WHOIS WG Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 06 August 2012 at 1900 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of WHOIS WG on the Monday 06[h] August 2012 at 1900 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-whois-survey-wg-20120806-en.mp3

Attendees
Michael Young - Individual
Wilson Abigaba - RrSG
Don Blumenthal - RySG
Susan Prosser – RrSG
Cintra Sooknanan – ALAC

ICANN Staff
Berry Cobb
Nathalie Peregrine

Apology:
Steve Metalitz – IPC
Anne Naffziger - IPC

Coordinator: ...remind all participants that this conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, very much, Operator. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the Whois working group call on the 6 of August 2021. On the call today we have Wilson Abigaba, Don Blumenthal, Susan Prosser, and Michael Young.

Cintra Sooknanan will be joining us in 30 minutes. We have an apology from Steve Metalitz. And from staff we have Berry Cobb and myself Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind all parties to please state their names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

Michael Young: All right, thank you very much, that was great. How you do that so smoothly - I mean you must do that a zillion times but you sound like a newscaster when you introduce these calls, it's fantastic.

Berry, do you want to just review the agenda with us real quick and see if anyone wants to add anything more in? Because I think we're just going to jump into reviewing the questions otherwise.

Berry Cobb: Yes, that's pretty much all we have.

Michael Young: Okay, does anyone want to add anything more to the agenda, anything that we hadn't planned?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I think that there's probably one thing that we should talk about and maybe we can go ahead and talk about it now before we get started is, you know, we are about half way through the public comment and we probably ought to start thinking about what our next steps are to actually get the survey published.

First and foremost is, you know, once we've updated the questions and made any changes or corrections per the comment then for other suggestions, where will the survey be hosted? You know, what will the actual URL be? Will it reside on one of the ISOC.UG servers where we had the draft or is it going to be promoted to more a production-based server?

And then the second aspect which is really just all on my to-do is once we've left the final version of the survey that we'll start sending out the communications to all the constituencies and stakeholder groups as well as advertising, just kind of like we do for a public comment about the availability of the survey and - you know, be open for other suggestions on how we communicate its availability.

So I guess the first question, Wilson, what do you envision on where the final survey will be hosted? Will it be on the same instance as what we did for the draft survey?

And...

Michael Young: Wilson?

Wilson Abigaba: Yes, do you want me to confirm something?

Berry Cobb: Yes, so Wilson, the question to you is once we've updated the final version of the survey where do you see this being hosted at? Is it going to be on the same ISOC server that we used for the draft survey?

Wilson Abigaba: Yes, available for use if you'd like to use it. Only I (unintelligible). I'm fine with it and it's available for use.

Michael Young: Okay, can we set up a URL that points to this survey though, Wilson, that's not - that's maybe a little bit more blasé and generic so that people are able to differentiate and invitation to the survey from any kind of association with - you know, a commercial effort or phishing or anything like that?

We just want to make it really clear by trying to use a recognizable URL. And I mean for that purpose I wonder if we can't get something set up to point to that server from - out of ICANN's domain space. Berry, that's one thing I worry about.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I will definitely get with the IT guys. I wouldn't see it being a problem about getting something like ICANN.org/Whois...

Michael Young: Survey or something.

Berry Cobb: Something like that.

Michael Young: Yes, and then point it toward wherever Wilson wants to mount it up, right.

Wilson Abigaba: (Unintelligible) I'm certainly fine with me. I'll just give you that technical requirement I need, like, just a database and PHP (unintelligible) all I would need.

Michael Young: Wilson, what we were saying is if we put it on the servers that you're using if you want, if that's easier. I'm just talking about setting up a URL that points towards your servers so that we're actually - when people follow the URL link they're feeling secure about using that link to a survey because it's underneath ICANN's domain space.

Wilson Abigaba: Yes, would be fine with me. But I know (unintelligible) those would be if ICANN can provide a server with PHP and MySQL I can also install it there.

Michael Young: That's even better. Berry, can you look into that?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I'll ask. If it is available to do I suspect that it may take time to do it, which would delay us getting this out to the public even further. But I'll take the action to ask, again, internal for both the URL and for hosting.

Michael Young: Wilson, do you want to send an email to Berry that specifies exactly what you'd like in terms of someone (unintelligible) a server?

Wilson Abigaba: Yes, sure.

Michael Young: Okay.

Wilson Abigaba: Yes, I'll send an email with the (unintelligible) of the server.

Michael Young: Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Great, thank you. And so then the second half is how we communicate this out. As I've mentioned, most definitely within the GNSO and the other SOs and ACs will be able to send, you know, basically through the mailing list to communicate the availability of the survey as well as I'll...

Michael Young: Twitter feed.

Berry Cobb: Yes, we can have ICANN communications send out a couple of Twitter...

Michael Young: Tweets, okay. That'd be great. Is there anything else (unintelligible) done to notify the related communities?

Berry Cobb: I'll ask. We could probably maybe try to get a splash page on the homepage of ICANN.org as well for - you know, at least a week or two once we first release it. So I'll investigate that as well.

Michael Young: Can we see if we can't get the - someone in the IRR - RIRs and the - and maybe even ISOC and the (ITF) and so forth to maybe retreat - retweet ICANN's tweet to their communities just to see if we can get more people who have a vested interest in Whois to take a look at the survey? And there's a (unintelligible) all right to ICANN?

Berry Cobb: What was the last part, Michael?

Michael Young: There's - isn't there not a standing (ITF) liaison to ICANN? Can we use that position?

Berry Cobb: Yes, on the board I'm pretty sure there is but I'm not sure - I think it's only at the board level but I'll ask around in terms of some of the other technical guys in ICANN to see about passing the communications to the IRIs and ISOC.

Michael Young: Yes, and Don, I mean - I'm sure you won't mind posting to (WIRDS) because you've already put a couple of things to (WIRDS), right?

Don Blumenthal: Yes.

Michael Young: So that would be a great list to get started but, Berry, I guess with my point with the (ITF) is not everyone subscribes to the general announce list. And even if one group gets something that's interesting on working group they don't necessarily go and post it in the general announce list.

                  So - and there's lots of people that may not be actively involved in (WIRDS) but may have something interesting to say around Whois, you know, like maybe the guys in the GNSO Ops Group or something like that, right?

Berry Cobb: Right.

Michael Young: Yes, so getting something posted in their general mailing list might be helpful.

Berry Cobb: All right, I'll definitely take a look at that. And then, you know, the last suggestion is maybe if we got this done we could do a commercial for the Olympics.

                  All right, any other discussion points about - I guess, turning the thing on? I think that covers the two things that I had thought about.

Michael Young: That gives you everything you need?

Berry Cobb: For now, yes.

Michael Young: Okay, good.

Berry Cobb: All right, so let's jump over - back into the public comments unless anybody has anything else?

Michael Young: Going once, going twice? No, okay. Let's go.

Berry Cobb: We left off at the last meeting on Row 32. This is unknown and it was from the survey tool. The first comment is noticed a whole lot of typos, especially missing spaces between words. And then the second comment is on yes/no questions, something that looks like a condition with possible options is confusing.

                   And I think with respect to the first comment we're covering those as we come across the comments through the public comment tool. We've already made some changes.

                   And then, of course, I think we'll also be doing a final review across the working group to catch any other typos and missing spaces and stuff like that as well.

                   And any comments on the second - the yes/no question? The only one that I see that's in this section is Question 37, do you support the use of standardized handling of error conditions within the (unintelligible)?

Michael Young: So that - again, just falls into an editing pass, right?

Berry Cobb: Maybe, I'm actually kind of confused by what the person's listing here.

Michael Young: So what do you think they're referring to then on - we're looking at 32, Number 32. What do you think they're referring to? And I've got the PDF opened, again, if we're referring back to that.

Berry Cobb: You know, again, there's two yes/no questions; 35 and 37 in this section. But it seems pretty clear to me that it's one of the two options. I'm personally kind of confused by the comment.

Michael Young: Yes, I don't know, that's why I suggested - I don't see them, that's why I suggested we do another editing pass. We've got typos and so forth still to correct anyways.

Berry Cobb: All right.

Michael Young: And that's just a general editing pass.

Berry Cobb: Right, right. Okay, moving on to 33, typo on question, (unintelligible) suggests such error conditions within the Whois system missing a space between such and error. And I've documented in our action that we'll just add a space to Question 38.

                All right, that takes care of Section 6 of the survey. We'll be moving on to Section 7, which is submitting Whois queries for domain names. The first comment, again, is unknown. Wild card search is nice, even nicer for marketing purchase or intellectual property (unintelligible).

                I have here, it's a list - as the working group response is noted as an opinion but not survey related. Any other comments in that regard?

Michael Young: Berry, can you slide the screen up a little bit more?

Berry Cobb: Yes.

Michael Young: Okay, thanks.

Berry Cobb: So again, anybody disagree that this is more opinion related versus a survey adjustment related?

Michael Young: I find all of Section 6 to be opinion-based.

Berry Cobb: Well, except for 36 which we'll get to.

Susan Crawford: Yes.

Berry Cobb: So if nobody objects then I'll move on to 35 real quick, these questions were for general users listed as the working group response that will refer back to Comment 20, which is kind of the master (unintelligible).

And that's going to be one final step after we do our final review is to maybe look at each section and listing out who the possible user types to answers the questions may be or at least referring to the skills required to answer the question. So I listed that and a recommendation is none.

Row 36, as a representative of a constituency I'd rather answer on behalf of not just myself and my needs, the wording of the questions on this page are specific to me and my personal needs, which I think may be too narrow.

Don Blumenthal: That - this is (unintelligible) to me.

Michael Young: Yes, I - do we want to have a constituency - if the constituency is willing to answer this survey as an individual? We don't have a specific mechanism so how would we do that and should we do that? Traditionally, Berry, has ICANN allowed that?

Berry Cobb: I - certainly my - I'm only three years into this. My takeaway is really that it's kind of up to the constituency if they choose to enter one in as a collective but, again, we're not really taking identification of the survey takers.

So we'd really have no way of knowing. And unless we did that - minus what we're doing in the profile, but - minus that, I'm not sure that it would really make that much of a difference.

For example, the business consistency may decide to submit the survey as one on their own but there is certainly nothing preventing from any of the individuals in the BC from taking the survey as well. Nor would we have a way to try to gate keep that. So any communication in that regard may be a little confusing.

Michael Young: So how do we identify - how do they identify themselves as a user of the survey? Wilson, if they want to come in as a constituency if they choose - I assume if they're coming in on behalf of the constituency they're going to identify themselves?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. The only way that they would really identify themselves, again, is just from the profile. And I think that we list - that we ask if they belong to a business - or if - constituency or not.

Susan Crawford: In the very beginning of it - this is (Susan). We do ask - not specifically if they're a constituency within the ICANN organization - actually, no, we do, non-commercial, government. But not by terms of - if it's part of the BC or the NGO. Just as a single user.

Michael Young: Okay.

Susan Crawford: Does that need to be defined better in the very beginning?

Michael Young: If we - should we add a - do you mean, Susan, put a question there are you representing a constituency or a group?

Susan Crawford: Well - yes, if that's what the Question 36 is - or Comment 36 is defining, they want to know that the survey taker is representing the consistency, an ICANN specific constituency.

Michael Young: Yes. So in our clarifying questions on identify at the - on - around the individual taking this survey at the beginning we should just add in a question then to - are you representing an interest group or a constituency. And then can we create a drop-down list of all the ICANN recognized - well, maybe we should allow them to do it freeform, yes?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. You know, that I read the second sentence, the wording of the questions on this page are specific to me and my personal needs, which I think may be too narrow. Do you think that it could be - he or she could be pointing at the fact of, like, Questions 42 through 44 or 45? Do you need...

Michael Young: I see what you mean, do you - yes, do they just want to make them more generic?

Berry Cobb: Yes, instead of second person make them third person or no person.

Susan Crawford: Right.

Michael Young: You know, let's just drop out the personalization in all those questions.

Berry Cobb: And then the...

Michael Young: Is there a need to include/exclude - all right. Forty-three, is there a need for the ability to search by wildcard? Forty-four, is there a need for the ability to search in the native language?

Berry Cobb: All right, cool.

Michael Young: Berry, how long are we scheduled for the call today?

Berry Cobb: Technically, two hours but we can go an hour-and-a-half or however long we want to really go.

Michael Young: Okay. Well, let's just see how far we get for an hour-and-a-half. Susan, Don, can you guys do an hour-and-a-half today?

Don Blumenthal: Yes, no problem.

Susan Crawford: Yes.

Don Blumenthal: Now I'll have to cut if we go over two hours but I'm okay for what we're scheduled.

Michael Young: Okay.

Susan Crawford: Yes.

Don Blumenthal: Just a general typographical suggestion, some point we'll probably do a search and replace. There's a lot of - actually I just lost it. There's a lot of (unintelligible) running together and a lot of such a - such error run together. It's kind of a repeated problem. And I'm seeing more as I look beyond what was mentioned in the comments.

Berry Cobb: You're correct on - I think after we get most of these major changes in then we'll have to probably - I think what we'll more or less need to do is once Wilson makes the changes to the actual survey questions he'll stand it up again and turn it on so that we in the working group can go back and review it through the actual survey itself.

    And then I think collectively what we'll probably need to do is if we find those specific errors then we'll just have to send an email to the list saying, you know, Question 45, words three and four need a space between them.

Because unfortunately Wilson's basically the only one that has access to make any edits to this.

Don Blumenthal: No, I was just suggesting that's a consistent error that might be solved with one operation.

Berry Cobb: Okay.

Michael Young: Folks, I need to grab a power cord because I'm running out of juice on this laptop. I'll be right back.

Berry Cobb: Okay, so moving on to Row 37, look up of anything other than domain name should be explicitly banned. I believe we agree that this is opinion-related.

And Number 38, there's no excuse for not handling Unicode. It's not the 20th century anymore. Unfortunately searching in (PUNI) code is also necessary. And I think we agreed that this was an opinion as well.

Okay, hearing no comments, so that takes us to the next section, adoption of a structured data model for Whois. And the first comment is Row 39, so much technical beating around the bush that is ultimately dependent on your preference regarding the details of either a Thick Whois or a Thin Whois.

My guess is that this was probably more opinion related.

Michael Young: Okay, I'm back.

Berry Cobb: We just started Section 7, Row 39.

Michael Young: Thirty-nine seems like an opinion.

Don Blumenthal: Yes.

Susan Crawford: Yes.

Berry Cobb: Forty, if there was any way to decide a common policy across gTLDs and ccTLDs on mandatory fields then, yes, I'd support that. I think opinion as well?

Michael Young: Yes, it's interesting but it's still opinion.

Berry Cobb: Okay, Row 41, Items 1, 4, 5, and 6 are for technical users. Item 1 may also be for general users if extensible is defined. And then Items 2, 3, 7, 8, and 9 are probably good for all.

Michael Young: Did I not catch extensible in the definitions that I did before?

Berry Cobb: You know, I think we implemented those after this PDF was generated. I'm not sure if we can...

Michael Young: Okay. So I think this might be solved then.

Berry Cobb: Right. I will take a working group - or the recommended action that we should define extensible or at least check to make sure that it has on the live survey.

Don Blumenthal: I'm - but you've got to jump back here. Okay, I'm a little confused, just want to make sure I'm looking at the right documents. You know, I'm looking at Question 41 on the PDFs and I've only got seven options.

Berry Cobb: We're actually on Question 46 now.

Don Blumenthal: How did we get from 41 to 46?

Berry Cobb: Because the - we moved into the Section - we're only just reviewing the comments from the tool and Row 39 started Section 7, adoption of the structured data model for Whois.

Don Blumenthal: All right.

Berry Cobb: And so on Page 13 of the PDF is Question 46 for Requirement 6A.

Don Blumenthal: I apologize. I'm thoroughly confused right now.

Berry Cobb: Yes, no worries. So I think number - in terms of the comment Item 1 is Question 46. Item 2 is 47 and so forth. And so if I'm counting that correctly there should be nine questions in this section, which I think that's the case. Correct, yes, nine questions.

Don Blumenthal: I'm just going to have to step back because I have no clue right now what's going on. I'm tracing what's on my screen which is Section 7 started with Question 39.

Michael Young: Right, so Don, look at 41 in Section 7.

Don Blumenthal: Right.

Michael Young: So Items 1, 4, 5, and 6. Section 7, now bounce over to the PDF of the questions that we've been using. And Berry...

Don Blumenthal: Not the items in the question itself.

Michael Young: Right.

Berry Cobb: It really should be stating Questions 1, 4, 5, and 6 are for technical users instead of items.

Don Blumenthal: I got it. Okay, I'm back.

Michael Young: So it - 41 just seemed pretty editorial except for the extensible comment. And I think we covered that in our hover definitions. So we should be okay then.

Berry Cobb: Yes, and well just take the action to make sure that it is defined on survey tool.

Michael Young: Forty-two just sounds like someone not technical enough to answer that.

Berry Cobb: Yes.

Michael Young: Which is okay, there will be people that can't answer these questions. Pretty interesting. What do they mean by - forcing mandatory fields will lead to registrars entering false information? Do they mean mandatory Whois data?

Don Blumenthal: I think so. And the person's suggesting that nobody's going to enter everything. If you force mandatory fields you're going to get false data and that's just nonsense.

Michael Young: Well, yes, and plus that train left the station a long time ago.

Don Blumenthal: Yes, it did.

Michael Young: And 44 seems to be...

Wilson Abigaba: (Unintelligible)

Michael Young: Yes, no, I think they're talking about, Wilson, is not our questions being mandatory but the general implementation of ICANN gTLD Whois in the - since the Thick registries occurred require you to - require registrars to populate the registry's central Whois with required data.

Susan Crawford: Yes, Question 53 addresses that, 53 and 54.

Michael Young: And 44 sounds like some more commentary. But it doesn't - I don't know if
                   we have any action on 44 either.

Don Blumenthal: Berry, I agree.

Michael Young: So unless anyone has any other suggestions on changing I think Section 7,
                   that closes Section 7 off.

Berry Cobb: Okay, so moving on to Section 8, which is extending the currently defined set
                   of registration data elements. Row 45, Whois information should be restricted
                   to a limited population with legitimate needs like LEAs. This would require
                   policy and the technical mechanism for identifying who makes the query.

Michael Young: It's an interesting proposal but it's kind of out of our scope, isn't it?

Berry Cobb: I would think. It's more policy related than necessarily...

Michael Young: Functionality, and certainly the functionality that this describes or questions
                   asked about, includes the ability to create tiered access or tiered user groups.

                   So someone who wanted to, if they were in a particular regime where they
                   used a Whois service and their policy supported this type of behavior there's
                   no reason that the functionality that we've been asking questions about would
                   - it would allow them to do this if that's what they wanted to do.

Don Blumenthal: Don't we ask some Who Was questions in the survey?

Michael Young: We ask Who Was questions. We ask questions about authentication and
                   tiered access. So that covers all this stuff.

Susan Crawford: Yes.

Michael Young: So I don't think, Berry, we have anything for this one. We don't need to do anything for this one.

Berry Cobb: Oka, got that documented. Next one of - or common comment, these items are for general users, again, pointing back to Comment 20. Row 47, a typo, it should be possible to collect contact information using a local address format based - or Whois needs to be a space there.

Michael Young: Okay.

Berry Cobb: What question number is that?

Michael Young: Berry, can I make a suggestion?

Berry Cobb: Yes, and I'll ask if the group's comfortable with this but I'm personally comfortable with - any time that there's typos in these comments you can go through and just process them over to Wilson to fix the typos. I don't think we need to agree to fix spelling mistakes and typos as a working group. Unless someone objects to that?

Don Blumenthal: No, (unintelligible).

Michael Young: Okay. So Berry, I think you have our support just to go ahead and process those ones.

Berry Cobb: Okay, does anybody catch which question that one is referring to right off hand?

Michael Young: Gosh, (unintelligible).

Susan Crawford: There is - I think possibly Question 60, information - and this is Susan.

Berry Cobb: Yes, there is it.

Susan Crawford: But also 57 has one as well.

Berry Cobb: Yes, I found 57, cool.

Susan Crawford: And there's one at 59.

Michael Young: Not doing so good.

Berry Cobb: Okay, great. Moving on to 48, social media contacts are only of use to spammers. Previous history needs to be kept but there are privacy issues that need to be addressed.

Michael Young: Okay, keeping my personal opinions out of it, the first sentence is an opinion. The second one is interesting. I don't know that it requires us to change our questions. Interesting.

Berry Cobb: Definitely more policy related than technical.

Michael Young: It is. It's interesting though because it does infer functionality because it infers, you know, Who Was has to have certain privacy capabilities - should be certain - it's inferring that there should be certain technical capabilities around privacy in regards to Who Was information.

                  And again, I think that that's reflected in the tiered permissions questions that we ask because if you - the ability to create dedicated access groups with different capabilities with accessing information, that would - that type of structure or functionality would also apply to Who Was data as well.

                  Although that might not be obvious in our survey. Do we need to change anything to make that more obvious in our survey? I'm going to suggest that we take - we just write a note to consider that when we get to the - when we look at the tiered permissions authentical framework which is just below.

Berry Cobb: Okay. All right, moving on to the next one, 49, historical info may be available on a subscription cost model only, that's probably more opinion related.

Michael Young: Yes, it almost sounds like business development. It's interesting but it doesn't - it's out of our scope I think.

Berry Cobb: Okay.

Michael Young: Folks, if I throw out an idea or a comment, please jump in there and disagree with me if you have any problem with it. I'm just doing this to help keep the flow going quickly for us.

Berry Cobb: Great, moving on to Section 9, internationalized registration data requirements. The only comment we had was just outlining the user types in terms of ability to answer the questions. And then I went ahead and wrote in here just to confirm, that U label and A label and US (ASCE) are defined our survey tool.

Michael Young: Yes, I think I recall doing all those but - yes, let's just check our (unintelligible) definitions.

Berry Cobb: Okay, all right. Moving on to Section 10, Row 51. Should this elevated access right to be granted to automatic computer systems or people carrying out a task?

Michael Young: If - ultimately automated computer systems area citing on behalf of people that need to carry out a task. So I'm not exactly sure what they're trying to get at here.

Berry Cobb: Yes, I think this is probably more opinion-related than...

Michael Young: Yes, does anyone have any thoughts on that one? I mean I would just kind of categorize it as opinion.

Don Blumenthal: Well, it's - yes, it's a policy question.

Michael Young: Okay.

Don Blumenthal: (Unintelligible) from this and how would it (unintelligible) from this?

Michael Young: Right.

Don Blumenthal: I'm not sure that gets us any place different but it's...

Michael Young: I just don't have any brainwaves on how we react to this one or if we need to do anything.

Berry Cobb: Certainly not with respect to the survey.

Don Blumenthal: No, I'd let it slide.

Berry Cobb: Okay, moving on to Row 52, need the none option to stay consistent with the no option of top questions in R8.1.

Michael Young: Okay, so that refers to...

Susan Crawford: This is Susan. Is it referring to Question 73 should be a none? No.

Michael Young: I think that the open - the none is equivalent to the first line, isn't it, Susan?

Susan Crawford: Well, I think they actually might be referring to Question 74, needs a none option to be consistent with the no or R8 - R.8 which is Question 72.

Michael Young: Okay.

Susan Crawford: I think they're referring to Question 74 where it talks about unranked computer systems. I think.

Michael Young: That makes sense when the earlier comment on automated computer systems.

Susan Crawford: Right.

Michael Young: I forgot we put in this question, okay. This - the report, I don't recall this in our open discussion.

(Unintelligible), yes, we should have a none there.

Susan Crawford: Yes.

Berry Cobb: Agreed and noted. Okay, moving to Question 50 - or Comment 53, the elevated access question should allow more than one answer.

Michael Young: Which one are they referring to?

Berry Cobb: I think it's 74 again as well.

Susan Crawford: Or do you think it's 72? This is Susan. Because it could be answer for - as employee or as a - like - well, maybe not.

Don Blumenthal: No, 74 (unintelligible) for multiple choice. It's one, two, or both. But I think 72 makes more sense.

Susan Crawford: Tend to agree with (Bob) - Don on that one too.

Michael Young: Yes, I would agree. Can we set 72 to allow multiple selections?

Susan Crawford: In fact, Comment 54 makes the same reference.

Berry Cobb: Does that change the wording of our options if I select multiples though?

Michael Young: Is there a reason we just can't allow them to select more than one?

Don Blumenthal: Can't think of any.

Susan Crawford: I think Wilson just needs to change the format. And then under the please choose all that apply or please choose any of the following.

Michael Young: Right.

Berry Cobb: Should we do that for all the questions or just 72 within this section? I guess 74 won't need it since it has the both. What about 73 though?

Michael Young: Sorry, I was talking to mute. In 73 there are layers of granularity, say you - the idea is to select the one that fits the level of granularity.

Berry Cobb: Okay. All right, moving on to - so I have here in the recommendation action for work - Comment 53 is just to adjust Question 72 to allow more than one option and then change the text to please select all that apply.

And moving on to Comment 54, I think we agreed that this is also the same kind of issue as on Comment 53. So I'm just referring the action up to 53.

Don Blumenthal: Yes.

Berry Cobb: Okay, moving on to Comment 55, finally a warm body from Chuck Gnomes. Note that the fifth choice of the first question is missing something at the beginning.

Don Blumenthal: Yes.

Susan Crawford: Yes.

Don Blumenthal: Yes.

Berry Cobb: Should that be a yes or a no?

Michael Young: It should be a yes.

Susan Crawford: Yes.

Don Blumenthal: Yes.

Berry Cobb: Good old, Chuck, thanks guy. All right, moving on to 56, unknown. These
                   except for the last one are probably best for general users although VPN may
                   need to be defined for them. The last one is probably best asked of technical
                   users.

                   And just like with the other ones, we'll verify if VPN is defined. And then,
                   again, Comment 20 is our master action here.

Michael Young: So we just - do we define VPN and the other definitions?

Berry Cobb: Again, I don't think that the survey's up right now so we can't confirm that but
                   when we have Wilson turn it back on to make these changes then we'll go in
                   a validate. And I've taken that note to confirm it has been defined.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay, perhaps maybe we'll (unintelligible) maybe a week for all of the group
                   to review every thing before I publish it to the public. (Unintelligible).

Michael Young: Yes.

Berry Cobb: Absolutely, in fact, Wilson, I think it would - you know, I think there's a good chance we may - if we don't finish the comments today we'll definitely finish them by our meeting next week.

So if it's possible maybe go ahead and activate the survey again and we can start - you can start making some of those changes. And then in parallel, we can also start looking for other typo errors and those kinds of things and confirm if some of these definitions still need to be defined or not.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay.

Berry Cobb: Okay, great. Row 57, some of these questions seem to not allow for the maximal case of constraints.

Michael Young: I have no idea what that means.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I'm confused as well.

Michael Young: Well, since they didn't identify themselves, you know, we can't clarify it. So I mean we just have to put this one aside.

Berry Cobb: Okay, Row 58, these questions are poorly formed, they don't distinguish policy operations and protocol questions adequately.

Michael Young: All right, well, that's a nice opinion. I don't know. We categorize everything into the different sections. Does anyone have any further suggestions on how we can improve this? Because I don't think that we can.

Susan Crawford: I think it's just an opinion.

Don Blumenthal: Yes, it's an opinion. Some of them (unintelligible) distinguished anyway.

Susan Crawford: Yes.

Berry Cobb: And certainly the policy part is out of scope. Operation and protocol may be in scope but as stated we don't really - there's no more adequate instruction for changing it.

Okay, Row 59. Looks like it's a typo to add a space. And for the working group's instruction we'll move on and I'll make sure that we note the action to clean that up.

Row 60, if you are intending on keeping this antiquated junk then registrars and registries need access to the data and everyone else should get blocked.

Michael Young: Okay, opinion.

Berry Cobb: I'm really looking forward to some of the responses on the actual survey.

Susan Crawford: It will be entertaining.

Berry Cobb: Indeed.

Don Blumenthal: (Unintelligible).

Berry Cobb: Okay, I think that takes care of Section 10. And our next section is implementing an authorization framework. Starting on Row 61, unknown, where do you see granulated access to RDDS on a one to five scale of importance?

Michael Young: Sorry, I thought we were the ones that were doing the survey.

Don Blumenthal: Let me just (unintelligible) this out. Is this a suggested question?

Berry Cobb: It's kind of how I'm taking it.

Michael Young: Yes.

Berry Cobb: Wait, no, Question 80 is where do you see granulated access to RDDS on a one to five scale of importance.

Don Blumenthal: Yes, now I'm even more confused. I will take the action to go back and try to find this - I'm pretty confident that I captured the section of it. Essentially what I had to do is cut and paste out of the PDF of responses for each one and perhaps I missed the second sentence on that. So I'll come back to this one.

Michael Young: Okay.

Berry Cobb: Okay, Row 62, these are probably okay for all users.

Michael Young: Opinion, great, thank you.

Berry Cobb: It goes back to our master of action on Comment 20.

Michael Young: Right, just trying to categorize all the questions, okay.

Berry Cobb: Yes, okay. What is granulated access? It should be defined.

Don Blumenthal: It is in the setup, isn't it?

Michael Young: I think so. And regardless, I think I did a hover definition - but a hover definition if we don't have one.

Don Blumenthal: (Unintelligible) authorization framework that is capable of providing granular (unintelligible) and data, that's (unintelligible).

Michael Young: Yes. I guess they just missed that.

Don Blumenthal: So do we want to go back to Chuck? He was so precise about (unintelligible).

Michael Young: Yes, Berry. Can you take that as an action item to circle back to him and say
we looked at this and this is where we think it's defined? Does he mean
something else or did he just miss that?

Berry Cobb: I'm thinking he just missed it but I'll try to get back to him. He may not
remember even filling these out.

Michael Young: He's pretty good with this stuff.

Berry Cobb: Yes, I'm joking.

Don Blumenthal: My guess is he missed it too but just knowing Chuck I wanted to make sure.

Berry Cobb: Okay, all right, moving on to 64. My expectation is that the (WIRDS) working
group can come up with clear and mandatory implementation guidelines for
the authentication framework that goes beyond simply recommending the use
of (HTTP) authentication.

Michael Young: Sure.

Don Blumenthal: Having been at the (WIRDS) working group last week in Vancouver, don't be
so sure.

Michael Young: There's a lot of interesting banter on that mailing list, Don, I do have to say.

Don Blumenthal: Yes.

Michael Young: It's not within our scope anyway, right.

Don Blumenthal: Yes.

Berry Cobb: Is it fair to classify this more as an opinion?

Michael Young: I think it's opinion.

Don Blumenthal: Yes, definitely.

Michael Young: Wishful thinking? Does wishful thinking count as an opinion?

Berry Cobb: Okay, Row 65, I should not empathize enough that granular access to data is together with - that - enough that granular access to data is together with (IDN) support the one reason why Whois needs a fundamental rethinking and reengineering, hence this is not option.

Michael Young: On a personal level I think that's why we're all here but it's really an opinion statement I think because we do have to go through the exercise of giving people the opportunity to say whether or not (IDN) support is mandatory. It should be mandatory whether or not Whois overall needs reengineering. But I don't think this survey would be being done if we weren't already there.

Berry Cobb: Well, this is Berry. I got a feeling that maybe this is the secondary comment to Row 61. I'll still confirm but maybe that's kind of the - how they...

Michael Young: They're supposed to go together?

Berry Cobb: I think so.

Michael Young: That would make sense.

Berry Cobb: Okay, so I noted 65 as opinion and no recommended action. Row 66, being able to protect privacy is key.

Michael Young: Yes, that's opinion.

Berry Cobb: Opinion. Sixty-seven, this question needs refinement such as where one means granulated access is not desirable, important is too ambiguous, .i.e. it could be important to not have granulated access implemented or to have it. In which case, an answer such as granulated access is important at a level of five is very misleading.

Michael Young: Wow, that just confused me, sorry.

Susan Crawford: This is Susan. I think what they mean is important to have it or important not to have it. Like, define which direction it's supposed to go.

Don Blumenthal: But it's there on the line, isn't it?

Susan Crawford: Where do you granular access to RDDS on the scale of one to five importance? Importance to have is a one or importance not to have it? I can see where they could get confused depending on your perspective towards it.

Michael Young: Yes, why don't we just add a bracket in, like, you're saying - you know, after this is says five meaning most important to have it - granular.

Don Blumenthal: That's at the bottom of the question.

Michael Young: It is. I missed that.

Susan Crawford: You're right, it is. So did they miss it too?

Michael Young: Okay, so the lesson to that is we should move it up to the top of the question?

Susan Crawford: Possibly.

Don Blumenthal: Yes.

Michael Young: Okay, we all missed it so it should go to the top.

Berry Cobb: And this is Berry. I'll denote this as a global change in the survey, that we
                     attended to the end of each question versus the bottom of the responses or
                     options.

Michael Young: Yes.

Don Blumenthal: (Unintelligible).

Berry Cobb: Give me a second while I take this note down.

                     Okay, moving on to 68, if there's any sort of special access to data available
                     governments around the world are going to want it for censorship or for worse
                     purposes under the name of lawful access.

Don Blumenthal: Okay, (unintelligible).

Berry Cobb: Yes.

Michael Young: Opinion.

Berry Cobb: Lots of opinions, okay. Moving on to Section 12. I just lost network access.
                     I'm going to take the synch function off so you guys can just migrate it on
                     your own.

Michael Young: Okay.

Berry Cobb: And we are at Section 12. Okay, Row 69, in reference to our question, does
                     the collection or use of any of these elements raise privacy or confidentiality
                     concerns? If so, please comment.

                     The other category should include, for example, information related to
                     payment which would be useful for LEAs.

Michael Young: I'm not sure what they mean by that. It almost sounds like they're thinking - or should not collect - should collect is in reference to payment versus data collection. It's strange.

Berry Cobb: This is in reference to Question 84.

Michael Young: Sorry, I was looking at 83, okay.

Berry Cobb: I think.

Susan Crawford: I think you're right.

Don Blumenthal: Yes.

Susan Crawford: Actually...

Don Blumenthal: But there's no other.

Michael Young: There's no other in 84. I think it was 83.

Susan Crawford: Well, but it means by 85 please comment or they're asking for an "other" category.

Don Blumenthal: Sixty-nine is an exact quote of Question 84.

Susan Crawford: Yes, so are they asking to put in an "other"?

Berry Cobb: It may make it more clear.

Michael Young: I guess the - how's 85 supposed to be read again, just - I'm looking at the PDF version of it. It just says, please comment.

Berry Cobb: I think the original intent was regardless of the answer we were looking for - you know, input as to their opinion regarding this.

Michael Young: So should 84 and 85 be conjoined? Because there's no comment box in 84. So I assume the comment box in 85 was meant to be the comment box for 84.

Berry Cobb: So wait, yes, but read the question. If so please comment. So if you select yes then 85 will appear to the...

Michael Young: Pops up.

Berry Cobb: Right.

Susan Crawford: Right.

Michael Young: Why don't we add something though when it pops up to say relational to 84?

Berry Cobb: I think the survey tool does that so as soon as you select yes then it will expand out, that - the please comment section. And I think that it's even tabbed over a little bit so you know that it's 84.

Michael Young: Okay.

Berry Cobb: But we can - how about, please comment on Question 84?

Don Blumenthal: Let's double-check that because other thoughts in the survey show the small line of code when there's a popup or a jump (unintelligible) or not sequential jump. I'm just not sure that's the case.

Berry Cobb: Yes, I'll take that note down. And so regardless, do we think that the other option is not necessary? Or maybe we should modify the question that if yes please comment.

Michael Young: Yes.

Susan Crawford: Right.

Don Blumenthal: Right.

Berry Cobb: Okay, moving on to Row 70, in reference to a question, to whom should access to audit data be available? Question is unclear. Do you mean who should be auditing? It should allow more than one answer. As a registrar I'd want to audit my data but I assume ICANN might want to audit as well. LEA might want access subject to a court order.

Michael Young: So this should definitely be able to select one or more of the following.

Berry Cobb: This is in reference to Question 86.

Michael Young: Yes.

Don Blumenthal: Yes.

Michael Young: And maybe we clarify the question to say which party should have access to audit data - comma, should it be available?

Berry Cobb: Could you repeat that, Michael?

Michael Young: Which party should have access to audit data - comma, should it be available?

Don Blumenthal: That's - I agree but I think his - the comment makes an interesting point. Who would - who's auditing are we talking about?

Michael Young: Well, that's another question and it's a policy one as to who actually does the audits, right?

Don Blumenthal: Well, multiple - I mean as they suggest, ICANN hopefully will be doing more auditing. That's an opinion.

Michael Young: Well, but ICANN...

Don Blumenthal: A registrar could be doing auditing and any number of other organizations.

Michael Young: Right, or they could simply be requesting the audit data to review it, right? If it be simply a requirement for the operator, the Whois service to retain or maintain auditable data.

Don Blumenthal: Right.

Michael Young: And then any of those parties could - want to interact with it. I don't know that we - I don't know if it's in our scope to ask who should be the one responsible for doing the actual auditing. We're just talking about who's the stakeholder in consuming audit data. Because that would predetermine - that would give you an indication of what kind of functionality the system has to have.

If you've got to distribute that auditable data to multiple parties it's a different functionality than if it's just the registry offer here, for example, that has to consume the data.

Don Blumenthal: Right, but it strikes me that the answer to that question could vary depending on who's doing the audit.

Michael Young: Right, but we - we're going to change it to say that they've got an other comment box and we're going to change it let them select more than one, right? Do you want to change it further, Don?

Berry Cobb: You know, while we're considering that, Rows 71 and 72 are in relation to the same question. Row 71, this radio button listed the mistake. The answer depends on the data. I'm hopefully assuming that that will be covered when we undo the select-only one.

And then Row 72, this should be a multiple answer question, technical information about the query such as client-led third-party web is useful for Whois server implementation and capacity planning but government should have no access to the queries beyond what the public has and the registrants should have access to any data that anybody else collects about their domains. And even that has risks.

Michael Young: So Don, is there anything more that you want to do to change that question?

Don Blumenthal: That's where I'm struggling. I don't want to make this any more - I sure don't want to add questions.

Michael Young: Yes, we have a lot already.

Don Blumenthal: Yes, (unintelligible). Let me go back up and look at the set up for this section.

Berry Cobb: Okay, great. So I've comment on 71, 72 as no recommended action or basically refer to Row 74, the changes. So without any further comments that takes us into Section 13.

Michael Young: Well, wait a second, Berry. Don's going back to look at the set up to see if he wants to suggest any other changes.

Berry Cobb: Okay, I'm sorry.

Michael Young: It's okay.

Don Blumenthal: I'm struggling here because I think that the language setting it up is good. But I see that person's point.

Michael Young: Don, I'm not sure I understand the point other than the multiple section thing. Do you want to explain it from your - how you see it?

Don Blumenthal: Let me flip back, got three screens working here, I'm confusing myself thoroughly. Well, what the questioner is suggesting is that multiple entities might do the auditing.

Michael Young: Might do the auditing or may want to consume the audit data?

Don Blumenthal: Might do the auditing.

Michael Young: Okay.

Don Blumenthal: And the answer to who should have access could depend on who we're saying is the auditing party. I mean if ICANN's doing the audit - just throwing out an example. If ICANN's doing the auditing everybody should have access to it. But should everybody have access to an audit that a registry does?

Michael Young: I don't know that we should be asking questions about who's responsible for the audit itself.

Berry Cobb: Right, yes. It seems like it's more policy related than technical requirement.

Michael Young: Yes.

Susan Crawford: Yes.

Berry Cobb: I mean even the question itself is borderline policy almost.

Michael Young: I completely agree with that.

Susan Crawford: I would agree with you as well.

Michael Young: So Don, I guess, maybe - do you want to - I don't think we should take it any more towards the policy side of things.

Don Blumenthal: Well, neither do I. And I'm not saying that we should be saying who should be doing the auditing. I'm just saying - and I'm not sure how much time (unintelligible) worked on this specific question but I think the person's point is a legitimate one.

Michael Young: Okay, so should we do more setup in the question, say...

Berry Cobb: Well, better yet, in terms of the section defining a framework and baseline set of metric, does Question 86 even provide value-add to answering that?

Don Blumenthal: It's a good point.

Susan Crawford: Good point.

Michael Young: I think we should scratch 86 all together.

Don Blumenthal: Yes.

Susan Crawford: It's easy because it's all policy.

Michael Young: Yes.

Don Blumenthal: You're right, you're absolutely right. It is true policy, yes. Put it in the system, decide later who can get to it. If we don't, somebody else will.

Michael Young: There's a typo in 87 as well if Wilson hasn't caught it already between what and additional, missing a space. Don, thanks for persevering on that.

Don Blumenthal: Okay.

Don Blumenthal: Even if the resolution was a complete bust. We'll just bump the question.

Michael Young: A sorry thing to do sometimes.

Don Blumenthal: I thought.

Michael Young: Okay.

Berry Cobb: All right, great. So I think that now closes out Section 12. As I mentioned 71 and 72, point back to 70. Now that we're deleting the question - so that takes us until Section 13. And I think we can probably finish Section 13 and 14 and then probably call it a day.

Section 13 is all new TLDs should operate a Thick Whois. The first comment such a small section, doesn't include much about Thin Whois options, not any discussion about what is Thick. Is there - are there privacy concerns, etc. really somewhat disappointing.

Michael Young: I think it fits into the opinion. I think - again, this is the train that left the station. Thick Whois has been around a long time. It's almost just a polite exercise in regards to legacy (unintelligible) that are running Thin Whois versus - a discussion of the merits of Thick or Thin Whois.

Berry Cobb: Okay, any other comments?

Don Blumenthal: Yes, for political reasons, do we want to do any rewording on this? All new TLDs should operate.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I think that's actually - right, the title of it may be misleading but the Requirement 9 is specifically pulled from the requirement paper. So I don't know that we would want to modify that language.

Michael Young: Instead of saying the all, in the title, why don't we just - for the title make it a little less political? Like, on the title, like, just say new TLDs operating Thick Whois. And then let them read.

Don Blumenthal: All right, if we're talking about new gTLDs is moving from a Thin to a Thick even an issue?

Berry Cobb: Negative, it's required that they be Thick.

Don Blumenthal: Yes.

Michael Young: No, Don, we created these questions in response to a long discussion we had earlier. Steve Metalitz raised a bunch of issues and this is what we came up with as being politically helpful we thought rather than beating up the existing legacy TLDs that are Thin, which is kind of where this topic was originally going in R9.

    We decided to actually make the questions about (unintelligible), that's why it's asking about standardized tools and timeframes.

Don Blumenthal: Okay, the last paragraph in the setup. Okay.

Berry Cobb: So I have for the recommended action that we'll just modify the title and remove all basically and just state the new TLDs should operate at Thick Whois.

Michael Young: I wouldn't even put the should as the title. Just new TLDs operating as Thick Whois and then let them read exactly what was under R9. We don't want them to think that we are - that is the working group's assertion.

Berry Cobb: Right.

Don Blumenthal: Right.

Berry Cobb: Okay, documented that. Row 74, referring to what is a reasonable timeframe for a legacy registry to move from Thin to Thick RDDS. Never should be an option, of course, otherwise this just feels disingenuous; an attempt to ignore that this is the main point of contention on which the whole previous technical beating around the bush is really depending - that and frustrating. Be legitimatizing and many things again.

Michael Young: I don't have a problem adding a never bullet. Does anyone else?

Susan Crawford: No objection by me. This is Susan.

Michael Young: So Berry, let's put a never button in.

Berry Cobb: Okay. Great. And the - Row 75, I think the first question has a typo. I don't see why registrars would be involved in this so maybe it should be about registries.

Michael Young: First question.

Berry Cobb: Question 89.

Michael Young: Because the registrars have to do the work to upload their Thick Whois information to the registries if they're going to convert. This is someone who doesn't understand how that process works.

Maybe just to make it more - easier for people to understand the connection, maybe we'll just change that as registrars/registries.

Don Blumenthal: Yes, that's good.

Berry Cobb: Okay, Question 89 - okay, noted. That takes care of Section 13. Section 14 is Who Was and we had no comments in that regards.

So that carries us over to Section 15 about registrars and registries. And then we have the general comment section and we'll be done.

Michael Young: So how is everybody on time? Shall we push through and finish?

Don Blumenthal: I'm fine.

Susan Crawford: I'm fine.

Michael Young: Okay.

Berry Cobb: Move forward, all right. Section 15...

Wilson Abigaba: (Unintelligible).

Michael Young: Wilson, are you okay to finish?

Wilson Abigaba: (Unintelligible) read the comments later on.

Berry Cobb: Yes, that's fine. We're capturing the recommended actions, which is - you know, what you're mostly going to be doing after we're done with this anyway.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay, thank you.

Berry Cobb: Okay, moving on to Section 15, registrars and registries.

Michael Young: So 77's a typo, right?

Berry Cobb: Column 3, title header contains broken text.

Susan Crawford: Yes.

Berry Cobb: Okay, yes.

Don Blumenthal: Yes.

Berry Cobb: And that's Question 107, yes. Okay, moving on to 78, whatever method it should be additional data and not disrupt current data points.

Michael Young: Are they talking about returning the abuse point of contact information in Question 105, which I think they are in which case I'd just say that's opinion?

                 Eighty - sorry, do I have that correct?

Berry Cobb: It could be 104 as well, pretty vague in terms of as a point of - instead of abuse point of contact versus data point.

Michael Young: All right, so I would just put it as opinion anyway because I don't think there's any action we can take on them.

Don Blumenthal: Yes.

Susan Crawford: Yes.

Berry Cobb: Okay, noted. Moving on to Row 79, the survey will take a long time to complete and users should be warned of that. Some questions need to be answered by technical experts, some by policy people, and some by legal experts.

But it may be unlikely that all questions can be accurately answered by any one individual. There are several ways to deal with this, every time could have a not applicable or not my area of expertise option; or two, the survey could be divided into sections to be completed by different people, organizations.

Could be encouraged to respond to this survey using a team of people having the full expertise needed. Respondents should be asked to state whether they are responding to their individual capacity or representing their organization, and that survey should be modified to accommodate that.

Michael Young: So we had this discussion - you know, almost the same thing - looks like a cut and paste from earlier. And I think what we talked about then, if I recall, Berry, was that we were going to flag each section on a scale of expertise.

So one end of the scale may be technical user, the person in the middle may being op focused, and the person on the other end being legal or policy focused.

And we can put a scale on each section and mark on the scale for each section. And of course, in the intro of the survey instructions we can certainly say, you know - remind them that they can stop the survey login - save their session, login with a different - a different person can log in with the same user ID to continue it if they want to share it across multiple team members.

Does that sound like reasonable action items to everybody?

Berry Cobb: I'm curious, it does bring up a question about multiple people filling this out. And maybe we're going to have to ask Wilson but I noticed in taking the survey several times, once I completed it the survey would recognize that I completed and therefore, I think it's scraping my IP address.

And I can't recall exactly how I could log in and out but I'm concerned that if there are three people in Organization A at three different desks, will they be able to log in to the single survey from three different machines?

Michael Young: Wilson indicated that that would be possible to start and stop the survey if you wanted to create a user ID. Do you just want to follow up with him, Berry?

Berry Cobb: Yes, I will. Because I do remember that the tool locked me out and wouldn't let me go fill it out again once I completed it.

Michael Young: Well, we do need to make sure it can do that because it's only fair, some people like - for example, I'm sure Chuck and his team will be organized enough to answer this across multiple resources.

Berry Cobb: Great, I'll send an email out to the list.

Michael Young: Okay.

Berry Cobb: To confirm that.

Michael Young: Eighty looks like its cut off. Berry, I'm just reading ahead a little bit. Apparently we have the power to do something.

Berry Cobb: Yes, you guys should have synch ability. My network connectivity's been popping in and out all day. Can you scroll on your own?

Michael Young: No, no, we're scrolled. The comment box stops at - it says, last comments here, submit button below. You'll also have the power to - and it hangs in outer space.

Berry Cobb: Hold on just a second.

Michael Young: Looks like a cut and paste issue.

Berry Cobb: Okay, I will go back into the original PDF and confirm.

Michael Young: What that one was?

Berry Cobb: Yes.

Michael Young: Okay.

Berry Cobb: Okay, Row 81, the above are probably okay for all users. Again, I think that's our global assignment.

Michael Young: Yes, that's editorial, okay.

Berry Cobb: And 82, registrar and registry contact details are already public. There is no need for useful purpose to - for useful purpose to add any of this to Whois output.

Michael Young: Well, that's opinion-based.

Don Blumenthal: Yes.

Susan Crawford: Yes.

Berry Cobb: Okay, and Row 83, abuse contacts are unfortunately mostly black hole but they're still useful on occasion. They're obviously the wrong address to use for technical problems, that's what the technical contact is for. And intellectual property or ownership complaints should be directed to the administrative contact.

Don Blumenthal: Opinion?

Michael Young: Yes, another opinion I think. Don, I think you're right. Because I mean technical contact is just something's broken and you - or you have a technical issue.

The abuse point of contact is that it might be a perfectly working website that's been compromised and running a phishing site on a downstream URL, that's not technically broken. It's just really bad.

Berry Cobb: Okay, that closes out that section. So we'll move on in to the general section. Row 84, and this is from the webinar that we had a while ago and his comment was - or his question - should questions about privacy and proxy services be included in the survey?

Michael Young: I don't think that's in our scope. Does anyone else think that's in our scope?

Don Blumenthal: No.

Susan Crawford: I wouldn't, no.

Berry Cobb: Noted. Row 85, also from the webinar and Thomas Rickert. Should questions about Whois accuracy be included in the survey?

Michael Young: Again, I would say not in our scope.

Don Blumenthal: Agreed.

Berry Cobb: Okay, Row 86 from Chuck, make it clear to users that if they do not understand a question to select the no answer option or create an opt-out option for the question.

Don Blumenthal: I'm not sure that no is the right route just because sometimes no is a qualitative answer.

Michael Young: Yes, do we want to have an opt-out button in the corner of every question? We'll never know why they opted out.

Susan Crawford: Well, it goes back to the point of whether they're the right audience for that question.

Michael Young: Yes.

Susan Crawford: So the better answer would be, like they said, not my area of expertise or something like that.

Michael Young: Well, that allows us to understand one reason why they opted in answering the question. What if they chose - what if they know the answer but they chose not to answer it for political reasons or whatever, right?

Susan Crawford: Keeping the opinion to themselves.

Michael Young: Yes.

Susan Crawford: Yes.

Michael Young: I know we talked about doing this before and the reason we didn't was we thought it would - the survey was very busy already and we didn't want to add more meat to each question. Because it would be a useful thing in every question, right?

Don Blumenthal: It's been so long and I really don't remember. Does the survey let you skip question?

Michael Young: Yes.

Susan Crawford: Yes.

Don Blumenthal: Well...

Berry Cobb: You know, and I think the other aspect - the opt-out is really an incomplete survey at the end of the day. For whatever their reasons are, whether it's too long or they didn't have the skill or they got board, you know, most likely that's going to be our real opt-out pool.

Michael Young: Yes, I'm torn on this one because it's not - I guess I don't - given how much he thinks about this stuff carefully. Chuck's feedback is generally pretty valuable.

I just don't see a way of doing this without us - I mean the right way to do this and then nobody would then do the survey would be if you click on opt-out and it pops down - you know, a few standardized choices for opting out. And then a comment box, which is just like answering a whole other question.

Don Blumenthal: Yes.

Michael Young: So the fact they can skip the question, maybe we need to make that very clear in the instructions right at the beginning of the survey.

Don Blumenthal: I think that's the way to handle it, yes.

Susan Crawford: Yes, it's out of scope for them.

Michael Young: Yes. Okay, so Berry, that's what we'll do. Make sure that people understand that they're allowed to skip questions. ASO would be a lovely suggestion if we had a heck of a lot more resources to split the survey up and administer it across multiple bodies and so forth. But I don't see us having the capacity or the - and we weren't given the mandate to do it that way.

Berry Cobb: This is in regards to Row 87?

Michael Young: Yes.

Don Blumenthal: Yes, and I'm not sure that some of the questions are going to be that clear-cut.

Michael Young: Yes, I think some of the questions would be extremely - that much harder to understand if it was out of context with a greater survey.

Don Blumenthal: Yes.

Berry Cobb: And I think this goes back to us adding to each section about the appropriate skill to take that survey as well.

Michael Young: So any - will the survey - does ICANN generally make it available in other languages?

Berry Cobb: I think when (Liz) was still with us. We addressed this in the webinar a while back and I think we talked about it in our next working group meeting after the webinar. And she advised against this because they tried to do that in some of the other Whois surveys and it was overly expensive and they didn't get the quantity of responses to justify doing it.

                   And I'm not going to say that we shouldn't do it but it was ill-advised in terms of the expense. And I'm not sure that - I'm not even sure that the ICANN language translation people would be the right group to do that, which would mean that we would have to maybe go a third party somewhere.

Michael Young: Right, so Berry, we don't have a budget for this anyway. So we probably should just stick to English them.

                   Unless anyone really objects?

Don Blumenthal: No, I remember - I didn't remember it was (Liz) but I do remember somebody saying what Berry just suggested. Yes, in a perfect world but I don't see how we can do it.

Michael Young: I also worry that interpreting or translating these questions correctly would be difficult. It was hard enough for us to get the nuances right in English.

Don Blumenthal: Right.

Berry Cobb: That's something I live with everyday. All right, the last two comments, I copied these over. They were from Steve Shen, the (unintelligible) original requirements report. And after we had submitted the draft survey he had included these two comments.

The first one, the survey is long. I fear we lose the attention of the respondents. You may consider shortening it and/or also that (unintelligible) people completing the survey, for example, you may consider asking each stakeholder group to submit one response instead of responses from individual members. This way you get to hear a representative voice of that stakeholder group.

Stakeholder group also have the incentive to ask the question diligently and this will make your analysis much easier.

Michael Young: So again, I think we need to - in our opening instructions, encourage people that they're just perfectly all right for them to represent a group.

Don Blumenthal: Yes.

Michael Young: And then - any other thoughts on 89?

Don Blumenthal: No, (unintelligible).

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I would just - I'm curious, should we at least one quick question in the profile? Are you filling this out as an individual or as an organization of some sort? And I'm not sure if our current profile really captures that or not.

Susan Crawford: If I recall the first question does ask that.

Michael Young: I'm okay but let me...

Berry Cobb: Yes, it does. Question 1, individual or end user or - then the other option.

Michael Young: Yes, it does.

Don Blumenthal: It does.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Susan.

Don Blumenthal: We're good.

Michael Young: So that's 89? Everyone okay with 89?

Susan Crawford: Yes.

Michael Young: It's really interesting Steve Sheng would make this comment because we pulled this stuff from a working report, staff working report that included these things.

So, you know, it's a decent comment. I think the response to this basically, Berry, should be that the questions were guided by the staff report. And these elements were discussed in the staff report.

Berry Cobb: Very good, all right. That is - unless there are any other comments on that that is our last comment to review. For the next session, there's definitely a

couple of actions that I had. We may have one or two more to review at our next meeting if I find additional information from our PDF (unintelligible).

But other than that, I think we're pretty much good to go with public comment review now.

Michael Young: Awesome.

Don Blumenthal: All right, amazing.

Berry Cobb: So we will have another session again on the 13. I'll send out a new agenda but roughly it will be to shore up these final action items out of the public comment tool. We should then probably review how we're going to handle Comment 20, which is to divide up - or list each section based on skill set.

                   And I'll create a little side document that kind of consolidates the recommendations of whether it was general users or technical users. And we can move that forward.

                   And then lastly, we'll probably be talking about the next steps for finalizing the draft, getting it up on to the development server, trying to find the formal home whether it be within ICANN or URL redirect. And then determining a date that we turn it on and announce it to everyone.

Michael Young: Okay. Berry, I may have trouble attending next Monday. I've got something up in the air right now but while we're on the call I was wondering - Don, is there - if I run into trouble next Monday I was wondering if you could chair the meeting.

Don Blumenthal: Well, you beat me to saying that there could be a problem.

Michael Young: What's that?

Don Blumenthal: I said, you beat me to saying that here could be a problem. I'll be in Helsinki next Monday and subject to the Gods of - to the Skype Gods.

Michael Young: We're both into an issue. Berry, you know what, why don't we do this, why don't we try to work through the remaining issues. Either we shift the date or we shift - or we work it through on the list and we do a meeting on the 20th I think.

Berry Cobb: I think that's the best option.

Michael Young: Okay, so let's knock back as much stuff as we can on the list. So a lot of its administrative that you and I could probably handle.

Berry Cobb: Agree.

Michael Young: And Wilson. And then the things that we need everyone to weigh in on, we'll throw out the list. If we don't get enough response we'll review them on the 20th, how's that?

Berry Cobb: Great, sounds good.

Don Blumenthal: That's good.

Michael Young: Okay.

Berry Cobb: All right, that's all I have. Any other last comments?

Susan Crawford: Nothing from me.

Berry Cobb: All right, awesome.

Michael Young: Okay. So thanks everyone. This was an incredibly productive call. I'm feeling much - you know, much more optimistic now that we've plowed through this.

So thank you, thank you for bearing through a two-hour meeting. It's much appreciated.

All right.

Berry Cobb: Excellent, take care everyone.

Michael Young: Have a good week.

Susan Crawford: Have a good afternoon.

END