

**ICANN
Transcription
Thick Whois PDP Working Group meeting
Tuesday 14 May 2013 at 14:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of THICK WHOIS PDP Working Group call on the Tuesday 14 May 2013 at 14:00 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-20130514-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Marc Anderson – RySG
Roy Balleste – NCUC
Iliya Bazlyankov - RrSG
Don Blumenthal – RySG
Amr Elsadr - NCSG
Alan Greenberg – ALAC
Volker Greimann – RrSG
Carolyn Hoover - RySG
Marie-Laure Lemineur – NPOC
Steve Metalitz - IPC
Mikey O'Connor – ISPCP
Susan Prosser – RrSG
Tim Ruiz - RrSG
Jill Titzer – RrSG
Christopher George - IPC

Apologies:

Carlton Samuels – ALAC
Rick Wesson - Individual
Jonathan Zuck – IPC
Avri Doria – NCSG
Frederic Guillemaut - RrSG

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings
Berry Cobb
Lars Hoffmann
Julia Charvolen

Woman: Okay please go ahead. Thank you.

Julia Charvolen: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening.
Welcome to the Thick Whois Working Group Call on Tuesday 14 of May.

On the call today we have Marc Anderson, Iliya Bazlyankov, Don Blumenthal, Volker Greimann, Carolyn Hoover, Steve Metalitz, Mikey O'Connor, Susan Prosser, Tim Ruiz and Jill Titzer. We have apologies from Carlton Samuels, Rick Wesson, Avri Doria, (unintelligible) and Jonathan Zuck. And from staff with Marika Konings, Berry Cobb, Lars Hoffman and myself Julia Charvolen.

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

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Julia and welcome all. Is there anybody who's on the call that didn't get your name called out?

Christopher George: Yes this is (Chris George) I'm on.

Mikey O'Connor: Great we'll add you to the list. Anybody else?

Jill Titzer: Jill)just joined, (Jill Titzer).

Mikey O'Connor: Hi (Jill) welcome to the gang.

Jill Titzer: Hi thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Anybody else on the call? I'm doing this kind of aggressively today because we've got kind of a little bit of an unusual situation with the phone bridge. So if you're on the call and we haven't called your name, please shout it out.

Okay today's agenda is posted in the upper right of the Adobe room so we'll take a brief pause to let people update us on their statements of interest and make any suggestions on the agenda.

Okay well our first two items are ones that we've been over a fair amount: competition in registry services and access to Whois data. I think I'm going to push this agenda pretty fast. I think I'm getting to the point of view that rather than beat on these sections, we should get to an initial report.

Marika has been feeding these pieces into the initial report so rather than leave it is an open-ended question for you, the group, I'm going to turn the tables on Marika and say Marika is there anything you need in these two sections before you move forward with the drafting of the initial draft? This would be a good time to sort of shout those out if there's anything that it would be use... Go ahead.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. For the competition in registry service the thing that were some comments and suggestions during last week's call as well as the week before and I think some people had volunteered to provide some edits but I don't think I've seen anything so I haven't made any changes.

So the question is whether you would like me to go ahead and just insert the latest version which is the one I think dated, let me just check, 24th of April -- I'll put that up on the screen -- or have people then suggest their edits as part of the overall view of the initial report or are there still edits forthcoming that people would like to put forward now so it can be discussed and reviewed.

I think for the other one the access to Whois data I think I've made all the changes that we discussed. And again once it's inserted in the initial report of course there's another opportunity then for people to review and provide further edits or comments.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Marika. (Alan) go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes I vaguely recall that I came up with a summary of that section that people thought was acceptable; I have no clue what it said. Maybe the transcript or the mp3 will say so. But I thought (unintelligible)...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I remember that too. Did it go into the chat do you remember or was it just talked off?

Alan Greenberg: I really don't have a memory at all.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes the beauty of being an elderly type person. You know we (unintelligible) people every day.

Alan Greenberg: I'm not sure I like the word elderly but okay. Decrepit perhaps not elderly.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I do vaguely remember that too so maybe some fast review of the transcripts. But I think let's continue with the chorus of get it to an initial report, keep an eye out for that summary and if it can be found, drop that in. (Alan) if you can recreate it that would be lovely.

But my goal with today's call is to really sort of tip us over into the final reviewing and initial report rather than all these little section because I really think that we're all starting to feel like we're at sort of an incremental spot. There's one item on the agenda that's new stuff and I want to get pretty quickly to that. That's the one Whois applications topic which is number five.

So if I push you all through the rest of the agenda too fast, please slow me down but I'm not as I said I think we really need to get to the initial report. We've got an awful lot of good material in it already and I think we're very close there.

Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I just looked through my notes and I don't know if that was (Alan)'s conclusion or summary but what I did note maybe we could add a sentence to the conclusion that would say something like "The working group knows of no substantive example as to why a different approach would be better in the context of this item."

I don't know (Alan) do you recall if that was your summary and if so, I can happily add that when we insert that.

Alan Greenberg: I think - yes that was the first part of it that there well may be differences, we don't know what they are, we haven't been able to identify them and therefore ICANN should not be in the business of providing competitive advantages whichever way it is and therefore we should make a level playing field or something like that. But yes that part captured the premise of the statement.

Mikey O'Connor: Let's go ahead and add that. I'm tempted to do a poll between experienced and decrepit. I was preferring decrepit myself.

Alan Greenberg: You said elderly not experienced.

Mikey O'Connor: I know. I've been overruled summarily.

Alan Greenberg: Experienced I'll of course take.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. All right anything else on these first two items? This is that stage of the working group where things start to get a little bit silly so we do need to push along.

Pretty much the same thought on the privacy and data protection piece; that's the next agenda item. In that one (Alan) posted his summary of that to the list I think proposed pretty much as a friendly amendment to maybe introduce the topic. And I just want to sort of see did that summary get into this? No. I don't think so.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. It's not in the document that's on the right-hand side so the idea would be once I integrate it into the initial report I would just add (Alan)'s part, maybe as the summary of that section gets longer. And I think we discussed of moving the recommendations that are at the end to a section that we'll label something like maybe not within scope but observations or suggestions the working group would like to make nevertheless while we also have some other conclusions from some of the other parts so basically it will be split up.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes let's do that and treat that as our going in position for the final - not the final draft but the initial report draft because again I think it's going to be a lot easier to edit this stuff in one document now.

Ooh (Jill) has a big comment in the... (Jill) do you want to introduce your comment in the chat? I have to read it while you're doing that.

Jill Titzer: Sure. Can you hear me?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes you're sort of cutting in and out. You may have to sort of swallow the microphone.

Jill Titzer: Sorry. That was (Alan)'s comment; I had copied it. So I think I'm having Adobe problems right now so I just had that in my notes.

Mikey O'Connor: Ah okay. All right so I think we're fine.

Unless I see shrieks of outrage in the chat or the queue I think we're going to do the same thing with this item. We're just going to push it into the initial report and start scrubbing the initial report. I think it's going to be just a whole lot easier to do this in one document.

The next one... Oh (Alan) go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes just for clarity the comment that (Jill) put in the chat was the version that was the last version in the last meeting. What I e-mailed and what's on the right is a revision of that, cleaning up the language and adding the points that we're made in the ensuing conversation. So it's the successor to the one (Jill) posted.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes right. So we'll stick with that one.

Okay it looks like Don got booted out of the Adobe room in the middle of all that. (Amr)?

Amr Elsadr: Hi this is (Amr). Just concerning the summary that (Alan) shared with us, I don't think there's much of a problem with it except maybe in the sentence where it says none of these issues seem to be related to whether it's thick or thin Whois model is being used. I'm not sure that that's necessarily correct.

I think that the concerns that we have with privacy issues on Whois policy is whether a policy will require a transfer of Whois data across borders and across legal jurisdictions. And since these are the issues that we might not have been able to address with the depth that we would have liked to, this would I guess in a way be the issue of concern. And since it is related to a thick or thin model is being used. I would like to hear maybe other people's thoughts on this including (Alan). Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: (Alan) do you want to take a first try? Go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Sure. I was trying to summarize what the report said and I may have misread of course and Don can certainly and I'm sure will pipe up.

I think this was the best conclusion that we came to that we're not aware of - some people have some uneasiness yes but I think ultimately we cannot rest on the statement that we didn't get around to it. We need to make a

recommendation and if there's a minority report, there's a minority report or a minority position. But I think we need to try to summarize and move forward and that's what I was attempting to do, not to dismiss that. And we can certainly add a statement saying there was some uneasiness but I think we need to move forward and go one way or another.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. (Roy)...

Alan Greenberg: I wasn't trying to slant anything but if I have along the way then we need to correct it.

Amr Elsadr: Hi this is (Amr) again. Sure I have no problem with making a recommendation and moving forward. I just - it's my personal feeling that the concerns that we do have is with implementing a PDP on thick Whois apart from thin and so maybe that's just the one part that I have a bit of a problem with. But thanks (Alan).

Mikey O'Connor: Amr do you want to propose a revision to (Alan)'s summary draft that maybe you and (Alan) and other could beat up a bit on the list this week? It sounds like it's a very close piece of drafting and I'm reluctant to do that on the phone although we can. But it doesn't sound like there's tremendous disagreement; it sounds like that particular statement needs to be sharpened up a bit.

Amr Elsadr: Sure if (Alan)'s okay with it I'd be glad to work with him on this.

Mikey O'Connor: Well let's see what the other folks in the queue - I accidentally jumped past (Roy) I apologize for that but we have (Roy) and Tim who may have some thoughts and then (Alan)'s jumped in at the end as well. So (Roy)?

Roy Balleste: Thank you Mikey. Since you proposed that perhaps we go back and tweak it a little bit, I will go by saying that I will be also happy to contribute.

I agree with the entire group that the document is almost there. It is just perhaps that particular statement sounds maybe too definite and perhaps we should leave it entirely open-ended because I think that ICANN has something to say in the end. And so I'll be happy to work on it a little bit more if that's going to help. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Terrific. Thanks (Roy). Tim?

Tim Ruiz: Yes thanks. This is Tim Ruiz. And I might have misunderstood what some of the concerns are but I think from my perspective the whole privacy and data protection issue isn't going to change regardless of whether we have thick or thin registry. I mean those issues exist today, they're going to exist in the future, if things change and EU privacy, U.S. privacy laws and rules change, you know.

The only thing that's different between thin and thick is in the thin registry those privacy and data protection issues affect primarily the registrars who deal with cross-jurisdictional issues with registrants all over the world and may even have offices in different places. And then in a thick registry those same issues are still there; they just affect the registry primarily and perhaps less so the registrars although I think can still be involved because registries will have customers then all over the world and they may have various offices and registries can be in any country.

So I don't - I think that's for me the primary issue is that it just switches from thin to thick so do we need to spend -- from registrar to registry perhaps a little bit more -- but do we need to spend a lot of time on that because all the issues are the same. It's just as to what entity they actually affect.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Tim. The chat is jumping around a bit. I guess (Alan) is next. (Alan)?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. As I said adding something about unease we can certainly put in. When we talked about the actual implementation last time I mentioned that it

may be as simple -- and I'm not saying this is how it's going to go -- as simply taking the escrow data and sending it the registry. We move data across boundaries all the time, certainly for escrow. The rules are different but we're doing that kind of thing on a regular basis and relying on the reliability of it.

So yes it's going to be a massive job and we're going to have to plan it carefully. Chances are when we go to some new great Whois replacement in the sky, it's likely to involve data movement because there's a good chance it's going to be different. I don't know what it's going to look like but it's not likely to be identical to today's thin Whois.

So the world is going to change and our challenge right now is to identify problems that we can related to this transition. And although we have people who feel uncomfortable with it, I don't think we've had specific threats that we can indentify in a concrete manner.

So I think at this point we have to move forward. I'm quite happy to try to embody that level of discomfort in the summary; I have no ownership over it. But I think we've got to do that at the best and move on. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks (Alan). (Mark)?

Marc Anderson: Yes I was trying not to drag this out any longer. You know to (Alan)'s point I agree we've spent a lot of time on this and there's certainly an understanding that with personal privacy information there's some unease.

But I think also we can't trivialize it and say it's not a factor or in a thin registry the issue rests in the registrars and in the thick registry the issues rest in the registry and that there's no change whatsoever, we're just shifting the focus from registrars to registries. I think that's not entirely accurate or really a fair statement.

I think also we have to recognize the fact we are talking about potentially a transition period where massive amounts of data would be transferred across potentially every jurisdiction on the planet. And I see (Roy)'s making the point in the chat that registrants have to be considered as well and that's something I've raised as well and I agree with that. How are registrants affected by having their personal data that's currently stored by registrars transferred potentially across jurisdictions to be stored in a different entity or registry.

I think it's a non-trivial factor. It's not sufficient to just say it's just a matter of focusing - shifting the focus from the registrars to the registries. I think we also have to recognize that we are talking about transferring data between entities. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks (Mark). Oh (Alan)'s in the queue. I was about to summarize but go ahead (Alan).

Alan Greenberg: Yes thank you. Sorry I'm not trying to dismiss any concepts but I thought Don's paper covered those issues; if it didn't then we need to go back at that level but I thought it did. And I was trying to summarize the gist, the end conclusions. So if it was in the paper and isn't well summarized, we need to summarize. If it wasn't in the paper and I thought the issue related to registrants was there, then we need to go back at that level. But we need the specificity and to capture it at both levels if necessary and move on.

So I'm not quite sure from what (Mark) just said if he feels Don's paper didn't address those or the summary didn't address it. Thank you. And I see Marika's hand is up.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I see Marika in the queue. Don be prepared to be put on the spot in a minute. So I'll give you fair warning. But Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I think just to note that Don actually put in chat that he's having a connection problem so he may not be able to respond.

Just to amplify (Alan)'s point, my understanding was as well that the idea would be that the summary would either be at the start of this section or at the end as part of the conclusion as a kind of summary of where the group came out at. But I don't think the intention was to remove any of the other findings that are in the section so those will be reflected in the report.

So just maybe reassure some that this is not intended to replace this section, it's just a kind of summary like we've done I think for all the different sections where we've come up with a kind of conclusion based on the working group's analysis, this is what we've found which doesn't mean that the different points of view are not reflected in the substance of that specific section.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Marika. (Amr)'s next and then I'm going to draw a line under the queue because I want to jump in and do a little chair action here. But (Amr) you get to go first.

Amr Elsadr: Yes hi just really quick I was not under the impression that we were going to change anything in the statement. I absolutely understand that the summary provided would have been just added maybe before or after statements.

And I have no problem with the recommendations to move forward in light of the summary and the statement; I think they're perfectly in line. It's just this one part of lack of differentiation between the two models of thick and thin, I don't feel that this necessarily reflects what the sub team came up with. And at the time we're all about that then fine but apart from that I really have no problem with moving forward. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks (Amr). I want to make several points. Now I'm going to actually go into chair mode as opposed to Mikey mode.

The first point is that I'm very committed to the idea that we will come out of this group comfortable in our skins with our product and I want all of us to come out of the group with that feeling. So if it takes a little while to hammer out the final details on that that's fine. I don't want to put people in the position of feeling pressured.

The second point there does come a point in these discussions where people have to say I've made my point, it's been heard and I'm willing to proceed even though I didn't get exactly what I wanted. And what I think this conversation is about is that the hearing and description isn't quite done yet.

I think it's quite safe to say that there is unease. I like that idea that (Alan) came up with that we are collectively a bit uneasy about this, that (Mark)'s point is also right that changing a bunch of data from one place to another is important and we care about that. And this paper should say what we've looked at and what we've concluded and then be summarized accurately.

So I think the next step is - I tend to throw stuff off to the list and then it's greeted with silence and then we do work on the phone. I really want to put a little pressure on (Amr) and (Alan) especially but others like (Roy) and maybe (Mark) and anybody else who wants to join -- (Marie) for example.

I'd like to see some action fairly soon and so I'm going to encourage really strongly this time that we hammer on this hard in the list that we take everything else and dump it into the initial report draft, we highlight the sentence that (Amr) is concerned about so that we remember that it's under discussion, that people work on it pretty hard this week and we try to drive this to conclusion. Because I am trying to drive us along but at the same time I don't want to drive us past our comfort level.

And with that I think I want to draw a line under this one unless there's something truly super urgent. I'm going to let the chat carry on. Those of you who have been saddled with this revision responsibility are also saddled with

the job of summarizing whatever comes out of the chat. But I want to keep moving the agenda along.

The cost implications one I think I'm going to skip, sorry Marika. In order of priority in my mind, the cost implications one is a bit lower because that one you and I can do together on our own if we have to. And I want to get onto the conversation about existing Whois applications especially because we have Susan on the phone -- Susan Prosser -- and she's one of the folks who's a little more directly connected to this than others.

Here's what we've got so far. It's on the screen. And Marika's got her hand up so I'll just hand off to her. Take it away Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. This is just to explain that what is on the screen I basically took from what was submitted as part of the public comment and I think what was in the final issued report and the charter and relationship issue description. So I think as I've already said on the list as well, I think this is a section that could definitely do with some more content or I think data, substantially the data on explaining some of these issues on what impact it would or could have on existing Whois applications both from the possible advantages as well as possible downsides because I think it may benefit from some further explanation. So anyone that could help with I think it would be greatly appreciated.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Marika. And Susan by now you should not be surprised when I call on you next. Since you're the only one on this call I know that anything in the way of expertise, you want to just chime in at this point and have some thoughts for us?

Susan Prosser: Sure. This is Susan Prosser. Can you hear me?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Susan Prosser: Can you guys hear me?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I can hear you just fine.

Susan Prosser: Okay sorry. I did read the paper yesterday. I am kind of still playing catch up. But when I read the summary version of the Whois applications it seemed to appropriate to me. I don't think there's any - from a third-party perspective Whois application provider I guess, the changes that will impact us I think are irrelevant. There will be changes that we'll have to adjust to but that's part of my perspective and kind of doing business.

The impact from my side and most Whois applications will be changing how we process data and working with the registries more directly. But I don't think changes from a thin to a thick is going to be a huge negative impact. In fact the potential risk if I might put this out there is there could be an increase in Whois data providers in a sense because of the somewhat easier potentially of accessing data and that would be probably the only thing that I think might be a risk involved.

From our own business perspective it's not going to impact us as a negative one or even positive one, one way or the other.

Mikey O'Connor: Marika how do you want to proceed with that? Do you want to take a listen to the transcript and sort of summarize Susan's view? I'm curious I guess, is there a place to go look for people like Susan's company? Susan for Domain Tools. I mean is there a place to go look for these Whois data providers so that we can ask them? Susan is there a trade association or a group of you?

Susan Prosser: This is Susan again. Being in a business I have a couple of competitive analysis, I have a list of people that I know do similar types of operations that we do that I'm happy to share with Marika or whomever if you want to collectively ask them and gather feedback from then and then if they have any feedback or have been following this. I know that there's some that are

within the ICANN community that has a problem that have been following this and then there's a few that I don't ever hear or see within that ICANN community that may not be following what's going on. But I'm happy to share the companies I know of.

Mikey O'Connor: Here's a - oh Marika's got her hand up and then (Alan) does too so I'll let others speak first. Marika and then (Alan).

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I think the first points that Susan made on the advantages I think are already covered if I understood correctly I think in the section or the proposed draft. But if there's a way to amplify it or Susan you want to suggest any edits, please feel free to share those.

I didn't catch exactly what you were saying in relation to their risks so I was wondering if you could maybe repeat that and I can try to capture that because it's a bit difficult to hear.

Mikey O'Connor: Susan?

Susan Prosser: Sure this is Susan. I can go in more detail or follow up on e-mail, whichever your preference is.

What I mean by risk is with a single location to gather this information all under thick, it would be easier for third parties to capture the information from one location then they've had to in the past, going to multiple registrars to gather the information from them specifically rather than going directly to the registry. If I'm looking for a dot org I got right to PIR. If I'm looking for a dotcom I go to whichever registrar has that information to gather the date and stuff like that whereas now I can just go right every thick registry for the full data. It makes it easier for third parties or for anybody to find information a little bit quicker.

Does that make sense?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. So that's considered a benefit or are you basically saying because everyone can get it easier, it makes it harder for third parties to provide that service? Is that what you're implying? I'm sorry if I'm not getting it.

Susan Prosser: It depends on which side of the benefit you want to talk about. Is it (unintelligible) a benefit of providers, is it advantages. But the risk involved is for the data is more easily accessible which means without people work in a smart business mind, it could be abused. And that's where the risk is.

Mikey O'Connor: So I would put that risk in a different category. I wouldn't put that in that in the existing Whois application risk, I would put that in some of the other discussions we've already had to access that data kind of discussions.

Susan Prosser: Yes you can keep it over there. In Whois existing the application is a benefit from the application providers. The only negative would probably be the registries themselves would have to take on more ongoing requests and things like that and (Mark) would probably have better insight into that level of concern.

Mikey O'Connor: Right. (Alan) you're next.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. There's lot of providers out there who provide free services to make it a little easier to get Whois and for those, the transition to a thick registry it may not justify their existing as much, if one only has to go to a registry instead of to the registrars.

But if we're talking about providers who do this as a business and I thought that was the main gist of this, they're currently working with a lot of different regimes because most of them also with ccTLDs. So essentially for every

TLD they have a switch or a pointer to say how do we handle the information and what we're doing is going to be changing the value of that switch. I'm not trying to belittle the details but basically they're already in the business of collecting the information, they provide value-added foreign access to show me current Whois and that's why they can make money it. And really we're changing their methodology among ones they already support.

So I think Susan summarized it very well. I'm not sure we need to do an exhaustive survey of all such providers and make sure that we haven't missed anything. We'll have comment periods and things like that that will address issues should we have missed something.

Yes I think we're in an enviable position here. We have a prominent provider of this kind of service on the call and saying it doesn't seem to be very onerous. So I'm not sure we need to keep on gilding it. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. I'm going to take it right from there and say that I agree with everything (Alan) said and that I'm also though going to take Susan up on her offer to forward a list of the providers to Marika so that we can contact them and as we go through to the end of an initial report and we can give them a heads up that this initial report is out there and that they should read it and be aware of it and that we would very much love to hear from them if there's anything in there that concerns them so that we can get a broader spectrum of input. But at least from where we're standing right now we're not seeing a showstopper in there.

Tim? We have to wait for hold to get undone I bet -- or mute I mean. You're still muted Tim. I still can't hear you. I don't know what to tell you. Oh he got dropped there you go. He dropped from the call.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. (Unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Yes okay dialing back in. Well so Tim leave yourself in the queue and whenever you get back in jump into the chat again and we'll circle back to you.

Anything else on this particular topic before we keep going? This is the delighted-to-keep-things-moving-but-don't-want-to-leave-anybody-behind mode. But that said...

Tim Ruiz: Tim's back on.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh go ahead Tim.

Tim Ruiz: Sorry about that. When you said that it dropped me it's like maybe I should take that as a clue, I don't know.

I was just going to mention back on the conversation with Susan and that that just kind of add another perspective to it that will basically be in agreement was that I had concerns about applications at the edge or whatever. When we were negotiating the current version of the RAA because it sort of just as soon as the registrar signs that RAA they can summarily drop port 43 for everything except thick registries which of course become net and that's most of it.

But right now port 43 for most registrars at least responds with the thick registry data so maybe the applications that have been relying on port 43 for all its Whois data for whatever reason, now that's going to be summarily dropped for everything except common net and only web Whois will be offered.

So when I brought up my concerns though about that no one seemed to be too excited about it including ICANN. And so I would say that Susan's summary is probably accurate and even if we are concerned it looks like the

RAAs going to supersede this anyway at some point so I'm not sure that it's a real issue.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I hadn't even thought about that. That's interesting. We might want to weave that into the, I don't know. Tim I'll sort of leave it to you. Do you want us to weave that thought into the draft? It's an interesting point. I'm not sure it's...

Tim Ruiz: I don't know if it necessarily is applicable to this but it was just more a comment to kind of support if there's any doubt that what Susan had summarized was not correct. I think that was my point, just trying to support that.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes okay. Good deal. All right any other thoughts on this one?

Marika are you feeling - Marika and I corresponded a bit during the week and I said are there any big, gaping holes that you need filled before you start writing the initial report. Are you comfortable with what you've got now on this Marika? Do we need to do anymore? What do you think? Go ahead.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. No I think I have sufficient - I may make some small edits based on the conversation we had today but people will that in the initial report. I just wanted to know on the draft initial report.

I just wanted to point out as well that in addition to this section I also circulated the proposed sections for response consistency and registrar port 43 Whois requirements. So my suggestion would be -- I haven't seen any further comments on those -- my suggestion would be to also insert those in the draft initial report so people can review those as well together with the other sections as part of one document.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I think that what we do with this call unless there are sections that you feel Marika need more work is let's set our next target to be a draft version of

the initial report as our review vehicle from here on in so that we can - that gives us... What's our deadline for Durban to get this done, sort of a month from now roughly right, mid June?

Anyway my thought is at this stage let's switch over to hammering on a draft of the initial report. That will give us I think a fairly comfortable amount of time to identify any remaining issues and really get them cleaned up and then we'll land this one in time for Durban and see what kind of reaction we get there.

Marika is that a new hand? Go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes it's a new hand. This is Marika. Yes just to confirm the publication deadline for Durban is the 24th of June and just a question as well. Would everybody like me to have a go as well at trying to write up a kind of conclusion recommendations section? And in that I could possibly already highlight as well maybe some of the questions that we would like further input on as part of the public comment forum.

I think that would also be a call to the working group to see if there are any specific issues you think we should be calling out as part of the report that you feel that we maybe need, we'd welcome further data on or if there are areas we think we should ask specific groups for input on. I think I already referred to potentially groups that are working with Whois applications that we may want to address some questions to.

But do you think it would be helpful if I tried to write something up in the form of a conclusion or do you want to focus first on just the sections under deliberations and leave the conclusion part until later?

Mikey O'Connor: No I like the idea of a draft that includes draft conclusions and then what we can be doing is edited that draft. And maybe what we could do Marika is you and I could collaborate a bit during the week. If you get something to me a few days before the working group meets, even it means reviewing it over the

weekend for me, I'm happy to go through a draft and touch it up a bit so that we are essentially converting over to a complete initial report including all of that stuff. Because I think at this point we're awfully close and the more of the draft that we can complete the sooner the better. So yes absolutely.

Tim I think that's an old hand, if it's new by all means carry on and then assuming it's old I'm going to jump to (Alan).

Tim Ruiz: Yes it's old. I'm sorry, bad habit.

Mikey O'Connor: No worries. (Alan)?

Alan Greenberg: Oh sorry. I must have missed your call. I just wanted to confirm what you said. At this point as I've said before I think we've gilded this PDP analysis far more than any I've ever participated in. I think we're ready to draft conclusions. If people disagree with them then that's a good time.

But this is not a draft report we're putting out because we're unsure where we're going and unsure how to get there and we want public input. I think we want a report that is as close to the final report as we can do at this point and I think we want adequate time for us to review it before the June cutoff for publication.

And in light of all the comments that are always made about publications that are done right before the deadline, if we can get this out two weeks earlier so be it. That would be really nice.

So yes I think this should be as complete as possible including our recommendations and let's get to work on polishing it at that point. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Terrific thanks (Alan).

Okay I see a queue that's clear, a plan for the week. I think the big action item for folks other than Marika and the rest of the staff folks and me is to drive home that conversation around (Alan)'s summary.

And so I'm going to throw a dart and say that (Amr) gets to speak first via e-mail on that. (Amr) if you could take a try at refining the sentence that concerns you in (Alan)'s summary and kick that conversation off on the list, do it in the whole list, not on the data protection privacy list. We're back to the committee of the whole now. And let's try and carry forward with the energy that went by in the chat which I didn't even attempt to read or summarize.

Let's try to drive that issue home this week and move forward with that as our plan. I'm just checking chat. Oh Marika's giving me action items in a private chat. And Marika I will take that one.

And with that unless there's anything else I think we'll draw this one to a close a couple minutes early. I'm seeing a lot action in the chat but nobody's hands up. So Julia I believe we're finished. And thanks for coming. So we're done.

We can end the recording. We'll see you in a week with an initial initial report. Thanks all.

Man: Thanks.

Marika Konings: Thanks guys.

Man: Bye-bye.

Woman: Have a good day.

END