

**ICANN
Transcription
Thick Whois PDP Working Group
Tuesday 19 March 2013 at 15:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Thick Whois PDP Working Group on the Tuesday 19 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-20130319-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Roy Balleste – NCUC
Don Blumenthal – RySG
Avri Doria – NCSG
Amr Elsadr – NCSG
Christopher George – IPC
Volker Greimann – RrSG
Alan Greenberg – ALAC
Carolyn Hoover – RySG
Susan Kawaguchi – CBUC
Marie-Laure Lemineur - NPOC
Steve Metalitz – IPC
Susan Prosser – RrSG
Tim Ruiz – RrSG
Jonathan Zuck – IPC

Apologies:

Mikey O'Connor – ISPCP
Marc Anderson – RySG
Jill Titzer – RrSG

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings
Berry Cobb
Lars Hoffmann
Julia Charvolen

Alan Greenberg: I guess the operator can't get on either.

Coordinator: Go ahead. Go ahead. We're now recording. Thank you.

Julia Charvolen: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the Thick Whois PDP Working Group call on Tuesday, 19 March 2013. On the call today we have Roy Balleste, Don Blumenthal, Amr Elsadr, Christopher George, Alan Greenberg, Carolyn Hoover, Susan Kawaguchi, Marie Laure Lemineur, Steve Metalitz, Susan Prosser, Tim Ruiz.

We have apologies from Mikey O'Connor, Marc Anderson and Jill Titzer. And from Staff we have Berry Cobb, Marika Konings, Lars Hoffman, and myself, Julia Charvolen.

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

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. It's Alan Greenberg. I'm the virtual Mikey today. And I was not on the call last week and I haven't had a chance to listen to the recording so I'm working a little bit blind.

But Marika has sent out a number of documents that I see were partially reviewed last time and we're going to continue that process. And I would suggest that we slightly alter the order to do authoritativeness first, because if I remember correctly that's Steve's section and he has to leave relatively shortly.

And can someone tell me to what extent you already reviewed it last time, because I'm blind? I don't have that knowledge.

Steve Metalitz: Well Marika - I think Marika can fill you in.

Alan Greenberg: Okay Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Just to explain - so basically on the last call we went through the report that Steve submitted on behalf of the subteam on the basis that we had some further discussion and some issues were identified.

And on the basis of that I drafted this document that's currently on the - up on the Adobe Connect and that was also circulated to the mailing list last week, with the idea being that this is basically the chapter on authoritativeness that would get inserted into the initial report.

So what I basically tried to do is translate some of the questions we had as part of the template into headings and call out some of the items that were part of the subteam report, as well as part of the discussion we had on the call and at the end translate that into a conclusion again based on what was submitted by Steve on behalf of the subteams.

And as you'll see there's I think one item that I identified as a question. I think it's in the second paragraph and basically says that, "It appears that Registry data is treated as authoritative."

And I'm asking there, "Would it be possible to actually specify by whom that is being done? Is that the Registry, Registrar, ICANN or all three of those so we can be more specific in the report?"

And as I said this was sent out for public - or for further comment - for comments to the Working Group and mailing list, but as far as I'm aware I haven't seen any comments added so - or suggestions from the Working Group on this document.

Alan Greenberg: Okay thank you Marika. I do have one comment and that is the UDRP does treat Registrar data as authoritative period. Now that's probably due to the reason that the UDRP was written when there was only thin Registries, because it predates the first thick Registries.

But nevertheless it still stands as the Bible that - which UDRP service providers use and they are told that the Registrar is authoritative. So - and if of course doesn't differentiate between thick and thin, so I think we need to at least mention that. Steve?

Steve Metalitz: Yes this is Steve. I think we had that in our - well we've - this has been through a couple of drafts and we had other documents that circulated within the subgroup but you're right.

And that certainly could be mentioned probably in the third - well yes, or in the second - it could be in the second or third point.

Alan Greenberg: Well the second and third I guess it should be.

Steve Metalitz: Well...

Alan Greenberg: Well I guess for thin Registries there is not much choice other than the dates the locks and the name of the Registrar - they don't have any of the data.

Steve Metalitz: Yes and actually I was - yes, I mean, it could go in the second one because as you pointed out both for historical reasons and because the vast majority, I would venture 99%, of UDRP cases involve thin Registries.

Alan Greenberg: Right.

Steve Metalitz: You know, it's - we could just add a sentence in there to...

Alan Greenberg: Right. I think we need to note at the very least that if we go to - if we recommend going to a thick Registry I don't know whether we want to explicitly say that one of our recommendations is that the UDRP be changed to reflect that, but at the very least we have to note it.

Steve Metalitz: Yes I think the problem with changing it, I mean, the other question there is all right, so we've had thin - thick Registries for many years. The UDRP has made the Registrar information authoritative. Has this presented a problem?

Alan Greenberg: I don't think it presented a problem because when the issue was brought up on the UDRP Locking PDP I recall at least one of the UDRP providers said, "Oh that's interesting," but had never, you know, was never really aware of it.

So it clearly hasn't caused too many problems. My understanding is on rare occasions there are things like court orders that require a domain to be transferred to another Registrar, and the losing Registrar's databases may still reflect that they're the Registrar of record.

So that kind of problem can happen but I presume in - even in those cases the Registry's data is what is used to identify who the Registrar is so...

Steve Metalitz: Yes that...

Alan Greenberg: That wouldn't be problematic in that case.

Steve Metalitz: Yes I think we pointed out that that is the case in - and the second sentence on thin talks about that.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: As far as Marika's comment, I mean, I think we could probably just say it's generally treated as authoritative. We didn't go into detail about from - in whose eyes was it considered authoritative.

Alan Greenberg: Well - but let me read that again. I don't see how it could be anything else but the Registry data. I mean, all we're talking about essentially are the dates and the identification of which Registrar it is.

And any Registrar could put up data saying, "I own ibm.com or I sponsor ibm.com." But only the Registry knows who they would accept, you know, renewal orders from or things like that, so by definition the Registry is authoritative on those items I think.

I don't think it's a matter of judgment so I'm not sure we need to specify who it is, because we end up with a paradox if the Registry isn't authoritative on those items.

Steve Metalitz: Maybe we just say the Registry data is authoritative, take out treated as.

Alan Greenberg: I think so or must be authoritative. Any other comments on this one or are we happy with the - this goes into the draft report?

Steve Metalitz: I - speaking as the convener of that subgroup it looks fine to me.

Alan Greenberg: Okay Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes so this is Marika. So just to clarify I should add a note, either a footnote or in the text on the mentioning the UDRP and noting that they're - in that case it's the Registrar data that's considered authoritative and adding the generally before treated, you know, where the comment is highlighted. Did I get that right? Are those the only two changes?

Alan Greenberg: I missed what you said on the last part.

Marika Konings: Steve suggested that what I've highlighted in yellow to clarify there that basically just to say, "It appears that Registry's data is generally treated as authoritative."

Alan Greenberg: That's fine.

Marika Konings: Authoritative. Okay I'll make that update and send that to the list for...

Alan Greenberg: Yes and I think the proper language is the UDRP deems the Registrar data to be authoritative, because they are instructed to go to the Registrar for the data.

All right. Let's wrap that one up and then we go on to stability. And if I understand correctly Marika that is the section on stability that I originally submitted and that was redrafted to put it into standard language and such. Is that correct?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. That's correct and again I think here we added the - a couple of comments that came up in the discussion last week.

Alan Greenberg: Right.

Marika Konings: And again here as added a couple of questions in yellow. The first one is we noted there and I think that came probably from your draft and maybe there's one of the comments that says, "Some Working Group participants are of the view that having personal data at multiple sites makes that data more susceptible to attack or misuse."

And I've asked a question there. "Is there any data or sources that support this statement that could we - that we could include?" And then there's a second - oh, you want to cover that first?

Alan Greenberg: Yes I will comment on it. I'm not sure it is salient to the discussion of stability, but it was raised by at least the NCUC and maybe NPOC, I don't remember, under this stability question.

So I personally do not think it is relevant to stability because they're saying, "Yes it may make it more stable but," and the but falls under the data protection - the privacy and data protection subgroup.

So I'm not particularly sure that that statement is relevant in this section. I included it because I didn't - otherwise I was ended - I ended up - position saying, "Everybody agrees that we - that thick is better for stability."

They introduced it and I wasn't quite sure what to do with it, so I guess I look to the general consensus of this group as to whether we keep that sentence in or not.

You know, the data protection - data privacy and protection group will presumably come up with a judgment as to whether there is data to support that statement or not. So I'm happy to leave it out altogether but...

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Actually the sentence after that does already indicate that the issue is being addressed in the section on privacy and data protection.

Alan Greenberg: Right.

Marika Konings: So it will be referenced there so indeed I don't know if we need to include, you know, data here but I think in any case it's probably already a call then for the information we'll need to include in that section that if there's any data that we can include I think that will be really, really helpful to, you know, get that information together.

Alan Greenberg: Right. I think once we get the output from the protection and privacy group we may want to revisit this and take that sentence out or leave it in with some modification.

But I don't think we can really close it off completely until we have their results. And it may be we'll take it out because they're addressing it well somewhere else, but I'd prefer to leave it in right now perhaps highlighted with that comment just so we remember it's there.

And the last question in the last sentence was something that was introduced last week, and I'm not sure what multi master replication is so I'm going to have to leave it to someone else. I see that seems to be the question that you're asking also.

Marika Konings: Well this is Marika. Indeed I did a bit of Googling and found that information that I think seems to indicate that there's a - that's a kind of technique that's being used to replicate or have different, you know, have a master database basically.

So I'm not exactly sure but at least I just wanted to make sure that the reference I found on Wikipedia - whether that's a appropriate link to provide there if people want to have more information or whether there's something better we can include, you know, and if there are any kind of specifications or anything we can refer to.

So I actually asked (Ray Gore) in the comments but I don't know if he has noted it. So I can forward this to him separately as well unless anyone else has any suggestions or opinions on whether, you know, we can just include the Wikipedia explanation of this technology or whether there's anything better we can include there.

Alan Greenberg: Yes it strikes me though that this sentence really is not talking about stability as such but, you know, perhaps data integrity or something like that because I - when I look at that the first question I would ask is if you're going to use a synchronization technique is which one do we synchronize with?

And I suspect as with the authoritativeness some elements are going to be - have to be synchronized from the Registry and perhaps some from the Registrar to eliminate inconsistencies. Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes hi. I'm just speaking up here. I'm not on this subgroup but if there is some desire to learn more about multi master replication and why it's important or different, et cetera I'm happy to talk about it.

I guess I might be the geek of the group. I can also try to find some kind of material. I haven't looked at the link Marika that you shared and that may be sufficient, but if you want me to look for something else that helps to describe it I'm happy to do that or happy to discuss it, whatever you - however you'd like to spend your time.

Alan Greenberg: Well I'm not sure we need to dictate the methodology, and I'm not sure it's within the remit of this group to mandate that a specific methodology be used, just that if - are indeed problems then there are ways to address it.

Jonathan Zuck: That's right.

Alan Greenberg: We can certainly suggest a way. I'm not sure I would want to mandate it, because potentially we're talking about a relatively large and onerous software implementation there.

Jonathan Zuck: I think that's exactly right. I mean, I think that this group ought to set up a goal set for, you know, a set of use cases of how this system would be used and problems that need to be avoided, and then it should be up to the technology folks to implement those use cases and avoid those pitfalls and with whatever technology makes the most sense.

So it's more like an offer if you - if anybody wants to understand that but I agree with you that it's not really the remit of this group to get into that level of detail.

Alan Greenberg: Yes and to be candid if you think about it there are very few things where the Board's ability to pass emergency consensus policy due to stability or security of the DNS applies.

And if indeed we were to find that there are regular inconsistencies between the two copies on a thick Whois, that's about - that's probably one of them that indeed if something comes up quickly it could be acted on, but I'm not sure there's enough indication that - of a severe problem that we would want to mandate some sort of complex synchronization on a - before going ahead with it, at least that's my...

Jonathan Zuck: Or even have standing to do so really.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Well I - we have said to do so if indeed we could demonstrate that there's likely to be a problem. I don't think we can do that. Okay how do we go forward on this one?

Since (Rick) is not here who apparently made that comment initially, do we want to keep this one on the back burner and bring it up again next week?
Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I can just, you know, send a note to (Rick) because as I said he may not have noticed the comment in the document so I can just maybe forward it to him and then, you know, ask him the question and based on his feedback I can, you know, share and update the draft or update the Working Group next week on the call.

Alan Greenberg: Yes I certainly haven't heard a lot of call outs here saying that we want to be very prescriptive about how to handle possible problems. I think we can certainly note that, you know, there is the possibility of it but there certainly hasn't been a lot of problems reported in that area to date.

And yes we don't have the majority of date - of registrations in thick on gTLDs, but it is also used widely on ccTLDs and I haven't heard reports of those kind of problems either.

Okay. What do we have next? Next we have escrow I think which has not - I gather has not been reviewed by this group yet. Is that correct?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Yes that's correct so basically the whole document is there so people should focus on the second and third page of the report. I don't think we - so I don't think we covered any of the questions though I think thus far. We basically left off on the last call.

Alan Greenberg: All right. How were you doing this last - sorry. My mouth is not working. How were you doing this last week? Just reading out each section and seeing if there's comments?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think basically the subteam leader or - well in the case you weren't there. I think Mikey did it - basically just provided an overview of what is covered in here and asked the group to comment on whether they agreed/disagreed.

And on the basis of that I would then, you know, take that away and write up the proposed chapter.

Alan Greenberg: Okay thank you. Jonathan is that a new hand or left up from before?

Jonathan Zuck: Oh sorry, left up from before.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. And still up unless - oh now it's finally down. Maybe things are sluggish today. All right. Well the issue is in a thick model we're looking at - okay sorry.

I'm trying to focus again. The standard questions that would apply. I noted so I tried to mangle them to make some sense. Marika I don't know what you're going to do when you reformat them, but you're inventive enough that I'll leave that up to you.

Question 1 is define the issue in the thick model. Whois is currently stored by the Registry and Registrar and two escrow accounts. I did check by the way on whether there is any prohibition or in fact notice that the two escrow accounts could well be stored at the same physical location and currently they can.

So it's an interesting comment. Again since the thick Whois and multiple escrows exist already and no one has ever noticed it, I don't think we want to make a recommendation not to do that.

But I certainly think we should note in the report that the possible benefits of two escrows could be lost. Any other comments on Question 1? Seeing nothing, Question 2.

Describe the circumstances of the data escrow in a thick Whois environment with Registrar escrow. Under today's policies with thick Whois the data is stored in four logical locations. In case of failure the data may be available from up to three other locations.

No question? And I put the up to because of that problem of if the escrow data disappears it's possible that both of them were to - were - could disappear simultaneously.

Number 3. The circumstances in thick Whois without Registrar escrow. And this is where one of the statements sort of got - the question got changed.

If we have thick Whois without Registrar escrow the data is stored in two logical locations. In case of a failure data may be available from up to two other locations.

Again if I have the advantages of two escrow accounts over one, multiple escrow accounts imply additional fallback options. And noting that in the real world catastrophic failures are almost always the result of multiple

simultaneous failures, and therefore the more backups you have the more likely you are to avoid catastrophe.

Downside is cost. Question 6. Does the data imply we are recommending double escrow if we recommend a thick model for all? And according to the input from the Stakeholder Groups, most parties agree that multiple is better than fewer.

Some feel that four copies are excessive and I think the some in that case was Registrars and VeriSign if I remember correctly. And this does not specifically recommend a third model but it adds another check for the reasons why thick Whois should be required. Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Just a question on Question 5. Should there be additional costs to Registrars and Registries?

Alan Greenberg: No because no one is questioning whether the Registry has escrow or not. The only suggestion that we eliminate one of the escrows is the Registrar escrow.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: I mean, right now Registries already escrow their data. They're literally will be more data and that could well increase the cost I guess. I don't know how escrow - how the charges of escrow applied.

If anyone here does you can chime in but certainly we're not adding an escrow service. We are increasing the volume of data.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Maybe I can just add something. And possibly more costs to Registries as additional data is being stored, something like that one.

Alan Greenberg: Sure. Yes. But we do note that the Registry Stakeholder Group supported it. So if there is additional cost they apparently feel it's a reasonable one. And Question 7, if your response to Question 6 is that thick Whois should be recommended, provide additional considerations with regard to implementation in relation to escrow that should be taken into account.

And the summary was on balance. All but one group agrees that thick Whois - if thick Whois is adopted there should be no change to the current escrow rules.

At some point ICANN should explore the implications of two escrows which could conceivably be stored at the same site removing the benefit of the duplication and the implications of Registry/Registrar integration which could result in having those two sites collocated.

That didn't come out of any of the comments but I thought it was appropriate because those are issues which will change the, you know, the numbers that are referred to above.

Comments? Questions? Silence. Everyone's dropped off the call. They need more coffee or everyone's happy with it.

Okay Carolyn is typing something. Carolyn, you can speak if you'd like. More coffee sounds good. Okay. Okay, Marika, what's next on our list?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Next is the synchronization and migration reports which I believe we haven't received yet but I see that Susan Kawaguchi is on the call as the sub team lead so she may have an update.

Alan Greenberg: Then we turn it over to Susan if she's actually on the phone.

Susan Kawaguchi: I am but I got dropped so I wasn't for a while. So our team didn't have much to say about synchronization and migration. We really focused on synchronization more.

But - and if you read the comments you'll see that people didn't have much to say about that either. So, you know, that, in my opinion, that brings me to the thought that synchronization isn't that big of a deal. There was nothing that came out of the transition of DotOrg that would indicate it was a major problem.

And, you know, I occasionally see issues where the registrar is not - and this is completely anecdotal on my part. But I have seen issues where the registrar had incorrect data compared to the registry data but, you know, that's very few and far between.

So for the most part people concentrated on the cost, the stability when transitioning the data and the number of records involved but I think none of those are big hurdles to, you know, overcome.

Alan Greenberg: Okay thank you. I put my own hand up. Two comments; number one, it strikes me that Rick's comment on synchronization and multi-master replication really falls under synchronization and not stability.

Susan Kawaguchi: That makes sense.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. And the other question is, Susan, your anecdotal evidence where the two are not in - are not synchronized and the registry has better data; which elements...

((Crosstalk))

Susan Kawaguchi: It was creation date. I run into that quite a few times. So whether or not - I mean, the registry has to know the creation date.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

Susan Kawaguchi: So what I'd do is always get the registry history - at least from DotCom when I'm trying to nail down a date just to confirm it.

Alan Greenberg: Okay and that almost makes sense. You can imagine scenarios where if the domain is transferred from one registrar to another somehow, you know, they end up with their creation date that they first sought there or something else because it's information they would have had to retrieve hopefully in an automated way but not necessarily.

Susan Kawaguchi: Right.

Alan Greenberg: So it's - that's believable certainly. And that's why I said if we're looking at automated synchronization techniques some of the data has to come from one side and some from the other; it's not just a uniform copy.

Susan Kawaguchi: Right.

Alan Greenberg: Hard to imagine a situation where the contact information would be more current in the registry unless the registrar had note failure and restored an old database or something.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yeah, that did make sense. And I really haven't seen, you know, I mean, most of what I do is DotCom so it's limited to the thin, you know, most of our problems in gTLDs are DotCom, not the rest of the gTLDs. So...

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Susan, can I plead with you to put something in writing? It's tedious but it really will help us go forward.

Susan Kawaguchi: Oh no, I did. Did you - did it not get out to the group? I sent it last night. Did you not get it...

Alan Greenberg: Oh.

Susan Kawaguchi: ...Marika?

Marika Konings: Susan, no, we didn't. I think you already referred last week on the call that you had sent something as well. But are you sending that to the sub team or to the working group mailing list? Because I'll check because I think there may be something...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...forward me the emails and I'll look into what the issue may be because I haven't seen them even to me nor on the mailing list.

Alan Greenberg: No, I haven't seen it either.

Susan Kawaguchi: Huh, I wonder what happened to it?

Alan Greenberg: I'm not on your sub team though.

Susan Kawaguchi: No. No I didn't send it - what did I do? I am so sorry. It was a busy day yesterday. No I read something and I thought oh done and I'm wondering if it's still sitting in my outbox or didn't go for some reason.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. Maybe perhaps send it to the Notify list instead of our main mailing list.

Susan Kawaguchi: I have no idea what I did because it's not in my...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: All right we'll leave it to off-line but I'll leave it between you and Marika...

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. So sorry.

Alan Greenberg: ...to coordinate and somehow fetch it.

Susan Kawaguchi: I'll send it directly to you, Marika, and you can...

Marika Konings: Okay.

Susan Kawaguchi: Sorry about that.

Alan Greenberg: It always...

((Crosstalk))

Susan Kawaguchi: I was wondering why you didn't upload it.

Alan Greenberg: It always amazes me that what should be one of the simplest technologies of the Internet fails so often for various reasons.

Susan Kawaguchi: Well I think this is user error but...

Alan Greenberg: Well and that may be the most common one.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: But at some level we sort of assume it's perfect and it isn't. Okay what do we have next? Start a review of competition in registry services if time allows. Do we have a document for that?

Marika Konings: So this is Marika. So what I've put up is actually our table comparison. Because for this topic we don't have - well I think a dormant (SOC) team I think is part of the survey.

Some people indicated specific interest in this topic. But I think the idea was, you know, based on our work plan on these topics maybe to work through these jointly and if possible be able to identify a rapporteur that would draft up, you know, a report similar to the one we've had on stability and as well as on, you know, data escrow that we can then use for discussion and then transform that into, you know, a chapter for the initial report.

So the idea would be to actually look at the comments based on what is in the document on the screen to basically identify what the positions are. And again on the second page I've identified for each of the topics specific comments or concerns that were expressed by those that solicit that. So we could have a look at those as well and see if there are any specific responses we can provide.

Although I think in relation to this specific topic there were no particular concerns. I think there was just - it was actually a question that more information be needed. So maybe the working group should actually discuss or determine what information is needed and if so how, you know, we're going to get that information.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. It is an interesting question in that we have answers ranging from more competition, no difference and less competition. Going to be an interesting one to summarize. And if I look at the summaries we're saying - somebody is doing something on this phone.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Just to jump in quickly. Just to clarify I was actually looking at the wrong one. I was looking at the cost implication one of the competition and registry services. And actually for that one there are a couple of comments that are on the second page that were identified by...

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Roy asked the question, "Did we talk about Question 6?" Question (unintelligible) data escrow. Yes, we did. Let me see if I can quickly pull it up.

The summary was most parties agree better - more copies are better but some people felt it was excessive. I don't think we had any substantive discussion on it other than to note that it was indeed the responses. Roy, do you have a specific comment? We might as well go back to it right now if you'd like to.

Roy Balleste: Thank you. This is Roy. Thank you. No, no I will agree with that statement I just wanted to make sure that that's what it was.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Roy Balleste: Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: No, I don't think it's changed. And I realize I have my hand up and I can't put it down. That's interesting; my screen is frozen. Marika, I'll let you take over while I somehow make my computer work again.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Your hand - yours is actually down. Sometimes it just helps restarting Adobe Connect. I've had that issue as well.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, no it seems to have woken up. Okay. So we are looking at cost implications. I'm sorry...

Marika Konings: Competition...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: We're looking at competition. Sorry. Can you lead us through? I don't have a copy of this at hand that I can actually read very well so, Marika, I'm going to ask you if you can take us through the comments on this one.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. So in the broader overview there were basically three that basically felt that there would be more competition as a result of requiring thick Whois. One response - or two response that indicated that they felt there would be less competition. One that said no specific comments and two that responded that they didn't expect any significant difference with the current situation.

And then looking into the comments that were raised in relation to expecting less competition comments from the NCUC and the NPOC. The NCUC comment basically says a competitive factor will be eliminated. Transition of current registries operating a thin model will only deprive registrants of this option in future domain name registrations but would additionally take away this benefit from current registrants who have already made this choice.

And then the NPOC comment said if all registries are obliged to use the same model all of them will end up providing the same standardized Whois services which - services which will place them on an equal foot no competition specifically regarding these type of services.

And as you'll see there as well together with my team we started trying to fill in already some of the comments or notes and trying to aid the discussions on this topic. So basically on the - in relation to the NCUC comment we noted here, "Registrar agreements already include the provision that the registrant consents to transmitting all of its office data regardless of the TLD to the registry. So it's not clear how a transition to thick Whois would take away this benefit from current registrants."

And in relation to the NPOC comment we noted, "Thick Whois relates to what data is published by the registry not necessarily what Whois services are provided."

Alan Greenberg: I put my own hand up. I guess in my mind the issue hinges - the importance of those comments hinges on what the benefits are of the thick - of thin versus thick to the registrants. I mean, I understand that they would no longer get - be registered in a thin registry but I'm not sure what the substantive benefits are of that. If anyone can help or does any of the answers address that?

I know that reflects back into the privacy and protection issues, which are being handled by the separate sub group but other than those, which are being looked at by those groups, what are the benefits that we are - that we are talking about? Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, hi. This is Amr. I'm sorry, I have to keep my voice down because I'm in the university library right now. Can everyone hear me?

Alan Greenberg: Yes we can. Or I can.

Amr Elsadr: Well I think the issue here is with registrants who are aware of the procedure for handling Whois conflicts with privacy law, ICANN's procedure for handling Whois conflicts with privacy law, this gives an option - a competitive option to registries working under thin - under a thin model - so that registrants who register their domain names with registrars located within countries with the privacy laws to register underneath TLDs.

If all registries adopt a thick model then this would sort of make it a more level playing group between different registries. Am I correct or wrong in that assumption?

Alan Greenberg: Well okay but what you're saying is it goes back to the privacy issue, the privacy and data protection issue.

Amr Elsadr: And data...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: So there are no other benefits other than the ones that are being looked at by the data privacy and protection group.

Amr Elsadr: What I'm saying is that some registrants might want to take advantage of privacy and data protection laws. If all registries adopt a thick model then this advantage would be lost. And I guess from a business sense that would be a competitive edge that is lost wouldn't it?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. But, I'm sorry, I'm just trying to analyze how we fit it in our model. So if the data privacy and protection group comes out with a statement that there are substantive differences in protection and privacy associated with thin versus thick then that could imply a competitive difference between the two.

If the data privacy group, on the other hand, in their analysis decides and recommends that there are no substantive differences then that's - if that's the only benefit then that reduces the competitive difference between the registries. I'm not presuming the outcome; I'm just trying to understand the impact of the outcome on this one.

Amr Elsadr: I'm sorry, are you saying we should defer this point to the data protection and privacy sub group?

Alan Greenberg: Well if the only benefits we're talking about are the protection privacy ones then I don't think we have any choice but to defer to that group because that's the group that's looking...

Amr Elsadr: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: ...at that issue.

Amr Elsadr: All right, sure. Sounds good to me.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. And anyone else have any comments on this one? So, Marika, if I understand if these are the only two substantive comments then, again, it hinges back on data privacy and protection whether there's close to unanimity on this - when we summarize this issue or there are substantive differences.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Based on, you know, the initial or the first page it's - I think the majority agrees there's either no difference or more competition as a result of requiring thick Whois. It's only, indeed - so the conclusion I drew was most agree that there will be more or no difference in competition if thick Whois would be required.

Alan Greenberg: And I think under our bylaws we view more competition is better than less.

Marika Konings: I'm not really sure if it's a bylaw clause but...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Well I thought one of our initial mandates is to encourage competition, I mean, given that when I...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...when ICANN came into existence there was no competition.

Marika Konings: Yeah actually you're absolutely right so I think the other question then is - oh and maybe you want to first go to Avri who has her hand up. Oh she dropped it again.

Alan Greenberg: I don't see a hand. Hasn't shown up on my screen yet. But, Avri, if you want to speak up, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yeah. I thought I did and then I wasn't sure. I think - I mean, I think you are right that it does hinge on a previous - on another question, the privacy one. I think that an argument could be made that there is an opportunity for competition though no one has taken advantage of it yet.

And so this would probably be a place where there was, you know, as I think Marika was saying, majority opinion but a - also another opinion. So, you know, that would probably be an accurate way of putting it is that, you know, there is indeed a little bit of a difference of opinion but it does hinge on another subject.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. And that's the way I was looking at it because I haven't heard - now I may be oblivious to it but I haven't heard, you know, what you would put in the advertisement saying we're a thin registry...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Oh I...

Alan Greenberg: ...if it isn't related to privacy and data protection.

Avri Doria: Exactly. I mean, I'm moving things to Iceland because I think, you know, people can get better privacy there. But indeed I can't think of any other reason to move to Iceland.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. So the benefits referred to here are data privacy and protection ones so it does hinge on what that sub group is coming out with.

Avri Doria: Right.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Avri Doria: But it still would be a minor opinion on this issue.

Alan Greenberg: No, no I know. But, you know, in the imaginary world if we all agree 100% there are no data and privacy issues then there are no benefits that we can pinpoint in this particular issue. I'm not presuming that's the outcome but I'm saying if we decided the privacy and protection ones are moot then there are no longer any benefits that we could tout a thin registry for and therefore it does revert back to that other sub group's deliberations.

I mean, and just to follow through and belabor the point if we found out as Marika had raised in an earlier issue, that there is very significant cost benefits to a registry because they didn't have to escrow all of the data but only a few elements of data and they could therefore lower the cost of the domain by 50% because of it that would be a competitive advantage and a benefit, you know, that we could list independent of the data privacy issues.

Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Maybe just focusing already on the next step on this topic is, as said, I think the idea would be that hopefully there will be a volunteer to write up a similar report as we did for the other topics between now and the next call.

Because, you know, we have an ambitious schedule and we're trying, I think, to, you know, complete as much as we can between the different meetings. I'm just wondering if there's anyone willing to volunteer for that.

Alan Greenberg: Is there anyone willing to volunteer for that? Anyone who hasn't drafted something that will take on this one. It's relatively simple. Please? If I whine and cry will anyone do it?

Avri Doria: That never helps.

Alan Greenberg: I've never tried whining and crying on a call, I don't know.

Marika Konings: Alan...

Alan Greenberg: All right, Marika...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...I think it's going to fall on you because I just don't have the capacity to add anything on to my pile right now. Or maybe we can...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Okay, that's fine.

Alan Greenberg: ...let's assign it to Mikey.

Marika Konings: There's plenty of other people that are not on the call that we can assign it to. This is Marika. I'm happy to take a first stab at this and probably especially looking, you know, to Avri and some of the other members of the NCUC and NPOC to really make sure that, you know, their concerns are accurately noted or...

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...indeed want already include like a minority statement on this issue that they share that with the list.

Alan Greenberg: Just consider, Marika, if you write it you don't have to rewrite it then.

Marika Konings: Good point.

Alan Greenberg: All right, how are we doing on time? We're five minutes before the hour. I don't think we have enough time to start on anything else. Do we - what do we need to assign or make sure gets done before next week, Marika.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I don't think there's anything, you know, as we've said before it would be really good if people can have a close look at this - at the table to really make sure - I already got some feedback from the NPOC and we've updated the information accordingly. So if there are any other items.

And as well on the second page if already people have ideas or suggestions on how we can start responding to the comments or providing information there I think that would be really helpful.

I'll work on the pages on data escrow, synchronization and migration and competition and registry services. Hopefully I'll get all of them ready for the call next week.

For the next call also I'll have an update for you in relation to the questions that we put forward to the Expert Group. And then I just wanted to note that I think you probably all will have already seen that the schedule for Beijing is out so the face to face meeting for the Thick Whois Working Group is scheduled for Monday morning from 7:30 to 9:00 and...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...breakfast and coffee for you there. But no promises.

Alan Greenberg: If there's no coffee I go back to bed. Thank you, Marika, as always. Thank you, everyone else. Have a good rest of the week and we'll see you next Tuesday.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Some of you sooner in other groups. Bye-bye.

Avri Doria: Bye.

Marika Konings: Bye, thank you.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks. Bye.

END