this is different. This is - I haven't - I'm now revealing that I haven't reviewed these with any great care either.

So I'm not sure. Let's see if we can drag through the first one in the next eight minutes and see how we do. So the next one is, "Describe the circumstances of Issue A in a thin Whois environment. And within thin Whois there are two sources of copies. There is one in the registrar and there's one with the escrow service that's used by the registrar."

And then what Alan goes on to say is, "If you presume that one of those two sources fails there is one fallback. If the escrow fails there is still the registrar's copy and conversely."

Then the next question is the template is, "Describe the circumstances in a thick model." And Alan's comment there is that, "Under today's rules there are the two sources are still there and in addition there are two more; there's the registry copy of the Whois data and the escrow service that's used by the registry resulting in a total of four."

So in the case of a failure of any one of those there would be three instead of one so that's a pretty dramatic increase in the number of copies of the data. The next one says, well, what's the advantage of thick Whois given this issue of redundancy. And their response is alluding back to this three fallback sources instead of one.

And then they make the point, "Since most catastrophic failures are often the result of multiple failures having multiple backups is preferred." If I read that sentence differently - I think I read the emphasis quite wrong - let me reread that.

"Since most catastrophic failures are often the result of multiple failures multiple backups is preferred." And the presumption there is that there is - maybe a remote chance that a catastrophic failure could take out both the registrar and its escrow copy. That would have to be a pretty amazing catastrophe. But I think the point that they're making is four is better than two in that kind of a circumstance.

Then they say, well, what's the downside of thick Whois? And some participants in the sub group believe that having personal data in multiple sites makes that data more susceptible to attack or misuse. And then they punt that issue to the data protection team.

And I think maybe what we need to do there is just let the data protection team know that that issue is being handed off to them and confirm that they've accepted that. And so maybe Marika, if you could circle back to - well and, Marie, if you could take that back to the sub team...

Marie-Laure Lemineur: I will.

Mikey O'Connor: ...data protection sub team just to make sure that we didn't throw the ball on one side and not have it get caught on the other.

Then the next question is, "Does data imply that we were recommending thick or recommending thin or is it neutral?" And here they say, "Most parties agree that multiple copies are better but some feel that four copies are excessive. Most participants support the benefits of thick. The two Non Commercial Stakeholder Group constituencies argue that there are risks associated with the registry having the data and VeriSign argues that two copies are sufficient. Registrars argue that in a thick model registrar escrow is no longer needed resulting in three copies."

So there seems to be some divergence of views on Question 6 as to how many and where. And I'll just read the last one and then open the queue up. Oh we're running really out of time.

But it's - I think it's still worthwhile to just go through this one and we'll probably pick this conversation up again on the next call. Hang on just a second, Rick, and let me just read this last one then I'll get to you in the queue.

The last question in the template was, "If your response to Question 6 is that thick should be recommended please provide any additional considerations." And the group said, "Well, on balance most but not all participants believe that thick provides additional stability over the thin. And some feel that this additional stability is not required while others believe that there's a privacy price to pay for this extra stability."

So there I've done the reading - the dramatic reading. Rick, your hand went down, do you - did I accidentally resolve something?

Rick Wesson: No, I was just lowering it so that you wouldn't think that I was - that it was an old question. My point is merely that no one provides any data on their dealings. It's kind of like, you know, asking some girls at a pillow party, you know, there's no empirical evidence to support any of the statements.

And so what I would really like - or something that would really help us I think is if when we do this kind of outreach that we ask not just for how you feel about this particular topic because it seems ICANN really is about polling for the status quo that we ask them to provide some supporting materials such as many of the - many of the statements that you just made could potentially be supported with a factual piece or data element, a paper that actually describes how they arrived at that conclusion.

Because, you know, if we're just going to weigh how people feel about something we can't negotiate whether it's good or not.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, and I was essentially just doing a dramatic reading. It's too bad that Alan's not here today. But it - I think that Rick is on to something with this. It would be good to have some empirical analysis of this. And the question is who does it and how fast could we get it.

So I'll throw that out for the sub team to think about and push through two more folks in the queue really fast and then we'll wrap the call up for today and sort of pick up right here on the next call. Volker, go ahead. Oh, Volker's hand went down just as said his name. Marc, I think you get the last word.

Volker Greimann: Oh sorry, I was on mute. Sorry.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh okay, sorry, Volker. Volker first and then Marc.

Volker Greimann: One thing that I might have missed but I don't think it was there - one thing that we should also maybe refer back to the availability sub group is the

question of whether availability means public availability. So if registrars should also be required to provide public data of - public service of Whois data in thick registries as they do now even though nobody queries it because nobody is pointed there from the registry.

I think registrars currently are required to keep that data and therefore the data is available in the event of a failure. But the question remains if that should be a public availability through a Whois service or should it just be a fallback position for the registry.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks. And I want to pass that one directly back, let's see; let me collect my wits here. So I'm not recording action points. Hopefully somebody is I say at the very end of the call. Marc, I think you get the last word and then we're going to wrap it up.

Marc Anderson: I'll try and be quick. You know, one request for the, you know, data escrow and, you know, stability sub group to look at is when you have multiple copies of this data they're not going to be in sync. You know, an escrow copy from two different sources, even if it happens, you know, unless it happens at exactly the same time there's going to be discrepancies.

So I guess my request to ask the sub group to take a look at would be, you know, when there are discrepancies, you know, whose version is authoritative? Or, you know, are there issues with those discrepancies around having, you know, multiple copies that aren't necessarily exactly in sync. So it's just a request from me for the sub group to take a look at. Thank you.

Rick Wesson: And a small recommendation on that. There's a thing called multiple masters. It's fairly well established, lots of systems do it and should not be a problem, lots of academic papers on topics.

Mikey O'Connor: What was that term again, Rick? That was Rick Wesson for the transcript.

Rick Wesson: Multiple masters.

Mikey O'Connor: Multiple masters.

((Crosstalk))

Rick Wesson: That's really used in LDAP (active) directory synchronization.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I think that would be good because I think that it would be useful to point to some of the technical standards that often apply. You know, this is a fairly common situation with multiple backup situations. And, you know, to bring those back in sync.

I'm getting a call on another line. This meeting has run a bit over and so I'm going to drop off very quickly because I'm tending my dad in the hospital and this is about that. So thanks for the conversation. I'll see you in a week, folks.

Marika Konings: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Bye-bye.

END