KATHY SCHNITT: Welcome to the SSAC Evolution of the Resolution Work Party Conference on Thursday, the 13th of April 2023. And, Barry, I'll hand it back over to you.

BARRY LEIBA: Okay. And I'm really going to hand it over to Andrew. He's got the plan for today. We're going over some text. So go ahead, Andrew.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yeah. Thanks, Berry. I guess my cursor being odd. Okay. So last week, we were talking about section 4. We went through some different paragraphs in section 4 and resolved them. And I had written this paragraph, if you can see the paragraph I'm highlighting right now. Last week about Audrey and Wes' presentation. And then I had one more homework assignment related to this, which was to follow a paragraph about proxies, and how it's all just DNS and IP addressing under the hood.

And this is also an attempt to resolve Joke's comment at ICANN76 where he said, you guys need to talk about the fact that blockchain technology is basically just DNS and IP addressing under the hood. And in order to bootstrap, you need to get it these things via normal IP addresses and via DNS names and that kind of thing. So that's what this paragraph is attempting to address. So please review this paragraph here, which spans both pages.

WARREN KUMARI: So some knits and notes. So I think I would probably drop an IP addressing in order for users to get to them. Because what we're really talking about is that they need a connection to the global DNS for people to gain access to them. I mean, what we're talking about is blockchain replacing the naming system not blockchain replacing the IP addressing system. So I'd likely just say to the global DNS in order for users to gain access to them.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So Warren, can I push back on that? Just a second. I mean, if you were to put IP address/blockchain head blah, blah, blah. You'd get there.

WARREN KUMARI: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: And if you're trying to replace addressing, maybe that's what you would do. In the same way that people find the DNS with an IP address. Usually, it's under the covers from some discovery mechanism, but it's all IP. Right?

WARREN KUMARI: Well, maybe then connection to the global DNS or knowledge of the IP address?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Or maybe even a parenthetical or using the IP address directly or something like that. But, you know what I mean? I just don't think we should hide and if you use that kind of a-- I don't want somebody ripping in to us going, they don't really need the DNS if they know the IP address themselves.

WARREN KUMARI: Yeah. No. No. Perfectly right. Yes, you're completely right. But the bit that I'm trying to figure out is-- so it feels like we're talking about a couple of different things in the same sentence here. So, like, the first sentence I think is in order for people to be able to actually reach the blockchain naming system, they need to know how to find it. So it feels like that first sentence and this sentence together, well, these two sentences kind of go together.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, that is a nice restructuring. To start off with you have to be able to find the block chain to use it for naming.

WARREN KUMARI: But about proxies that act as bridges, I think that that's more talking about the using a DNS proxy so that you can easily query the system using a normal, without having to run special software on your PC. So I think that maybe. If Andrew and others don't mind me moving stuff around, can I propose moving some bits around?

RUSS HOUSLEY: We move around.

WARREN KUMARI: There we go. How does that work? Actually, I can move some more things around. And we can always push control Z if people hit what I've done.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yeah, get rid of additionally here. It does make sense to start with talking about bootstrapping because that's the first thing.

WARREN KUMARI: Yeah. And then the bit that I'm unsure about is the sentence that I'm highlighting or I guess just bolding now because it's easier to reach. The Internet must be used for bootstrapping blockchain based naming systems because no other network is as ubiquitous and universally accessible. That kind of makes it sound like blockchain replaces the Internet or something. Like, I think this sentence I've highlighted is not particularly helpful. Maybe we could say that, because it's not that blockchain based naming systems would replace the Internet or that use the internet to bootstrap into blockchain, and then you never need the internet again. It's more blockchain based naming systems are another way of resolving names on the internet. So do you object to just deleting that sentence?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I was just trying to say that the Internet is the ubiquitous network that's everywhere. So that's why you use it to get these other things. But maybe that's kind of obvious. I mean, no one's going to be using the telephony network to download bootstrap or blockchain naming system.

WARREN KUMARI: Yeah. But I mean, we also wouldn't say the Internet must be used to reach www.foo.org because no other network is ubiquitous or universally accessible.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Okay. That's fine.

WARREN KUMARI: So I don't know if what I've written, like with all the shifting stuff around if it's still readable or if I've destroyed.

RUSS HOUSLEY: This this here, what is it for?

WARREN KUMARI: So let me add some stuff here.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yeah, resolution. Right?

WARREN KUMARI: I know the bit that I'm having sort of weird stumbling over is between the Internet and blockchain based naming systems. Because that sort of implies that blockchain based naming systems are distinct from the Internet. What did I just do? I just clicked the button. Okay, there we go. Maybe act as bridges to the blockchain, to the blockchain, to blockchain based naming systems.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yeah. Can we just delete bridges and just talk about proxies? I was concerned that someone reading this wouldn't know what a proxy is.

WARREN KUMARI: Yeah, I mean, I think that by proxies that act as bridges to blockchain based naming systems, I think that that works. I just removed from the Internet too. Does anybody think that I broke stuff horribly? Geoff is being oddly silent.

GEOFF HUSTON: I'm mute button. I am. I'm trying to think of what you're saying and why you're saying it. And I think you've kind of leaped into the answer without the rationale. And I was thinking about words that trying to justify that second paragraph. Let me cut and paste something into the chat, I guess. It kind of needs this sort of bridge that says that the blockchains aren't the b on an end all. Where's the checkbox? So you'd kind of start with something like in order to provide a seamless interaction between blockchain based naming systems and the DNS, comma.

You know, these systems typically use proxies that act as bridges. This gives backwards compatibility and does not alter the applications or the libraries on the host system in order to access the blockchain based name space. You know, the real trick is you say we do this, but you don't say why. And the why is because nothing else changes if you do it right. It's just a proxy that looks to the user their application and host system as a DNS point.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: You had additional text after the text you pasted into the chat.

GEOFF HUSTON: Yeah, I haven't talked it yet. And what I was trying to say and it's more like and let me start typing here text, Andrew, in order to say this. This structure allows applications and the host libraries. Right. That was the point I was making. That basically this whole thing then is seamless down the end point and nothing needs to change. And I suppose to make that moreover, you'd say this proxy. And it is actually to be permanently bridged at DNS proxy structure. So the one side of the proxy looks like a bit of DNS. Nothing changes at the user point. The other side of the proxy does the blockchain magic.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I guess this is the kind of thing which resolves every name via normal DNS unless that name happens to end in .crypto, and then it sends it through via some magical path.

GEOFF HUSTON: Yes.

WARREN KUMARI: So what do you think of what I started typing above that. Because seamless interaction between blockchain based naming systems and the DNS, to me it feels like it slightly oversells how will it works. It's like you were saying and your second sentence, which isn't purple, and a bit of your first, and try to stick it into one. Although I may just be fiddling with text because fiddling with text is more fun than thinking.

GEOFF HUSTON: Yeah. But I know what you're saying, and it isn't over some. And what I was trying to sort of bring the concept down is you just need a small bug somewhere to make this all work and you don't need to rewrite applications libraries. You don't. It's just a small bug. And whether you can call it seamless or frictionless. You can see where I'm trying to hit, I haven't got another adjective that does it.

WARREN KUMARI: How about in order to-- How does that work?

GEOFF HUSTON: Closer, systems or applications. Yes.

WARREN KUMARI: We are actually making progress or at least we're putting words down.

GEOFF HUSTON: Right. And I think it sort of says it more plainly. Yeah. I'm going to start thinking about the bootstrap in the previous paragraph. And now you're kind of motivating the proxy element that says, yes, it deliberately is made to look like the DNS because that way, we don't have to rewrite the universe in order to use blockchain.

WARREN KUMARI: Seeing as I wasn't here when this was written, can I just make a couple of comments on something a little bit higher up around the blockchain size, etc.?

GEOFF HUSTON: Sure.

WARREN KUMARI: So once data is on these blockchains that exist forever, I would have said and is immutable or something instead of separate sentence, but whatever. I think this is terrible for scaling. That this is terrible, but sounds a little weird. Like, I would instead say, this is very poor for scaling or this is bad scaling implications.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Problematic?

WARREN KUMARI: Yeah, this is problematic or suboptimal, or yeah, something. But the bit that I actually wanted to say is in general, blockchains don't really require a fee to process changes specifically because of or in order to limit the scaling, it's more they have a fee because there's cost to running it as an example. So for example, with Ethereum, if you have a smart contract, everybody who is a full node on the Ethereum system has to perform some work to make a change.

So it's not specifically to limit scaling. It's more I would say, therefore, most blockchains require a fee to process changes to the chain. Or actually, it's not even there for really. This is programmatic for scaling because it continues to grow ad infinitum. Maybe in addition, most blockchains require a fee to add to or make changes to the chain. It's almost the same thing, but just slightly differently worded.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: What would happen if the fee wasn't there? So that's maybe where we're going with this. Right? If the fee wasn't there, then the thing would just grow ad infinitum. Because if you just depend with whatever you wanted to. So isn't that, therefore, somewhat justified?

WARREN KUMARI: Not really. I mean, it's not that-- Yes, if there was no fee, you would probably have badness because it would just grow. But saying therefore implies that that is the reason that the blockchains have a fee. And the [00:19:13 -inaudible] is because there is a cost. Like, if there wasn't a cost, yes, it may just grow crazily big, but therefore implies a sort of causality part. So let me copy and paste what you have and propose a

change. Google spell check thinks infinitum is not a real word. Does what I propose text here seem reasonable still?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I don't think we need the in addition. You can just say most.

WARREN KUMARI: Maybe I'll just check change that to which limits.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Sure. That's great.

GEOFF HUSTON: But it's not the fee. I'm like, the problem is the blockchain confuses the current state with the log of how we got there. And the real problem for scaling is that every modification will change, augment the records, the log, it does not replace. And so this monotonically increasing data set becomes the scaling problem because more modifications, more entries they're both the same. They just add to the lotto. And it's not the fee that's prohibitive. It's the monotonically increasing data set. And while this is fine in month one, by month 3000, you're starting to really put up some storage cushion.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's true, I fear. Right? It's the gas thing. You know, you have to pay to change. That becomes prohibitive for many uses, thankfully including malware.

GEOFF HUSTON: But I think cause and effect is really the issue here, Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, that's right. I agree with you. I just think we need to link those two together.

GEOFF HUSTON: Russ, the size is prohibitive and the fee acts as the gateway in terms of trying to limit the unconstrained growth in size. So you either have unconstrained growth or you have fees, or in the worst possible world, you have both.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, and I think we actually do have both.

WARREN KUMARI: Well, is this useful to say? What if we just say, this is problematic for scaling because the size that data continues to grow ad infinitum? As long as one full copy of the chain is blah, blah, blah. I mean, instead of going down the rat hole of, what's the purpose, cause and effects? Just remove it and just move on.

GEOFF HUSTON: I agree. That's gets to the root cause here. Yes.

WARREN KUMARI: And actually, maybe we can say can continue to grow ad infinitum. Because people stop adding stuff to the blockchain, it stops growing.

GEOFF HUSTON: But we all think edits are free. In the blockchain world, they're not.

WARREN KUMARI: Yeah. Well, I'm just thinking, if you say this is problematic for scaling because the size the data continues to grow ad infinitum, that's not true if people get bored and wander away from the blockchain. Right? I guess it doesn't matter. It just feels like it sounds as though the chain grows on by itself without user participation, but mine is more just in it, so I'll just remove that.

ROD RASMUSSEN: So I would argue you have two separate issues that are intertwined. Right? Because the gas, the fees, or one way of dealing with, they create friction so that you can actually grow the chain for those who value the chain. And so it's an economic response. But that makes it the economics by themselves. And you don't even have to necessarily charge fees because of the growth. You can charge fees because you've got the cool one. Right? And so economics are the factor regardless for you. This to be used in things that otherwise have a relatively cheap or almost free cost as in changing DNS entries do. So there's an economic impact regardless of why the fees are being charged in the first place.

Then there's the scientific. The math does not work eventually to do something where the amount of changes overwhelm the amount of

things you can store in a blockchain that makes it practical to actually physically use. And look at those as two separate things and the interaction of them together is one set of reactions that you have to try and do to make sure the chain doesn't grow. It's too big. It's unwinding and unusable.

WARREN KUMARI: Yes, I think we agree. Is it able to include that text in this?

ROD RASMUSSEN: I think it's important to point out that the economic issue is a factor because it has an operational impact. Right? This may not be your Panacea for replacing the global DNS or what have you. And it's not just because of the math problem. It's also an economic issue potentially.

WARREN KUMARI: Yeah, I'm trying to figure how we get that text in. I mean, we do say recent research into blah, blah, blah found that it's currently more expensive for malware distributors to use this than for them to use the DNS. Maybe, actually, I've got some potential next. Does that work? Potentially with better typing. Let me move it down. Does that cover?

ROD RASMUSSEN: I would also say there's a growing cost, by definition. There are increasing cost.

WARREN KUMARI: I mean, kind of, maybe. The gas fee for Ethereum has recently gone down because of, a bunch of text.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay. There's the retail cost, but then there's the production cost. Right? The cost of being sold.

WARREN KUMARI: I mean, honestly, the storage cost is relatively minor. Like, Ethereum is what? 200 gig at this point, something that?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah. It's not size. It's the computational requirements. Right?

WARREN KUMARI: Yeah. But that doesn't really change based upon the size of the chain. You don't have to touch older data. The whole point of the blockchain is you only care about the hashes for the most recent block or two. And the rest of it is just storage. So how low is it the Ethereum now?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: So is this sentence saying that the chain will not grow in an unbounded manner? Because I guess I don't understand what this pressure is meant. I mean, we are just talking about this gas stuff.

WARREN KUMARI: Yeah. But I mean, the gas is currently fairly at least up until fairly recently, it was relatively expensive. Like, the reason that I got wkumari.eth, and I only got wkumari.eth was because it cost me like $67 or something stupid. If it had been free, I would've got wkumari.eth and adamisthedoodoohead.eth.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: But you're not talking about the chain not growing in an unbounded demand. You're talking about the chain growing slowly. It's still unbounded. It's just not accelerating. It's decelerating because of the cost of gas.

WARREN KUMARI: There's a cost to running, and this provides a limiting factor on how quickly the chains grow.

GEOFF HUSTON: Well, I flipped it on a head in a comment that I added in the document, Warren, which you might want to look at, which is that it reflects what Rod is saying that popularity is really the problem. And unconstrained use generates new entries, etc. And the fees are actually an attempt to constrain that growth. It's a barrier to entry, which says, well you can't just change things every second. Thank you very much.

WARREN KUMARI: Well, except that imposing a fee implies that somebody said, this is growing and that's going to get expensive. Let me invent something to try and slow down how quickly it grows.

ROD RASMUSSEN: And that's not the case?

WARREN KUMARI: No. The fee is an artifact, a natural artifact of the cost to make the changes. Like, the gas fee in Ethereum is purely because thousands of machines have to each do a little bit of work and you are paying everyone who is doing that work to do the work for you. Or in blockchain, it's not that some guy said, I will charge you a $1.50. Instead, what it is is the cost is the fact that lots of people need to do lots of calculations to try and mine the next block. I sort of view the fee as a natural artifact of the design of the blockchain, not a fee that is imposed by someone.

And maybe this is all just semantics. Right? Maybe it's one of those things where the amount of time that we're spending discussing getting the wording just right is way out of scale with how many people are actually going to read the document and what they're going to take away from it. I mean, it's not like, your text is fine, my text is fine, some vaguely hand wavy. It costs some money to run this, so that's why they don't get pretty big, infinitely quick, or I don't know.

ROD RASMUSSEN: You're right. We're dancing around exactly the same concepts. And it it's more about the motivations, etc. And you are right. The other part of the fee is to compensate or to create a self-sustaining system by compensating the folks who incur expense from the folks who are generating the reason why that expense is happening. As much as it is, as a beneficial side effect or part of a primary intent, an intent to constrain unbounded stupid noise growth. So the fee is both a factor in a self-sustaining system to compensate from the folk causing the work to the folk doing the work, but also as a form of constraint on the completely unbounded growth potential. And you could argue whether that constraint is real or not, etc. That's kind of by to by.

WARREN KUMARI: So what if we just say something like, the fee, I trying to take what you had and reword it slightly. But basically, the fee for such additions naturally limits the growth of the chain or something. The fee for such additions and changes that--

ROD RASMUSSEN: Inhibits unconstrained growth.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: You could just say it slows growth.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Well, that's synonym. But the whole issue is if you didn't have the fee, you're in a dark space. If you have a fee there is some inhibitory factor.

It doesn't stop. It doesn't do anything like that. But it just slows down, oh, possibly nothing. I'll do this again. I'll do this again. Blah, blah, blah.

WARREN KUMARI: So how's that? I mean, there is a cost to running and--

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: This fee is referring to this cost. There is a cost to running, and this fee--

WARREN KUMARI: This inhibits unconstrained growth. Does that work?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: So now we're not talking about the fee. We're just talking about the cost of doing all these mathematical things on a thousand different computers.

WARREN KUMARI: Yeah. I mean, we didn't say whether the cost is monetary cost or technology cost or something. I mean, there's a cost to running [00:36:03 -inaudible], and the fees that this require or something.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Sure. I think that's how it looks, but it is the fee goes back to. I mean, as you were describing earlier, the reason for the fee is because of all these computations that need to happen on all these machines. So in a sense,

we don't really have to talk about it because we're talking about the cost.

WARREN KUMARI: Okay. So does this work for everyone who had views? I have a horrible feeling that I run rough shot over. Comments.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Hearing anyone complain, I will click accept.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Good enough for now.

WARREN KUMARI: Somehow, I managed to get the font all messed up. Oh, somebody fixed it. So I just have a lot. It looks as though Ethereum, the block the chain is using, about a terabyte of disk. That feels big.

GEOFF HUSTON: Well, for a marginal system that is not effectively mainstream, it's a terabyte already.

WARREN KUMARI: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Just I had thought, I mean, one terabyte disc is cheap. Just last time I adopted was, like, 300 megabyte or something.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: [CROSSTALK] because we've only got 15 minutes left.

WARREN KUMARI: Oh, yeah. Okay.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: So last time we were talking about finding 5. I'll briefly show that finding again, and we did some work on that finding. And we changed it from saying there's currently no mechanism to saying proposals at ICANN and the IETF are being considered to blah, blah, blah, blah, facility for coordination. So last week, I thought it would be a good idea to write a little bit about, where did they go?

Yeah, these two proposals to facilitate namespace coordination, which is a horrible title. And it might go away. This text might end up somewhere else in the document at some point, but we thought we needed to say something about SAC113 in The ALT Internet draft. We did talk about SAC113 earlier in the document. We talk about SAC90 in that. But this is kind of more about what it is in relation to a proposal to facilitate namespace coordination. Go ahead, Warren.

WARREN KUMARI: So some quick updates. ALT TLD has finished IETF last call. And we sent a liaison or the IETF sent a liaison to ICANN saying, "Yo, heads up. We're adding this thing to the special use registry." And ICANN replied yesterday or the day before saying, "Cool, thanks for letting us know." So that seems to be moving along nicely. The old document itself specifically does not create a registry for names under .alt. So it

specifically doesn't create a registry to deal with coordination or something.

What it does say is we're not making a registry and then it moves on. The GNU folk stepped up and said, we're going to create a registry under .alt. You know, we're creating gns.alt. And if anybody else wants a name under .alt come talk to us. I don't know if any of that counts as coordination. The IETF basically was like, hell no, we're not getting rid of that crazy legal drama. GNU said, we don't mind us some drama. So I don't know if any of that is useful knowledge or what we're talking about here.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: It's not discussed here because the proposal itself doesn't propose a registry. I did hear the presentation from the GNU people at the DNS op. But I don't think we need to discuss their idea for a registry here unless people feel differently.

WARREN KUMARI: Yeah. It's just the first paragraph says proposals that attempt to write some kind of facility coordination between global DNS and namespaces. And then there are two pros that are currently considered by ICANN and the IETF. And that paragraph makes it sound like we think that these proposals are providing facilitated coordination. And I don't really know if they are.

GEOFF HUSTON: I think you're reading a lot into the white space, Warren. It is proposing coordination between a, the global DNS, and b other namespaces. It is not proposing coordination between some parts of b other namespaces and other parts of b, other namespaces. Because it's not our job. We don't care, blah, blah, blah. So my tight reading in that sentence, I think conforms with what we've done. Here's this space. You can organize, you can bother not organizing. We don't care. It's not our problem.

WARREN KUMARI: Okay. Do you see how it could be read that way, and I'm assuming that's actually how it was intended? I think maybe some of my twitchiness on this topic is that a bunch of the other naming people like GNU, and Ethereum, and Namecoin, and Okay Turtles, who I think is also Namecoin had come along to ICANN meetings and tried to actually coordinate and sort of participate in the process. And ICANN largely, or at least in their view, ICANN largely said, here's a nickel kid. Go get yourself a real namespace. And when Christian Grothoff came to the IETF and asked for like seven names to be reserved, from his viewpoint, the IETF said, “Wonder off, we don't like you.”

So I think that many of the alternative resolution people would view this as sort of history is written by the vectors type stunts. You know, you all didn't really try to coordinate. You just pretended to, and then you told us we couldn't have our name. And so grumble, grumble. So I don't really have any proposed text. Just I think that it feels like we didn't really try very hard to provide facilitated coordination between blah, blah, blah or at least they--

GEOFF HUSTON: You see, Warren, I'm not on the IESG. I don't take part in these lofty meetings. But in some ways, I kind of feel the real problem that these folks had was expanding the gTLDs. And that every time there was another wave, whatever space they tried to come out for themselves was at risk. And what we said, this community as part of our coordination with that group was, here's some spaces where we promise not to trample on. And how you organize yourself within that space is not an out problem, but we undertake not to trample at the top level. And so we have done our best on to this side.

WARREN KUMARI: When did we say here is some space you can use? That's what ALT is finally doing now.

GEOFF HUSTON: And that's what I'm saying. That's exactly what I'm saying, Warren. That's the change. That's the coordination. We didn't do it before. It was all just random risk.

WARREN KUMARI: Okay. I mean, to me, it feels like they came along and wanted to coordinate with us. And we didn't do a very good job of that. And I think we could have done a lot better facilitated coordination between the global DNS and other folk. I think we've done a shitty job, and I think they would say we've done a shitty job. We have now finally 12 years on said, here's a bit of space that's, basically, desert space that

we're not going to use. You can use it if you really want. Doesn't really feel like facilitated coordination. It feels like in the US, we have created an Indian reservation for you on a piece of desert. You can go sit over there if you really like.

GEOFF HUSTON: I think we're straying well off the topic. And I could debate this with you, Warren, for a few days, really, because you know, you're wondering in deep lakes as we both know. But I'm just not sure how relevant it is to this particular sort of section and paragraph, which is trying to sort of paint I think a picture that says, these are the current efforts of coordination. Your comment about the value of it and its context and a broader phrasingology, you know, I'm not sure really sits in the SSAC paper debut.

WARREN KUMARI: No, but I think my concern is, this is going to be read by-- a fair bit of this talks about things like alternative resolution and blah, blah, blah. And so it's going to be read by those folk. And so I think maybe if we don't intentionally piss them off in the first paragraph of this, that might help. So I'm not saying whether or not it was a good coordination stuff. It feels like we might be overselling what they will think [CROSSTALK].

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Well, is there a less strong word that we can use beside facilitated? Because, essentially, one of these proposals provide is a sandbox. Two sandboxes for different purposes. And that I can understand why

someone would take offense if we called that facilitated. Because you're not really facilitating children if you tell them to go play with the tonka truck and the sandbox. Is there like free form coordination or something like that?

WARREN KUMARI: I mean, if we're really facilitated, that helps. Or there have be numerous proposals and discussions over the years that attempt to address some. Okay, how about I just provide some text?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Sure.

WARREN KUMARI: Have been numerous discussions and proposals to provide some sort of coordination.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Some kind of coordination sounds kind of coy like just tell me what kind of coordination we're talking about or is this limited?

WARREN KUMARI: Yeah. Does that work instead?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yeah, but make it one paragraph. Or do you really want two paragraphs?

WARREN KUMARI: I don't know. To me, it feels better as two because it feels like it flows better, but whatever. Actually, there'll be newer discussions. What about this instead? What's that instead? That's too sharp. Too sharp. Regarding.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Then you would want to say regarding how to coordinate. There have been numerous discussions over the years regarding how to coordinate. Yeah, works for me.

WARREN KUMARI: Does anybody hate that?

GEOFF HUSTON: I always find this sort of passive sentence of going, there were discussions is kind of like, there were smoke filled rooms. We're not going to tell you who was in the room, we're not going to tell you what they said, but we're just going to refer to it as we know and you don't. When you say numerous discussions, it kind of invites who, what, where and when?

WARREN KUMARI: What if we have some links to things like where--

GEOFF HUSTON: That would instantiate a bit of for me. So if you either have links to presentations or you have some rephrase in the talks about there has been consideration of the question of how to coordinate between over many years. And consideration kind of says, much the same thing without really saying, well, there were talks and you weren't coming.

WARREN KUMARI: What was your wording? It sounded good, but I don't remember what it was exactly.

GEOFF HUSTON: There has been consideration over the years regarding. And there has been consideration. And that's pretty clear without trying to say we talk. There was a discussion.

WARREN KUMARI: Okay, I wanted to add consideration and discussion. But I think we can say and discussion.

GEOFF HUSTON: Yeah. Yeah. That kind of works a little better. It doesn't sort of lead to an insider track that the rate of what's in [00:51:31 -inaudible].

WARREN KUMARI: And can I put coordination back or not?

GEOFF HUSTON: Yeah.

WARREN KUMARI: Okay.

BARRY LEIBA: Okay, while you're finishing typing that, we're almost at the top of the hour. And I wanted to hit one question before we wrap it up. The time this call all ends, which winds up being 6pm my time is somewhat inconvenient for me. And I would like to move it an hour earlier. I appreciate that that means Geoff is on an hour early.

GEOFF HUSTON: No, it's not a problem for me. You're moving it from 7am to 6am. I do those hours easy.

BARRY LEIBA: Okay, because my convenience does not override your convenience, so I just want to make sure that really is okay with you.

GEOFF HUSTON: It's perfectly okay.

WARREN KUMARI: I'll point out that one hour earlier, there is admin SSAC evolution, the DNS resolution meeting.

BARRY LEIBA: Yes, we're moving that an hour earlier also. That's just Russ and Andrew and me getting together. Is everyone else on the call okay with moving us an hour earlier? And I will take silence as a, it's okay. All right. So I will post something to the work party mailing list. We will not make this change next week. We will still be at this time next week, and I'll just post to the work party list to see if anybody has a problem with moving it. Okay. Thanks, everybody.

WARREN KUMARI: Actually, one very last quick question.

BARRY LEIBA: Yes, go.

WARREN KUMARI: Who here is going to be at RIPE? I don't know if I will be yet, but I thought I would be. Andrew and Geoff.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I'll be riding my bike there.

WARREN KUMARI: Okay.

BARRY LEIBA: So when is that?

GEOFF HUSTON: Taken last week of May or the last week. It's sort of the 20 mumble list of May.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: The 25th of May is when it intersects to this work party.

BARRY LEIBA: Likely we will cancel that one, but we'll sort that out as it comes.

WARREN KUMARI: Yeah, and maybe some of us can get together and also talk about it in person or have lunch or something.

BARRY LEIBA: So I understand there is a GWG workshop next week that this conflicts with.

GEOFF HUSTON: You know, the GWG workshop starts at 11:30PM and continues to 9AM for 3 days running. By the time we get to day 3 this time, I don't think I'll be alive. And I'm certainly sure I won't be on a GWG call because that's just insane. That clash wasn't for the [CROSSTALK].

BARRY LEIBA: All right. So this still will be on next week. And if Geoff is alive enough to make it, we will be happy to have you on.

GEOFF HUSTON: I confidently predict this is a live priority in GWG. And that's sad, but true.

BARRY LEIBA: All right. Okay, everybody. Thanks for coming on this week, and we'll see you next week. Same bat time, same bat chat.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]