Transcript ICANN Marrakech
GNSO Session Saturday, 05 March 2016
GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group
Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. 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 recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

James Bladel: The next session is an update from the Next Generation TLD Directory Services and that's a PDP and Chuck will be providing that update so go ahead and take it away, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Chuck Gomes. I'm the chair of the RDS PDP Working Group. And let me quickly go through these slides and see if you have – slides and see if you have any questions.

We haven't been going too long but I think we're making good progress. The – I won't go through all of the items on this list, I'll let you take a look at those on this first slide when the charter was approved and so forth.

First working group meeting was on the 26th of January. Notice the fourth bullet there, there – and this could have changed since this slide was made, 134 working group members and 110 observers. So looking at just GNSO working groups this may be the largest participation in just a GNSO working group. Of course the cross community working groups have had quite large participation recently.

Great leadership team selected by the working group. Note that we have three vice chairs and they're all sitting at the table here. For those in the audience who may not know all of them I'll ask you to just wave your hand a little bit, Michele Neylon is over there; Susan Kawaguchi is to my left over here – Susan if you'd raise your hand. And David Cake is to our left here.

It's no accident, primarily to my fault, that there's one member of the leadership team from each of the GNSO stakeholder groups. Now when I say that I want to make sure it's clear that the working group is open to everybody, you don't have to be part of a stakeholder group to do that. But I thought it might be useful if we had someone from each of the SGs to be able to serve as natural liaisons to the four stakeholder groups. But again let me emphasize that does not mean only stakeholder group members can participate. Let's go to the next slide please.

Okay the – I guess it'd be a lot easier to look at the screen in front of me. We started off with staff creating – oh and, you know, I need to mention part of that leadership team is not just the four – the chair and the three vice chairs but also two great staff support persons, Lisa Fifer and Marika Konings, are helping us a lot as all of you in here know they do. And so the leadership team is made up of the six of us with lots of help from Terri.

So staff did develop a mind map. Many of you are familiar with those, based on the charter and other key documents. And from that we have developed a draft work plan that is currently under review by the full working group. We started reviewing that just this past week. And there's been discussion on list and in our meeting last week we will continue that discussion in our meeting this coming Wednesday here in Marrakesh as well as those participating remotely.

The leadership team prepared the draft work plan and there's already been a lot of good input and we will continue to dialogue on that. I'm cautiously optimistic that we'll have a draft work plan within the next two or three weeks at the most. Maybe sooner if we're fortunate.

Notice a really important thing to note about this there are three phases to this working group. And you can see that kind of in the middle of the slide there. And the first phase is a requirements development phase. The second phase is really where the policy development will occur depending of course on what

happens on the requirements phase. And then the last phase is oriented towards implementation planning on that.

Now, all of these things are going to overlap and will be interdependent as you would guess. But Phase 1 is what we're working on right now. And the work plan that is out for review is just to do with Phase 1, the requirements development. And so as you can see in the middle there, Phase 1 our task is to define requirements for registration data services and regardless of what the system would be to deliver those services. That's our task right now.

And a key question that we have to ask is whether a new registration data services system is needed or if not, how could the existing system for Whois be modified to meet the requirements that we will develop in this phase. So that is what Phase 1 is all about. And that's what the work plan is dealing with now. Now depending on what happens in Phase 1 the work plan will have to be added to going to Phase 2 and Phase 3.

Even in Phase 1 there are 11 questions in the charter and in the issues report that need to be answered. And the first five questions are the most critical with regard to answering that question, is a new RDS needed? So the work plan that's out there right now will – deals primarily with those five questions. Depending on the results after that we will, again expand the work plan to deal with the other six questions.

And of course some of those six questions will come into play even as we're doing the first five so we'll be trying throughout to look at the whole picture and not just individual questions.

The leadership team is working on an initial outreach to the SOs and ACs, constituencies and stakeholder groups. Within the next couple weeks we'll probably have that finalized. Now let me give a heads up here, this is a really good place to do it I think.

Our first outreach to the SOs and ACs and constituencies and stakeholder groups will be relatively limited. We're not going to try and get your feedback on the whole picture when we start out because it's huge. We're going to try to keep our requests for feedback from SOs and ACs and constituencies and stakeholder groups fairly small so that it's more realistic for you to respond in a short period of time, the time that's allowed.

So you can anticipate that we will have multiple outreaches to you, your groups, throughout the working group process even in the Phase 1 itself. So just a heads up there. Typically in working groups there one initial outreach and you have to talk about everything. It's going to take a while to go through these things and we're thinking that it would be much more effective to divide our outreaches into smaller segments and get feedback from you closer to the time that we're actually dealing with the issues. So that will be coming and we will appreciate prompt feedback from you on that so you'll see that probably within the next three weeks or so.

The last bullet on this slide I did reach out to the board working group on RDS because they – the board actually initiated this PDP as you know. And so we actually have a meeting scheduled for Monday morning between the leadership team of the RDS and the board working group on the RDS to talk about how the board members would like to be involved in this PDP working group. So we'll know a little bit more after that meeting on Monday morning.

Next slide please. I already kind of indicated at the top that the chartered organized the work into 11 questions. And by the way, those 11 questions go across all three phases, Phase 1, Phase 2, Phase 3, and just different application of the questions.

I've talked about the first sub bullet there. This is really Phase 1, what are the fundamental requirements for gTLD registration data? And there are – the first five questions in the charter you can see them in a very brief indication of those five questions in red there.

And then the real key question for Phase 1 is do we need a new framework? And if yes, then we're going to have to go onto Questions 6-11. If no, how could the Whois system that we have today be modified?

So we're now reviewing the inputs with regard to starting to identify requirements. Now, we don't – I don't think we show this on the slide but the charter asks us to, as a starting point, use the expert working group report. Now I want to make it very clear, we're going to be doing that but our work is not restricted to what came out of that report. We will be totally open minded in considering all things and everybody will be able to participate in – as we look at possible requirements.

Next slide. I think that should just about be the end. Okay so there – all we have there are a bunch of links there. As many of you know, there's a huge amount of information from work that has been done over the last 15 years on this issue. And so these are really just a subset of the information that's available. And so the working group members have a huge task just to come up to speed, if they haven't been involved in these things over the years on this so we have a lot of good information that's available. We will use that and we will use new information as we can.

So hopefully that gives you a good idea of our start. I would be happy to entertain any questions anybody has.

James Bladel: Thanks, Chuck. Great start. Great leadership team. I think we all sleep a little bit better knowing the list of names we saw are driving the boat on this and it's certainly a tall order. So let's go to the queue then. Does anyone have any questions for Chuck either from the table or remote? Yeah, hi. Come on up. Do you have a microphone back there or – there's a stand up here. There we go. Thanks, (Ally).

Liz Williams: Sorry, I've just disturbed all my neighbors that I was sitting next door to. Liz Williams for the record. Chuck, I wonder if you'd be kind enough to give a sense of the way in which you approach the first question. It's very similar in the way

in which we, for example, constructed the new TLD PDP years ago in 20015 where there was that threshold question. It would be helpful to understand – I'm a member of this working group as well – and have been involved in it for quite a long time.

The nature of the first question is terribly, terribly important for people to understand because with 134 people as members of the group and then nearly as many observers, it's probably helpful to have an understanding of how the group is actually going to structure its work to answer that threshold question and when the stop point is, is there a stop point? And how could that question be asked to get a consensus understanding of whether the fundamental requirements for registration data are needing massive change or whether we cobble along and make up something as we go along. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Liz. Chuck speaking again. And if you look at the first sub bullet there, you'll see the – in red the indicators of the first five questions and the first one, as you can see in the charter, has to do with users and purposes of registration data. That is a very fundamental question. I can't say for sure that we'll cover that question first though.

In the draft work plan that has been developed and that is under discussion by the full working group some have suggested that that not be the first question we consider. We may actually take a look at data elements first is what's been suggested. Don't know how that'll turn out but we will make a decision as a working group together on that.

It may be that we kind of consider the two together. But as far as how we might do that I can't say too much about how we're going to approach that. We will do very careful deliberation on each one of the questions. We may have to jump around a little bit in the questions but users and purposes and the actual data elements of registration data will be very fundamental things.

To say more than that about that now would be premature because I want to make sure that I allow the full working group to deliberate on this and how we

will approach it. We do have – the leadership team does – has discussed this and has some ideas but again we're trying to allow the full working group to weigh in on that. So sorry I didn't answer all of that, Liz, but hopefully that's a little bit helpful.

James Bladel: Thanks, Chuck. Any other questions from the room? Oh, Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much, Stephanie Perrin for the record. And I'm on the group so I don't know the answer to this question really. I'm one of those people who think we should ask ourselves the fundamental question, why do we have a Whois, before we get deep into the users and purposes. However, I'm willing to let that stay, although I'm probably not willing to shut up about it. You'll hear from me regularly.

But there's a fundamental problem with this, which I'm sure you're aware of, Chuck, and that's the recursive nature of the discussion. So we get to the users and purposes then that will bring us back to the question of the larger purpose of Whois and who is it actually for anyway? Is it for the, you know, the bottom feeders or is it really just to register a domain name? And I don't mean to be pejorative in the sense of bottom feeders, there's a place in the ecosystem for everyone.

So how do you propose to deal with these questions that are essentially recursive? That's not the only one. The whole issue of, well, does the current system work? What do we do about, you know, it goes on and on. How do we maintain the forward motion that I sense you've really got on this and yet accept that some people, particularly for the giant cohort of people we got on this, the light is only going to go on on a few issues six or eight months from now.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Stephanie. And I don't think it's going to be a going forward steady progress, it's going to be a going forward and backing up and going forward and backing up. And actually the charter itself, and the framework that was developed makes it clear that – and this is especially true of Phase 1 – that we

need to be looking at all the whole picture and not just in parts because of that very thing.

We're going to find ourselves bouncing around a little bit and that's okay. While at the same time trying to manage it and make steady progress. So it won't just be a going forward. We're going to bounce around. We may have to consider several of the questions together in parallel. We're going to go back and forth and we'll try to do that in a way that can result in steady progress. But that's going to be one of the challenges of the group. And you raised the point now.

I should point out too, and sorry to take so much time here, James, but we formed a small team early on to take a look at our membership, and Stephanie with her raising her hand reminding me of it because she helped on this little team, to look at our membership to see if there are any gaps in expertise that is needed or in representation.

And so that's another activity that's been going on. We're trying to identify and we hope to have – there's a survey out for the working group members right now to identify their areas of expertise. So we're looking at that to see if there are any holes we need to fill. And thanks to Stephanie and the four other people who have volunteered to kind of take the lead on that.

James Bladel: Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Hi, Edmond Chung here. Just building on what Liz mentioned and what Chuck responded, just want to make sure because the big yes/no question here is very important. But when, Chuck, you talk about the data elements and stuff, I'm a little bit worried that we go down the rabbit hole of the technology because that, you know, the technology framework itself is not something that should be the determining factor of whether this – the Whois needs an overhaul because we often hit that snag and say, hey, we got to get IDNs, we got to get these things in place anyway so we better overhaul the Whois.

That to me is not really what the question is about. So just wanted, you know, I guess clarify that, you know, the technology is moving forward. I think we have the RDAP and those kind of things. That shouldn't be part of the determining factor of the yes/no question we have here. Just is that kind of the way we're going or…

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Edmon. In fact on an earlier slide, and I didn't emphasize it very much, it said, you know, do we need a new system regardless of what system that is? Our job is not to do the technical work for the protocol. You're right, that's been done. We've got one right now, RDAP, okay. But regardless of whether that's used or any other, our task in the Phase 1 is to recommend requirements for any system, whatever it is and whatever platform it is based on.

James Bladel: Okay thank you. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, James. Michele Neylon for the record. Just, you know, this PDP is going to be big. It's going to be long. It's going to be painful. By the time we're through with it Chuck and I probably won't be on speaking terms. Stephanie and I definitely won't be on speaking terms. That's not true. And, Stephanie, come on, don't look at me like that.

Now, I mean, we spent a huge amount of time going through a lot of this in the original EWG. There are a lot of very simple questions that have very complicated answers. You know, that's the crux of the matter. If it was simple and easy we'd probably have fixed it all by now and lots of people would be out of jobs or something, I don't know. But it's a big one, it's a complicated one and I suspect that the GNSO Council is going to see one or all of us turning up to give updates for quite some time. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck again. Thanks, Michele. And those that have been around ICANN for a while know exactly what he's saying. We've had two cross community working groups in ICANN in the last year and a half or so that have drawn a lot of attention and will be primary attention of this meeting this week.

But this working group will be a huge effort and it'll be another test, big test, of whether we can apply the multistakeholder model that most of us believe very strongly and effectively. It's going to be huge challenge. There's going to be lots of disagreement, but we appreciate your support of the working group going forward to help us all work together collaboratively to come up with recommendations that hopefully will help all of us improve registration data services going forward.

James Bladel: Thank you, Chuck. And I understand we have a question from a remote hub.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. There's a question from the (unintelligible) City hub who asks, "How can technology help in improving the platform?"

Chuck Gomes: Could you repeat that? I didn't get it.

Marika Konings: How can technology help in improving the platform?

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Chuck again. Well if in fact we identify requirements for example, for different levels of access, if we ended up recommending things like that, the current Whois protocol does not provide for that. So technology will be key to implementing some of the recommendations depending on what those recommendations are. It's kind of hard to talk to it. The IETF did great work in the words effort to develop a protocol that would meet a lot of needs that are not met by the current protocol for Whois.

So ultimately when we get to implementation technology, again, depending on what requirements we recommend, and are approved, technology will be a key element of that. But that is not the responsibility of the working group to develop a technology. Fortunately there's at least one new protocol out there that would meet a lot of the requirements. But that is not our task. But it is – technology is critical depending on what we recommend.

James Bladel: Okay thanks. Michele.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: I'll keep it brief.

James Bladel: Yeah, one more from the floor. Very brief please. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: No just agreeing but disagreeing with Chuck, as I like to do. While the technology isn't our problem up to a certain point the – we should be always conscious of the costs of any suggested solutions or output. I mean, ultimately if you change the system dramatically that does not come at a zero cost. There is going to be a cost that is going to have borne by somebody.

And we can't come out the far end of this, come up with convoluted complex set of proposals that are going to take 25 years to implement and billions of dollars to build. That would be a – I think that would be a failure.

Chuck Gomes: And thanks, Michele. This is Chuck again. And this is really a brief response. I think it's Question Number 10 in the charter, guess what it is has to do with? Cost. So that is absolutely part of our task.

James Bladel: Thank you, Chuck. And Klaus will have the last word on this.

Klaus Stoll: Okay, Klaus Stoll for the record. NPOC and NCSG. I feel already a little bit frustrated as an observer in the working group and hopefully as a contributor in the working group that we seem to be working rightly from different position and these positions are absolutely clear but nobody seems to try to unify them.

Wouldn't it make sense right at the start to ask all the different stakeholder groups to declare their interest in the Whois and what should be done there and trying to conciliate first the interests and then coming quicker a little bit to a solution instead of implying all the time this is your interest, this is my interest and things like that.

I think if you work for quite openly from the interests you are much more honest and much quicker. And, Chuck, you said this is a test for the multistakeholder model. I think whole ICANN is a test of the multistakeholder model. And I wouldn't worry about it. Until now we muddled through it and I think this one will happen the same way. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Chuck again. We'll do a lot of muddling but I'm hoping we can get past the muddling and actually come up with some substantial recommendations. Every member of the working group has to submit and has submitted a statement of interest. Now that doesn't necessarily cover their particular interests with regard to how they'd like to see this come out. But there will be plenty of opportunity for people to express their interests as we deliberate on each one of the questions and other things that we have to do.

Klaus Stoll: Chuck, as a quick response, wouldn't it be better to start right at the beginning with that exercise?

Chuck Gomes: I guess I'm not fully understanding the question. Chuck speaking again. The – because we did start – statement of interest in fact there were actually several people that did not submit statement of interests and they were moved to observer status unless they did submit one. But we're doing a survey right now asking for areas of expertise and knowledge. I guess I'm not totally clear on what you're thinking we should do first that we haven't already done.

Klaus Stoll: Chuck, I think I didn't express clearly and I apologize. I'm not talking about statement of interest and I'm not talking about personal interest. I'm talking about different stakeholder groups like civil society, registrars, registrants, business community, to ask them to say what is your specific interest. What is your expected outcome? What's your ideal scenario? And trying to consolidate these things first instead of implying all the time using such – I think certain things like that.

I think we should put our interests clearly on the table and start working from there. I think that would – it's not cutting the – not but making it much more transparent.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck again. I'll probably talk to you offline on this because I'm not sure – we're absolutely going to do that throughout the process in terms of doing it right now with nearly 140 members in the group and we have good representation from most of the key stakeholder groups within ICANN. We have to do what you're saying in order to succeed.

Many of those interests we already know and have seen over the years. That's one of the reasons why we have a leadership team of four to try and have competing interests together. But I think we probably spent enough time on this. I'll talk to you offline if you'd like later.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Chuck. Thank you, Klaus, and for everyone that contributed to that conversation. So the next step I believe would be, if I understood you correctly, will be to expect some outreach to the SOs and ACs and the various stakeholder groups and that's coming when do you expect?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, the next step probably is the finalization of the work plan for Phase 1, or at least the first part of Phase 1. In conjunction with that we will be sending – we will be reaching out to all the SOs and ACs in ICANN as well as the specific SGs and Cs in the GNSO seeking feedback from them. And that will be – won't be asking for feedback on all 11 questions, it'll be a narrow focus for initial feedback and probably some feedback on the work plan.

James Bladel: Okay thank you. Okay we're going to bring this one for a landing. We'll end the recording here. And thank you, Chuck, thank you to the leadership team. This is definitely a heavy lift and we appreciate your work on this.