

**ICANN
Transcription
Thick Whois PDP Working Group meeting
Tuesday 6 August 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 06 August 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-20130806-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Don Blumenthal – RySG
Alan Greenberg – ALAC
Volker Greimann - RrSG
Carolyn Hoover – RySG
Marie-Laure Lemineur - NPOC
Steve Metalitz - IPC
Mikey O'Connor – ISPCP
Marc Anderson – RySG
Carlton Samuels – ALAC
Susan Prosser - RySG

Apologies:

Christopher George – IPC
Avri Doria – NCSG
Amr Elsadr – NCSG
Frederic Guillemaut – RrSG
Cintra Sooknanan - NPOC

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings
Lars Hoffmann
Berry Cobb
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Go ahead, we are now recording.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, Ricardo. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, this is the Thick Whois call on the 6th of August 2013. On the call today we have Carlton Samuels, Mikey O'Connor, Steve Metalitz, Alan Greenberg, Marie-Laure Lemineur, and Susan Prosser. We have apologies from Frederic Guillemaut, Amr Elsadr, Avri Doria, Christopher George, (unintelligible). From staff, we have Marika Konings, Berry Cobb, Lars Hoffmann, and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

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

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Nathalie, and I will just note that Carolyn Hoover has just joined the Adobe room. Welcome Carolyn and I imagine we will get a few more folks joining the call. I think I accidently succeeded at training people to show up about five minutes late, so we will maybe take a break after an agenda item or two and just add on the rest of the people that are on the call. Usual pause to take a look at the agenda, which is on the right, and also, if people have any updates to Statements of Interest, this would be a good time to chime in. All right, next and first real agenda item is to recap the Durban sessions that we had. We had two, one on the Saturday GNSO session and then one in the middle of the week that was on more the public's meeting of the working group, trying to elicit comments from the community.

And for those of you who were there, you know that I get a bit befuddled in the live meeting context. It was a little too much for me to keep track of. And so, I don't really have very clear recollections about the things that happened in those meetings and would love to hear from other people about the highlights of what happened there.

So I'm going to sort of throw the conversation to you all and let you tell us about things that you found interesting in the meetings in Durban. And you

know, I have a few giant highlights, but I'd really like to hear from others on this one, because as I say, I'm pretty used to running calls on the phone, but running meetings in person sort of overwhelms me.

Has anybody got any thoughts about sort of the highlights of the meetings in Durban that they would like to share with us? Don't all speak at once? I don't see anybody in the queue. Let me do my best, but this is sort of in my hapless category.

I think what was interesting to me in the GNSO Saturday sessions was that there was very little discussion actually of the substance of the report by the council. I was a little surprised by that, and it may be due to the ineffective way that I presented what we had done and it may just be that there was broad agreement. You know, and that's part of the reason I'm asking for your help, because it was hard for me to read the room, keep track of what I was saying, et cetera.

And I think that in the public meeting in the middle of the week, we had pretty good engagement mostly around you know the topic that we've worked I think maybe the hardest on, which is the privacy issue. And there my sense of at least what I was trying to accomplish was to encourage people to comment you know and promote the public comment cycle, which just closed.

I think we might have elicited one or two, I'm not sure, but you know again, it wasn't you know - it was a conversation that I think as I recall ended a bit early because we sort of ran out of conversation and moved onto the next meeting. Marie, go ahead.

Marie-Laure Lemineur: Yes, can you hear me?

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

Marie-Laure Lemineur Yes, well maybe I have a feeling. I might be wrong, but I have the impression that the overall attention of the community has geared towards the Expert Working Group Report, so maybe that has taken you know some pressure off of us. I don't know, I'm not sure about that, but that's the impression I have and I may be wrong.

Mikey O'Connor: Well you know thanks for that. One of the things that I would observe is that I think we are in fact a little bit ahead of the Expert Working Group with our recommendation, because I think that you know now I'm sort of heading off my chair role of this working group and reacting a bit to the Expert.

I think they sort of did the easy stuff, but they left the hard questions I thought untouched or at least not as deeply researched as I was hoping for. And I think that the approach that we are proposing, which is that before this is implemented, there needs to be some pretty substantive work done by people with very deep expertise this essentially as a part of the implementation process to ensure that these issues are handled correctly.

I think that's also a suggestion that could be taken by the Expert Working Group, so anyway, you know that is one thing that sort of emerged for me that I felt more comfortable with our treatment of that issue than I was with the Expert Working Group.

Steve go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, this is Steve. I mean we are ahead of the Expert Working Group, we are in a much more advanced stage of the process.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: I mean they are in the pre-PDP stage and we are trying to wrap up a PDP or at least push it into the very last stages, so you know it's not surprising, but I think it also underscores that we should push ahead, try to get ours wrapped

up on the books if you will as the Expert Working Group process proceeds forward. I mean I just think it's going to take a long time for a new registration data model to come into existence.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I agree.

Steve Metalitz: In the meantime, we need to make sure that the existing one works as best as we can make it work.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, totally agree. I got a little feedback in the chat that I was getting drowned out. (Unintelligible). I'm not hearing that. If I turn up my volume a little bit, does that help? It may be - I'm doing this purely over Adobe Connect, so it may be that I'm not hearing the bridge. Carlton says it's better, so good.

Okay, any other comments on this? Marika has got her hand up. Go ahead, Marika, sorry.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I can actually hear you perfectly fine on the audio bridge as well.

On the session we had in Durban, I looked back at my notes and I tried to wrack my memory as well on what we discussed. But thinking back, I think a lot of the issues raised were also issues that we had already discussed in the working group, so I think a lot of the facts and focus actually on explaining and providing some further you know feedback on how the working group had covered some of those items and being able to provides some responses to the questions that people had as those were similar questions that had also come up as part of the working group deliberation. So I didn't actually take any note of any new items that we hadn't already covered or encountered.

But you know I think as Mikey also said, if there are any issues that people solved that were raised during that sessions that are not covered either in the report as it currently stands or in any of the other comments that have been

submitted in response to the public comment forum, we can of course add those to the public comment review tool so that we do give indeed consideration.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, absolutely. Okay, well I don't want to belabor this. You know I think part of my reaction was that we've done a pretty good piece of work and that we need to carry on. And I think that also, it is reflected in the public comments, which we will get to in a second. But before we do that, up on the screen is sort of our next agenda item, which is to take a look at the work plan.

And I think I've left it in a state that you can all move around in it on your own, make it bigger or smaller, but the place that you want to be is at the end, starting basically now and going through the target that we are shooting for, which is the GNSO Council meeting at the end of October.

And what you see is that we've got one, two, three, four, five, six weeks of review of public comments. And as you will see from the Public Comment Review Tool that's coming up in a second, I'm not sure that we are going to need that much time, so we be able to push this schedule a little further forward, but that's sort of the milestone dates that we are working under right now. And clearly, it gives us plenty of time to give those public comments a good solid look and circle back to the report.

I saw Steve's hand go up before Marika's, so I will let Steve go first.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, thanks, and this is Steve. You know my reaction was the same. I mean based on my quick read of the public comments, I don't think we would need this much time to review them. And I wonder what is the council meeting preceding October 31 and what would be the document deadline for that meeting, and maybe we should aim for that.

Mikey O'Connor: That's a good idea. Marika, you are conveniently next in the queue. Maybe you can take a stab at that as well. Go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Indeed I wanted to know when I provided the draft of the work plan, there is a lot of flexibility in there depending on how quick or how slow we go with the public comment review or any other issues that may come up as we deliberate on the final report.

Certainly targeted there is the 31st of October council meeting, but there is indeed a council meeting before that, which takes place on the 10th of October, which would put the deadline for motions and documents on the 30th of September that will be the earlier meeting. Of course, you know, should we miss the 31st of October deadline, so the meeting after that, which is in Buenos Aires basically.

So I think again there and probably based on the next couple of meetings, we may have a better sense of how quick or how slow we are going so we can adjust this as needed.

Mikey O'Connor: And that one in October, is that the very first one after the August break or is there (an even earlier one).

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. There is a meeting on the 5th of September, but the cutoff date for motions and documents is the 26th of August.

Mikey O'Connor: Well if we went crazy, we might even make that, but certainly it seems to me that we could - I think we are all pretty much agreeing that the goal should be to try to pull this in if we can and it seems like there is room to do that, which is good, and it looks like we've got several opportunities to do that.

Any other reactions to this work plan besides this sort of shared one, which is that this seems a little bit more leisurely than maybe is necessary? Okay, well I think that's enough on that one. Let's go on to the comment review tool and

I've asked Marika to put the one that Alan posted to this list since it sort of incorporates both Alan's thoughts and (Don)'s in this and that's what is in front of you.

I'm going to leave it up to you to scroll around in it in case you haven't had a chance to review it yet. I know many of us don't really have the chance to drill into these until we are actually on the call, but to give you sort of a secret decoder ring way to read this.

The highlighted yellow ones are the ones that (Don) highlighted thinking that those were the ones that we really need to dig into. The rest being items that basically agree with our initial report and for the most part either we support them or strongly support them, so what (Don) was doing with this yellow highlighting was sort of focusing our attention.

And I'm going to grab control, sorry everybody, and then I'm going to zoom in and I'm going to give you all control back. If you want as an individual, there is a plus sign underneath the document that if you click, you can make it bigger and smaller to fit your own screen.

Anyway, so the yellow is (Don)'s pass at what we need to pay attention to, and so I think one of the things we need to do is make sure that that's right, and then, the working group response column. Alan put some responses in there, tentative responses to the ones that (Don) highlighted. And you know, those are I think a good start for our consideration of these, so I think we've got a two-phased process today.

The first is to very quickly go through and make sure that (Don) didn't miss any comments that we should dig more deeply into and then move on to the actual review of those comments and formulating our response.

Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Mikey. I think you missed the preamble to that. prior to (Don) doing what he did, I had posted a message saying that I think for the vast majority of the comments, our answer could be thanks for your agreement with our conclusions and/or support of our draft recommendation. And under the action taken, no further action is necessary on our part.

Obviously, we could break that out with more distinction, but the premise was that the vast majority of them could be answered with something akin to that statement.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: Don then went through and my recollection - and (Don) is on the call, so perhaps he should speak for himself. My recollection is (Don) said, "(Patrick Vanderwall)'s comments are the ones that we are going to have to focus on," and he highlighted parts of them that he had particular troubles with. I think that's what he said, so he may want to explain what parts of (Patrick)'s did he highlight and whether in fact we need to answer all of (Patrick)'s perhaps differently than the stock answer.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, that's true, because I see that there are some from (Patrick), which (Don) didn't highlight, so Don, do you want to jump in and decode your highlighting for us? We may have to wait for him to unmute. We may have to wait a little longer for him to unmute. Maybe he stepped away. (Don) is still not coming through.

(Don): Hello?

Mikey O'Connor: There we go, now you are on. You are gone again. We got two syllables out of you (Don). We got the hello with a question mark after it.

(Don): Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: So whatever state you were in when you said, "Hello," that's the state you want to be.

Man: He's talking now, but he's quiet. He is very low.

Mikey O'Connor: Really? It's not coming through on Adobe at all. Are you on the bridge, (Don)?

(Don): No, I gave up on the bridge.

Mikey O'Connor: There you go, now it's good.

(Don): Okay, I just won't move my head for the next 40 minutes.

Mikey O'Connor: Or be very terse. All right, go ahead.

(Don): Too bad it's not right after next surgery when I had the brace. That would be easy.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh dear.

(Don): Yes, back to our regularly scheduled program.

Mikey O'Connor: Great, go ahead.

(Don): Go ahead what?

Mikey O'Connor: Go ahead and sort of decode your highlighting. You know some of the comments from (Patrick) you did not highlight, so our thought was are the ones that you highlighted the ones you felt we needed to focus on or is there some other...?

(Don): The ones that I highlighted here were the ones I thought - where I saw disagreement, and it wasn't even until after that I noticed that (Patrick) was the common denominator in all of the ones I marked.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, okay. All right, so I sort of read that right - that the highlighted ones are the ones that we probably need to focus on. Although, Alan commented on one more that wasn't highlighted, so I think we are zeroing in on the notion that many of these comments - most of these comments we can probably answer in the way that Alan was describing, which is you know thank you very much for your support and sort of carry on from there.

Marika, does that suffice or do we need to go deeper into even the ones that register agreement? You know I'm sort of looking to you as the keeper of the rules on this.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I think if everyone in the group agrees with that approach and is indeed of the view that those comments that are in support are sufficient, I think that's all it needed. Basically, the (new guidance) required that working groups review the comments received and address them. Basically just to respond to that - you now thank you for your comments because they are in agreement. I think that's a sufficient response.

But I think several members here of the working group have also been involved in the development of the comments that have been submitted, and they also may be in a position to indicate whether that would be acceptable for the groups they represent.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes and actually, that's sort of where I was headed was that if you as comment preparers, and many of you were including me, are satisfied with that, that's fine. But if you as you were preparing your comments were thinking about amplifying a section of the report, or clarifying it, or expanding it and would like us to undertake that effort, I think that would you know also be fine.

And so I sort of turn to - I'm not building a queue of (Don) and Alan and sort of what's up with that. (Don), go ahead.

(Don): I caught something on my last email yesterday where I was being just a bit facetious, but not entirely. I do want to go back through the worksheet and see if there are any thoughts where somebody may have agreed with us, but fundamentally missed an important point.

I don't know if that's worthwhile doing or not, but as I suggested, some of the reasons for agreement just struck me as not quite understanding the issues to begin with.

Mikey O'Connor: Why don't we - well me get to Alan now and circle back. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I guess in response to (Don) I would ask for one or two examples so we can get a flavor for what he is talking about, because I didn't catch a lot of those.

In terms of as someone who held draft to comment, this PDP workgroup may have the shortest set of recommendations that is one -- and it's a short sentence -- than any PDP. I strove in the ALAC comments to make our comments shorter than the recommendation. Changes were made at the end where I don't think I met that target, but nevertheless, and you know certainly I didn't feel it necessary to go back and tick off everything because the recommendation in fact exactly met what we wanted to see coming out of this PDP.

So from my point of view, I think it's important that someone other than just (Don) go through them one by one and make sure that we are not missing something, because any single person can miss things.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: Although, I really don't want this workgroup to read the 30 or whatever comments - the number of comments there are or 50 one by one and you know have a campfire group. You know each of them saying aye.

I think it has got to be done with a little bit more than just one person, but I don't think we need to go over them as a group one by one when indeed they are agreeing with what we are recommending. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I - certainly from the IS PCP perspective, we were striving to come up with enough of a comment so that it wasn't just - I mean maybe that's what I should have been doing is just striving to be shorter than our recommendations.

But we - I don't think when we discussed this felt like we needed to have those reasons that we gave inserted into the report and maybe that's - well I will leave the queue sort of open. I agree with the idea that we should go through these with some rigor and make sure that we haven't missed any.

And then (Don) you know in terms of your idea about people agreeing with us but not understanding us, I think that falls in the nice to have, but not critical to have category for me. So maybe what we could do is put that effort after the critical path of getting the final report to the council.

Another way to do that would be to say that those are cues that our report isn't quite clearly written enough and that we need to clarify that, so I'm sort of on the fence on that.

(Don), you are up.

(Don): Okay, like I said, I didn't have a chance to go back and through and confirm my impressions. Let me do that this afternoon or tomorrow morning and see if

I find anything. Let me just rethink what I wrote and see if there is anything that really jumps out that bothers me. If not, I will absolutely deal with it later.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay, well I think the key issue that you are raising and I think is a really important one is if we haven't been clear enough in the report, we should fix that. And so, I think it's worth giving it a hard look with that perspective in mind and I don't think you should carry that burden alone.

I think we should all go through these comments fairly carefully and make sure that you know we either haven't missed one that we actually need to address or you know have missed one that because our report isn't clear, they've sort of missed the point. I think those are both good things to do and we certainly have time to do that. It's not like we are under any time pressure at all, so another week I don't think will hurt us at all on that.

Alan, back to you.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I know (Don) said he won't be in the next two meetings. I won't be in the one after this and I may or may not be in the one following it. I would like to think that we don't have much more work to do than that and I would strongly object to saying let's submit a report to council and then go back and look at something.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: This group is not going to go back and look at something after our report is signed, sealed, and delivered, nor should we defer looking at something that we think might be important until after the report is completely finished. So if it's something we need to do, we need to do it in this pass you know or in this phase.

But since (Don) was the one who identified the concept, I think we need at least one or two examples so we can look at it and say yes, this is something

that concerns us as a group or does not concern us as a group and move forward.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: One way or another I think this report can and needs to be tied up quickly and we should do that. And if that means we get some weeks off at the end, some of us are willing to accept that. It's a burden and a hardship, but I'm willing to.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay, well taking one for the team. Way to go, Alan. I agree.

Now there is one person who is missing from this call and we need to get to (Keith), because I ran into Patrick Kane in the hotel bar in Durban and Pat was - had questions about the data authority section and I pointed him at Steve. Steve, did he happen to run you down during the course of the Durban meeting and talk at all about that?

Steve Metalitz: No.

Mikey O'Connor: I think that's another loose end that we need to tie up.

Steve Metalitz: He didn't. I did talk to (Keith) at some length who - well I mean he certainly is supportive of the recommendation, but I didn't get into any details with him on that point.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay well I think that's one last action item we need to make sure because what I said to (Pat) was look, you know, we're in public comment this is the time to fix it if there's something in there that's not right for sure get a comment in we'll take it up and get it repaired.

So I just want to make sure that, you know, they didn't write a comment and so presumably everything is all right especially if you talked to (Keith) a bit but

I do want to add that to our punch list just to - it seems a terrible shame not to circle back to that and get it tied off. Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Mikey I'm vague but my recollection is without having gone back to the report that on the authoritativeness issue we presented a number of issues, said it's not clear but also said it's not our job.

That is there's a whole slue of and going to be a lot more thick registries and ICANN really needs to think about this but it's not ours, it's not our sole responsibility to pass judgment on it.

Mikey O'Connor: Right.

Alan Greenberg: So I'm not sure how much more we need to work on that if I'm remembering right and that's close to our answer.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Yes well that - go ahead Steve.

Steve Metalitz: I just would agree I think Alan summarized it correctly.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes and my point to (Pat) was to, you know, take a hard look at that section of the report and because (Pat) often isn't as close to the details of these things as (Keith) especially on this particular one.

And so the fact that there wasn't a comment and there wasn't really much in the way of follow up probably indicates that when they dug into it they found it okay. I just don't want to leave that one - (Mark) is here, sorry (Mark) I left you totally out of the conversation.

I completely forgot that you're another (unintelligible) guy. Do you want to chime in on this instead of me just speculating?

(Mark): This is (Mark) sure I can jump in and unfortunately I haven't spoken to (Pat) about this so I'll have to follow up with him. You know, so I don't know what his particular concern is here but I'll certainly follow up and see what questions he had there.

I think though, you know, one thing that's come up a couple of times, you know, we've mentioned it on this call. I think there's some opportunity for us to provide more clarity.

And I've noticed this when, you know, I've spoken to the - about the report to people internally that there's some sort of background. Some of the discussions that we've had in the working group other people haven't been a part of certainly.

And, you know, and so I think maybe, you know, there is an opportunity to provide a little more, you know, background, you know, I'm not suggesting changing, you know, the content.

Just providing, you know, a little more background and clarities but the final document does a better job standing on its own. And I think, you know, from the comments people have had earlier on this call and, you know, in previous discussions, you know, I think it could use a little bit more of that.

But, you know, as to the (unintelligible) I'm - I'll have to follow up with (Pat) on that, thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks (Mark) and sorry to leave you out like that.

(Mark): No problem I joined a little bit late so you might not have noticed.

Mikey O'Connor: No I didn't notice that you were in there, anyway my apologies. Cool, so if you could take that action that would be terrific and I think the other thing that maybe I'd like to saddle you with is if you could come up with a list of, you know, I think that this is sort of like the action that we're handing to (Don), which is let's find places where this report can be sharpened up, I think that's...

Man: Mikey, Marika has had her hand up for a while.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm terribly sorry I've been seeing that as something else, go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: Thanks Mikey no problem, this is Marika. So just to note as well because I think the (unintelligible) there was also a section where I think there were some staff comments that were submitted on the draft initial report.

And I think at the time some of the working group noted as well that the comments probably were more about accuracy and maybe not a (unintelligible) but again if they did go to the point that that is maybe a section where they may want to have a look and (unintelligible) so we can make it clear or really focus in on what the actual issue is.

And so it may be helpful because I think we did - got a kind of (unintelligible) and I did look back at that and I think most of the items have been covered or addressed already.

But I did go back as well to other colleagues following the closing of the public comment form to know that if there were any other issues that haven't been raised or addressed as part of the public comment form that they should come back to me the latest by the 15th of August.

So if there's anything that comes from there I hope to get that to the group sooner rather than later as well if there are any - and I think I noted as well

that (unintelligible) especially related to for example implementation of related questions.

Is there any items that they feel the working group should specify or clarify that may help implementation of this recommendation you provide that we - that the report doesn't change in that aspect that they pointed out at this stage so the working group can then provide input on that.

So (unintelligible) giving them a deadline of the 15th of August also if I get anything by that time I'll share that immediately with the working group.

Mikey O'Connor: That's fantastic, the other question that came to my mind as you were talking Marika is are there any things on the punch list that have not been addressed and should we add those to this - I'm I guess thinking that at least I as the chair would be pretty comfortable if there are open punch list items those got added to this public comment tool I would be comfortable with that as well.

And I have to admit you were just a little bit ahead of me on the implementation related issues. I think that in a way this is similar to the kind of concern that (Pat) may have and to the extent that we can - I mean some of these we're consciously saying look those are outside of either our remit or our capability or our, you know, the time that we have available.

And, you know, that's sort of at the heart of the privacy recommendation that we're making. And there may be others that we want to highlight like that as we finish up this last version of the report. Marika back to you.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika I can help because we did start a punch list but I think between that and the final initial report I think there were some additional changes.

I could maybe have a look at what's on the punch list and see whether that's still relevant in light of the changes we've made and then maybe add them in (unintelligible) public comment review tool.

So the working group can determine whether the, you know, changes are warranted based on that feedback or whether they consider those issues already addressed or covered as someone reports.

Mikey O'Connor: Great, all right it sounds like we've all got a little bit of work to do this week. So for those of you like Alan and Don just a quick, you can just type the answer to this in the chat.

Are you going totally on vacation and thus are completely unavailable or are you simply conflicted with the meeting time for the next couple of weeks and can do work on the list because...

Alan Greenberg: Don said he's going on vacation, I'm getting ready to board a plane for an ATRT meeting next week while this group is meeting. And the week after that I have a little bit uncertain for personal reasons.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes okay, so there's some time for list work it sounds like maybe except for Don he's going on vacation in (Nebraska) he better move fast.

Alan Greenberg: I'm completely overwhelmed for ATRT reasons and I will not be participating very much unless I see something that can be responded to as a one line comment.

Mikey O'Connor: This is the trouble with ICANN we need to start cloning these active participants that's a whole different breed. Okay, let's sort of move on we've got about 20 minutes left.

Let's try to crank through - Marika's giving me a private thought, which is maybe we take a week off for people to review comments next week. We could conjugate about that as we go but let's...

Marika Konings: Yes (unintelligible) quite a few people in the chat noting that they're on vacation next week so maybe just anticipating that we may have already light attendance so maybe we can just give people some homework during their vacation time.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I love that, for me everyday is a Saturday so I feel no qualms about doing that at all. Yes, the chat is (unintelligible). Sorry, let's take a look at some of - if we're done with sort of the process stuff let's take a look at the substance and sort of jump into some of the early comments that we know we need to address.

The first one being number five, which is from (Patrick Vanderwall) saying it should be noted that port 43 Whois protocol has never designed any form of automation in mind it was meant to display (asky) text strings on text terminals hence any complaint that then Whois model makes automation difficulties irrelevant.

This seems a weak argument for dumping within model. On the contrary the fact that some registrars may change on a regular basis the way that their Whois results are displayed an additional protection for the registrant in that it makes large scale harvesting of their data slightly more difficult.

And Alan's posted a comment in there I think rather than reading it right off I will open the queue for the rest of you to sort of chime in on this and then circle back to Alan's comment and then make some comments on my own. So (Mark) you're first go ahead.

(Mark): I think there's two parts to this. First the part that, you know, he's saying port 43 was never designed with any form of automation in mind and I think this is an example of one of the things that I don't think we did a good enough job in the report.

I think in the report we should highlight the fact that, you know, we're not, you know, we're not trying, you know, the purpose of this PDP is not to try and fix Whois in any way.

You know, we're just looking at, you know, the impacts of migrating from thin to thick. Whatever problems there may or may not be with Whois that's not a part of this.

And I think Alan, you know, mentioned that in his comments there, it says, you know, port 43 was, you know, he basically says it's not particularly relevant now.

And I think that's true but we should, you know, I think, you know, we just need to call that out a little bit better in our report that, you know, we're not trying to address any issues there may or may not be with port 43 in this case.

He goes on though and this is where it gets a little interesting though because he goes on to say it's seen - on the contrary the fact the registrars may change on a regular basis provides additional protection in that it, you know, it helps prevent harvesting.

And this is something I think, you know, we should talk about whether or not it's appropriate for us to address it, you know, it may or may not be out of scope.

But I think one of the things we focused on is providing a consistent Whois response and, you know, I think, you know, in general, you know, and not to speak for everybody in the group but I think in general the feeling of the working group has been that providing a consistent Whois response is a benefit and that's what part of our recommendation is.

So he's arguing that mixing up the results is a way to combat harvesting of data, which it is it's a true statement but that's a little bit contrary to our recommendation.

So, you know, I think, you know, there it would be worth pointing out that - pointing that out and maybe making the point that, you know, providing a consistent Whois response is a benefit here. I guess I'll leave it at that.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay (Blake) just respond really quickly to that second point, which is the in fact new RAA does have languages that's forcing the registrars into a consistent response format entirely outside of the thread of this working group.

And I think Alan catches that in his comment as well. I think one of the things that we could do though is and I'll have to go back to the report and I confess I don't have the report open in front of me.

What we tended to do in a lot of these sections is call out the arguments against a given thing and then say eventually at the end on balance the working group concludes that, you know, those arguments aren't - don't overwhelm the value and we...

((Crosstalk))

(Mark): Yes I think that's a good point.

Mikey O'Connor: ...and we might need it to benefit better.

(Mark): Yes and I think, you know, I think we, you know, I'd have to double check but I think we're, you know, the case we're making or the recommendation we're making is that, you know, registries follow the, you know, the response standards set up for new gTLD.

So the new RAA has a uniform, you know, response for registrars but I think that our recommendation is that registries follow a consistent format as well based on what's in, you know, what's been standardized for the new gTLD's.

You know, which, you know, it's a good case...

Mikey O'Connor: I think you're right and I think what we need to do and I will confess to not having done this is we need to go back and make sure that the argument that (Patrick) is making in that second half is included in our report and that we address it with the reasons why we, you know, take another view. Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: I think by the way our pass practice has often been that we not rewrite a report because of one comment but put an answer in and then publish those or make those available by either in the report or a pointer in the report to where they are.

So, you know, yes if there's something that's really horrible that we left out that's being identified by a comment we need to fit it. That's what this phase of preliminary to final report is for.

But I don't think we need to adjust it to make sure that this, you know, there's no possible misunderstanding. This review tool on its own right is one of the vehicles we can use for that.

And so I think we need to, you know, overall focus is this something that's being misunderstood. Now a lot of what (Patrick) is saying here I believe either has in the latter case has been overcome or overtaken by reality in that the world has changed.

Number two, registrars are not going to have to support port 43 if we go to thin, if we go to a thick Whois. So the whole issue of registrars in port 43

disappears, you know, so we're not doing anything for consistency among registrars in port 43 the requirement is no longer there.

Mikey O'Connor: Right but I think when...

Alan Greenberg: And his lead in issue or at least lead in of Marika's extract of it is that what port 43 was designed for well Whois wasn't designed for what we're using it for right now.

You know, the whole, you know, that's the cardinal statement that we're working by. This whole thing is not what was imagined in 1958 or whenever the first RFC came out.

You know, it was to find the techie to tell him his computer was down essentially and the world has changed yes so thank you for noting that.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes and, you know, I think we're all pretty much on the same page. I think the main thing that I would like to do is, you know, I'm a very cheerful editor of a report that's not clear.

It seems to me that one of the things that there seems to be a still very strong agreement on this but, you know, if we need to clarify the report I don't view that as the end of the world.

And if a fellow as involved and as acute as (Patrick) is, is confused by our report then there are other people who will be as well. So I don't think it's a bad thing to go through and take a hard look at that part of the report and see if we can't just sharpen it up a bit.

Anything else on this one I think we're all pretty much in agreement that it doesn't change our mind it just gives us an area of the report to sharpen. That's the summary I'll make.

I'm just watching the chat here I think it's the chat, it's chat so if anything urgent comes out of that let me know. Let's go on to the next highlight everyone, which is number 39 I think check my arithmetic but I think that's where we're at.

This is another one from (Patrick) and the highlighted bit is the lead off bit it says, it's questionable to still invest time and resources in trying to fix the protocol and the (unintelligible) both of which will go through substantial changes in the near future.

And again I'll take a queue and then to the extent that you don't hit something that I should be said then we'll add that to it. I skipped some comments that Alan commented to so yes but if you read that but I think I'll stick with this one for now.

We've only got a few minutes left and we'll tick those other ones off soon. Steve and then Alan.

Steve Metalitz: Yes this is Steve, I mean Alan's response is correct we haven't recommended any change in the protocol but I think the bigger question here, which is also carried through in some of the other highlighted comments is the view that we shouldn't bother trying to fix problems with Whois because this new model is coming that will sweep all before it.

And I just think as noted in several other comments including the M3AAWG and others we do need to fix Whois or improve Whois to the extent that we can.

And having just spent quite a while analyzing the expert working group report and preparing comments on that as several people have noted that's a first step but it's a long way from - we're not going to see a new registration data model for several years.

Even if we - everyone comes to consensus on things in the expert working group report. So I think we should probably respond to this by - in that vein that we can't just freeze everything on Whois until the new model comes along.

Also I think we can make the point that whatever the new model is going to be it's probably easier to transition to it if everybody is in the same architecture now rather than having to have two separate implementation paths one for thick and one for thin registries limitation paths with regard to the transition.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I think that's - I agree with both of those Steve and I think we hinted those in the report. This again is the sort of thing that I think if we go through the report and find these I think we can sharpen up the report without disturbing the flow very much. Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes thank you. I support what was just said, you know, we were charged with should everyone be thick and the implied secondary question is or should everyone be thin.

We went down a long laundry list and went into it in detail and on virtually every point we came out with there's no real difference or thick is better. So the reasonable conclusion of that was not transition everyone else to thin but transition to thick.

We are addressing the question, you know, the theory of whether we should have been doing this at all is interesting and if indeed we had a new data model coming by the end of the year we may have reached a different conclusion, we're not there yet we're not going to be there for a while.

We may be getting rid of the word Whois in the new architecture, you know, the new architecture that will come after us and it may not take 2000 years to

do but it's a big job ahead of us and the questions that we have to answer are complex so let's not pretend we're going to be done real quick.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Alan, (Mark) I think you're going to get to be the last word today - well I'm going to take the last word.

(Mark): Yes I mean I don't think I have anything really new to add over, you know, over what was just said. I mean I, you know, I'm hesitant when, you know, people say that, you know, we're just going to solve everything.

You know, it's, you know, I think it's a little, you know, presumptuous to assume that's going to fix every problem. And, you know, we can't bank on when it will be available, you know, and as Alan said, you know, it's, you know, we're not tinkering with it at all.

You know, it's just a, you know, how we're implementing it. And, you know, Mikey I think you made a, you know, a good point again, you know, I think, you know, there is some opportunity to, you know, clean up the language a little bit to make some of these points more clear in our report.

But I'll leave it at that I don't really have anything new to add on whatever people said.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I think that's great. Alan you want another bite at the apple do you?

Alan Greenberg: I realized as (Mark) was talking that in fact over the next little while there is going to be some tinkering done. We do not address language issues at all, the current Whois and there are some very pressing problems that need to be addressed and we can't wait for the new data model to do some of that.

We are deploying IDN TLD's, we are deploying registries in other countries. There is going to have to be some work done. I don't think we really

addressed this but that works going to be a lot easier if everyone is running in the same model.

So, you know, from that alone...

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

Alan Greenberg: ...from that alone it's not our tinkering but someone is going to be doing some tinkering we have no choice and, you know, this just supports that. I don't think it's something we ever addressed and I'm not really interested in going back and adding a whole new section right now but it just reinforces the overall direction.

Mikey O'Connor: ...yes I think what these are is I'm loving this conversation because I can imagine myself sort of sitting down with the report and the transcript of this call, getting some great ideas for a sentence or two to add to a given section to sort of sharpen it up.

So this is really helpful. The one thing that I'll add and then I think we'll wrap the call up because we're right at the top of the hour is that right at the beginning of this when the working group was just getting underway and the expert working group was also I happened to be in a meeting with (Steve Crocker) and I button holed him after the formal part of the meeting.

And asked him, you know, from his perspective, you know, whether we were going to collide with the work of the expert working group and he very emphatically said no, absolutely not do not wait for the expert working group that process.

And his guess was several years at least and, you know, may the number five although that is my foggy memory not to be attributed to Steve really. But anyway I mean strong sense from Steve saying that these two projects in now way should be dependent on one another.

So I think we're pretty much in agreement I think at this point one last thing, Marika suggested we take a week off. What do you think give me checkmarks if that's a good idea of negative checkmarks if you want to press on.

I mean one way to do this is just keep going and do this as informally as a group and then tie it all up towards the end of the month, another would be to take a week off, okay.

A couple checkmarks for a week off, Alan's not going to be here.

Alan Greenberg: My preference is for everyone else to work and it be done by the time I come back.

Mikey O'Connor: Well that's fair, you know, I guess well I've seen people wanting to take a week off so let's...

Man: Yes Mikey coordinated our vacations, you know, so.

Mikey O'Connor: ...yes that was really clever of us wasn't it, so that's good we'll get it all out of the way next week and then carry on from there. All right so we'll take a week off, see you in two weeks. Thanks all and we're chugging right along I'm looking forward to a pretty fast process.

I might even take a spin through these two sections of the reports and drive some language into the report. And with that we'll wrap it up, see you in a couple weeks thanks.

Man: Thanks.

Woman: Thanks bye.

Coordinator: Thank you very much (unintelligible) the recording.

END