WHOIS WG Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 11 June 2012 at 1900 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of WHOIS WG on the Monday 11th June 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-20120611-en.mp3

Attendees

Cintra Sooknanan - ALAC
Susan Prosser - RrSG
Michael Young - Individual
Wilson Abigaba - RrSG
Don Blumenthal - RySG
Avri Doria - NCSG
Anne Naffziger - IPC

ICANN Staff
Berry Cobb
Nathalie Peregrine

Apology:
Steve Metalitz - IPC

Coordinator: Excuse me. I'd like to remind all participants 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, (Kelly). Good morning, good afternoon, good

                     evening. This is the Whois call on the 11th of June, 2012. On the call today

                     we have Wilson Abigaba, Michael Young, Anne Naffziger, Susan Prosser.

                     We have Avri Doria and Don Blumenthal as well joined on the Adobe. We

have apologies from Steve Metalitz and Cintra Sooknanan will join us in 20 minutes' time.

From staff we have Berry Cobb and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I would like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

Michael Young: Right, it's Michael Young speaking. Thank you, everybody, for coming to the call. It's going to be a relatively short call today. The purpose - we were debating even having a call but Berry and I talked about it and thought we should have a short call anyways so that Wilson can explain a little bit - give us a little overview of the results of the initial feedback we've had from the sample survey.

Explain - make sure that we all understand how to read the materials that he's provided with us and that way we have a - all of us are well set up to go review it in detail and start preparing to adjust our questions accordingly from the feedback we got.

Okay so, Berry, do we want to just open up quickly and see if there are any action items, I guess, that are really due at this point because there's no point in reviewing the ones that are quite a bit off in the distance.

Berry Cobb: Correct. This is Berry. We don't have any open action items. There is one that I don't have listed here per our email dialogue about notifying the GNSO Council about the availability of the draft. Yet to hear back from Wendy; if we don't hear from her by Wednesday then I'll have Liz forward it onto the Council to make the formal announcement.

Michael Young: Okay great. So, Wilson, this is really your meeting today so if you could treat us gently and go through and educate us a little bit on the documents that you've put together and how we should be looking at them and reading them.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay, thank you, Michael. This is Wilson speaking. I didn't know if I was supposed to explain the results but (unintelligible) observe maybe (unintelligible) about - maybe about (unintelligible). Does anyone have any specific questions that you'd like to be addressed?

Hello? This is Wilson speaking. And I'm asking if there are anyone with specific questions that - is there any specific questions that you'd like to be addressed?

Michael Young: Wilson, it's Michael. I'm just watching for hands up. I don't see any so I'll put myself in the - at the beginning of the queue and ask a question. When I was looking through these percentages breakouts it - for each question - it looks like, you know, they're adding up to 30%-35%. Is the - is that because the percentages include those people that didn't complete the survey when it calculates the percentages?

Wilson Abigaba: Okay, yeah, just like I mentioned in the email we have - we had a bit (unintelligible) but of those only 25 completed the entire survey. Now for these answers and the rest we're just considered all the entries for that (unintelligible) operations.

For example if we just took just an example of question - just an example of Question 1 (unintelligible) - Question 1 is on Page - is on Page 3. Just an example, which of the following terms, best describes your status? For that we had a total of - what - we just considered the number of people who answered that question.

If - but this question (unintelligible) so all the (unintelligible) entries, all the one (unintelligible) entries are considered. But for the questions where the user did fill in anything we only considered what's the number of entries that we received for that particular question.

If you want I can also produce one which only includes the complete answer. That would mean that for each question we have a maximum of 25 entries. Am I clear?

Michael Young: Yeah, so to my understanding it's what I thought, right, just includes the percentage breakout includes the abandoned surveys as well so that's why it's - it doesn't add up to 100%, right? Okay.

Wilson Abigaba: Yeah, it doesn't add up to 100% because, for example, the 107 entries, which are not complete. Some answers - some questions got answered, others are not. So (unintelligible) answered because (unintelligible) just said where the - where a respondent have answered, that is your question. So some persons might have 100 (unintelligible) 25.

Michael Young: Got it. Okay that's helpful. So there were a couple things, I mean, I would like us to kind of - when we actually start to analyze the results in detail I'd like to do it in the context of also looking at the public comment postings. But I can't help but note a couple of interesting things and - as I have browsed through these results before the call today.

And I think one of the biggest ones was I was really pleased to see the geographic distribution of the initial volunteers we got to look at the survey was I think surprisingly more distributed than I had hoped for. I mean, still kind of US-dominated but after that it distributes nicely across a lot of different localities which I thought was really interesting.

Did anyone else notice anything...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: You know, did anyone else notice anything that they found interesting so far?

Anne Naffziger: This is Anne.

((Crosstalk))

Wilson Abigaba: ...Europe and US.

Anne Naffziger: Hello, this is Anne. One I guess question more than comment; are these numbers what we were expecting or are they lower or higher? If they're lower is there something more we want to be doing for outreach or are we satisfied with the numbers we have in to date?

Michael Young: You mean in terms of the people that have taken the test survey, Anne?

Anne Naffziger: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

Michael Young: I think we - when we discussed it before, from my recollection, I think we said that if we could get upwards of 15, 16 takers that would be decent. And it would be really great if we could get the - a statistically significant sample size of 32. So we got pretty close so I think it's fairly decent.

Obviously we're not closing this for a while yet so we have the opportunity even around the Prague meeting to solicit people and ask them to try it and provide feedback.

Anne Naffziger: Great, and then - this is Anne again. And then a follow up to that question is because of the percentage of folks that completed the entire survey is a little lower I guess we've grappled with this issue on many calls about the length of it, the complexity of it.

I guess I'm just thinking out loud what are our takeaways going to be or what's our thought process on the fact that we have a lower number of people that have actually completed it and trying to get that number up a bit. Or do we think it's just - I mean, who knows - like there's a - the number that have, you know, skipped over some of the questions. I guess we just don't

know because we aren't mind readers. But that was one of the things that sort of jumped out at me in terms of these initial numbers.

Michael Young: Yeah it's interesting. You know, looking at some of these I, you know, what was going through my head now is how do we apply some rigor in how we interpret the results and what should we do with these?

I mean, our initial objective was to use this feedback to improve and clarity, I guess, on the survey questions. So the comments that people have actually written I think are the most useful thing in that regard. Although it's very hard not to look at the actual percentage result and so forth and not be curious as to - or interpret why, you know, C might have been chosen versus D.

But that's more the - I guess our responsibility when we interpret the final survey or we - we shouldn't say interpret, I guess, the right word would be to document the final survey results and suggest any findings that are not subjective.

Although I'm very cynical when I refer to something as objective; I think it's very difficult to have 100% objectivity on anything. But it's our role and responsibility to look at the results as objectively as humanly possible.

Did anyone else have any thoughts or ideas? You know, if - I largely suspect not too many of us have gone through it in detail yet, which is one of the reasons I thought a short call would be good to just remind everyone that we do have some initial results back, encourage them to go away and look at the. So I think, you know, the call has probably already accomplished that or reminding people about these - about this information being available.

And so if you haven't looked at it in detail that's okay. It'd be really good if there's any confusion or any questions you have about how to read through these documents or look at the results. Well, we have Wilson here to ask him those questions now.

All right, Berry, I think your comment on the chat is really - is really a good one. We do have to remember that this is a sample exercise and people will address it accordingly. Yeah, it may also be representative of the abandonment rate as well too.

Okay. Wilson, did you have anything else you wanted to talk to at the group? Because I, you know, I don't want to keep people on - we might make this a really short call if there's no other questions at this point.

Berry Cobb: Michael, this is Berry. I just...

Wilson Abigaba: No...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Oh, I see Don has one, Berry.

Don Blumenthal: Okay, it's not so much a comment but just thought I'd mention in terms of our approach to this a couple of the people who participated in our Webinars were at the conference in Frankfurt last week. And we just got some very solid compliments on having done something like that (unintelligible).

Michael Young: Oh that's great to hear. I'm really pleased. Appreciate that feedback, Don. It's good for everyone to know that that's what's being said out in the open like that.

Don Blumenthal: Okay, I'll go back to sleep now. I just came back from Frankfurt last night. I have no idea which end is up.

Michael Young: I know how you feel. I came back from France on Friday so...

Don Blumenthal: Okay.

Berry Cobb: Michael, this is Berry. I'd just like to also explain to the group the way we have this survey structured today at the end of each section per Wilson's comment we have a - kind of a general blank area for users to provide specific feedback about questions within that section.

When we get closer to the close of the public comment period I want to work with Wilson to extract those out so that we can load them into our public comments survey tool - or not survey but just our public comment review tool.

And that way we can ensure that we correlate - or collect all the comments and keep them into one particular location and so that we can, as the working group work through each one of them and then adjust the draft accordingly based on dialogue and consensus from the group.

Michael Young: Right. Okay thanks, Berry.

Berry Cobb: I think Avri has her hand raised.

Avri Doria: Yeah...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Boy, everyone does now. Go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: I have just a quick question. Is that quick statistics thing that we're looking at in the window something that was sent to us? I'm going through my mailbox looking for it and I'm missing it. If somebody could tell me the date it was sent?

Michael Young: Wilson sent it in response to the - as a reply to the notification for today's meeting and it's - they're attachments at the bottom of that.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks.

Michael Young: Okay so Susan, we already answered your question? Okay.

Susan Prosser: Yeah. That was it. Thank you.

Michael Young: Okay. Cintra I see just joined the call. Cintra, just to bring you up to speed we're kind of winding down on questions here but the purpose of the call today was just an opportunity for anyone who wants to ask questions or clarifications of the documents that Wilson sent out. We recognize that not everyone's had a chance to go through them in detail.

                   Plus, you know, the sample survey is still open and will be open for a while. But we've got enough feedback at this point to be useful. And so if you have any questions to him about the documents he sent out or how to read them feel free to ask them.

                   Okay I'm guessing that's no. Berry wants to figure out when we should schedule our next call. So why don't we - Berry, why don't we just do a call - a standard call for new business and then work on the schedule for the next call.

                   Does anyone have - while we're on the call does anyone have any new business? Okay hearing none. Berry, what did you - what did you have in mind for the next meeting? I'm thinking we need - for everyone's sanity we should probably put the next meeting past Prague.

Berry Cobb: Hi, Michael. This is Berry. Most definitely with Prague concluding June 29 then we have the first week of July, which is the 4th of July and a United States holiday. Then that moves us into the second week of July but we also have the closing of the public comment period on the 16th of July.

I'd probably recommend that we reconvene on the 16th. I'm not sure that there's a whole lot we can do until the public comment period closes and then we start to review through the comments. While the official close is on the 16th I'll try to make every effort to have the first draft of the review tool available on the 13th so that we can get started right away on the 16th.

Michael Young: Okay that would be - that would be great. Does anyone have any questions for Berry or any issues with that proposed schedule? Because I think that makes a lot of sense.

((Crosstalk))

Wilson Abigaba: ...ask Berry.

Michael Young: Oh, go ahead, Wilson.

Wilson Abigaba: Yeah, Berry? Yes, someone asked the question whether the response so far is the below expectation or just our on average. And (unintelligible) I'm not sure how to answer but follow up that question not that we've received no comments so far about almost - what maybe 2 weeks into the public comment period it is they're expecting to do something about these?

So is it a cause of alarm? (unintelligible) so far only (unintelligible) so far enough for us to make a decision or we need to do something about it?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I'm not sure I heard the entirety of your question but let me know if I got it correctly. As I did mention in the chat to date there are zero comments posted in the public forum or public comment forum. I do suspect we will get a few posted in there namely I've had dialogue with a couple of stakeholders and there are legal reasons why they can't actually complete the survey so I suspect some of them will provide feedback via the formal tool.

Whereas certainly there have already been a number of comments submitted at the bottom question for each section. And as I mentioned earlier I would like to work with you to figure out how we can extract those comments out so that I can get them loaded into our review tool and make sure that we, as a working group, address each one of them.

Did that answer your question, Wilson?

Wilson Abigaba: Yeah, you answered my question. You seemed to say that right now it's not - it's not a cause of alarm that we have no zero public comments and - but you expect some comments, it's okay.

Then (unintelligible) expect to have (unintelligible) this survey and how we are doing about if that 25 is low - 25 complete responses is a low figure or what you might have expected.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. To be quite honest I think 25 is a pretty good start. I do think we'll get more participants that complete the survey as we get closer to the close of the public comment period.

Certainly there's a lot flying around outside of the Whois working group right now with respect to prep for Prague. I think there's at least 10 other public comment periods going on at the same time right now so certainly that will compete with the bandwidth of the community.

I will also note that it's not written in stone but it has been a practice used in other working groups. Right now we have the public comment period set up with 21 days for public comments and then 21 days for replies to those comments.

I think given the current demand on the community right now it would behoove the working group to allow us to accept comments all the way up through the 16th of July. What I've seen up to this point so far is there's been

very little replies to comments but certainly a lot of late entries for normal public comments being submitted.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay. Are you planning to do anything during Prague to encourage the communities - the public to respond to this?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. As of right now we have nothing planned. There is no public session planned. We will be submitting to the GNSO Council the - per our charter we have to formally deliver the draft survey to the Council which will be sending out a note around the middle of this week for that formal submission.

It will be up to the Council to determine if they would like a briefing about the draft survey as to which Michael said he would be available to do that if they call upon us. Outside of that I don't think we have anything else planned to publicly announce the survey but that's something that we could certainly take a look at.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay thanks.

Berry Cobb: Avri, you have your hand raised?

Avri Doria: Yeah, I do. Thanks. A couple questions. One, I think you're absolutely - I should say first it's a comment not a question. I think you're absolutely right about extending it past Prague and, you know, at least one week past Prague. I'm not sure where that goes with your dates.

And I think that's practical because as of a week before people do start shutting down; they have a lot of work to finish in their jobs before they go off so I think that's a great idea.

One of the things I'd also recommend is - not that there needs to be any sort of leading but if there could be some sort of reminder, you know, a something

that people could see and go oh yeah, yeah, that's worth doing, that would be good.

The question I had, which is what concerns me, is on the non-completion. And I - maybe I missed it the first time they said it but when you just said that certain people didn't complete it for legal reasons that makes me really curious as to what sort of legal reasons there would be. I'm curious also is, not having looked at it online do people have the ability to stop and come back or is it straight through?

And I guess third in that vein is if we're seeing a lot of non completion is it possible to get to these people who don't complete, who are the beta testers for this and find out why? Thanks.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I'll try to answer all those. The first one with respect to the legal reasons, as I understood it - I won't name the individual but it was their own company policy that before they complete anything in the community circles that they have to have legal sign off on completions of such things.

And the only reason it came to my attention is because this person was trying to access the survey but they couldn't review the whole survey without completing questions. And then we had figured out with Wilson that all you had to do was just complete the very first question of the profile and that opened up all the sections of the survey.

As such we also supplied a PDF copy of the entire survey so that community members can review the entire survey that way without having to complete the survey itself.

So outside of that I don't know that there's any huge concern for us from a particular company's policy on the legal reasons why they can or can't complete things.

As for the second question with respect to participants not completing the survey I would say first the 25 completions we have is close to our test pool number that we had when we announced it internally before we released the public comments. I would - personally I'm kind of pleased with that number.

Secondarily I think you asked if there is a way to stop the survey and come back and pick up where you left off. Yes, that feature is enabled. And then lastly given the quantity of non completions to be quite honest I'm not - I'm not surprised by that either.

Certainly the survey is long and certainly some persons out there are probably just curious at this point in time and then plan to come back to it. So I would imagine that our gap will close over time as we get closer to the close of the public comment period.

But I still expect that there's still going to be a greater quantity of those that never finish the survey in the draft form versus when we actually release this for the official completion some time at the end of June. Did I answer all of those?

Avri Doria: Yeah, sort of. There was one which was, is there any way to reach out to the people that didn't complete since they're doing it as a beta test to get from them a clue as to why they might not have or is that something that would be too difficult to do or that you don't have their names and emails or something?

Berry Cobb: Right.

Avri Doria: Or is that something - an outreach that could be done?

Berry Cobb: I'll defer to Wilson to be the official but I believe within the profile we are not collecting names nor email addresses...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Berry Cobb: ...so we don't really...

Avri Doria: So you can't.

Berry Cobb: ...we can't - we can't relate or connect the dots as to who completed it. However I did ask in the public comment period that if participants choose to provide feedback in the survey tool that they supplied their name. And I know Chuck Gomes has been very gracious in helping us out in that regard throughout the survey. And he's identified who he was but he completed the survey; the others haven't.

Avri Doria: He's always a master at these things. But, yeah, okay thanks a lot.

Berry Cobb: He is.

Wilson Abigaba: Yeah, we cannot identify who - in particular who has not completed because it's meant to be anonymous and we are not collecting any personal information. So we cannot get back to them and we can't even know who has not completed.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you very much.

Michael Young: Yeah, Avri, it's Michael speaking. I think what we need to do is just go through the comments that people have actually written in and look for clues. In some cases, you know, the comments already given strong indicators of - or tell us point blank, you know, why someone might abandon the survey so we just have to look for those and take it to heart. You know, in a demo drive like this there's lots of reasons why people would abandon it in experimentation and not in the full survey.

Avri Doria: Oh yeah, no thanks. I was just trying to, you know, the more we understand the more we can sort of fine tune things before the other. But, yeah, I appreciate it. Thanks.

Michael Young: Yeah. I agree with you 100%. Okay so you might have noticed in the chat I suggested to Berry that maybe what we do - if we don't need it we don't need it but if we schedule - on the July 16 if we schedule another meeting a week later given that we have a July - end of July deadline for looking at these initial public comments and addressing the survey in response to them it's a very tight timeline so I suggest that we have two meetings a week apart.

                     If we don't end up - if we're super efficient and we don't end up needing it then great but I just think it's safer to schedule two meetings. Does anyone object to that?

Don Blumenthal: No.

Michael Young: Hearing nothing - sorry?

Don Blumenthal: No...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Who was that?

Don Blumenthal: Don.

Michael Young: Okay great. Okay. So we did have a couple people join so - during the last set of questions and I don't see any hands up. I will ask if there's any new business one more time since we had a couple people join. And hearing no response I think we'll move to wrap up the meeting.

And we just want to wind it up with particularly thanking Wilson for all his recent hard work. I can see a lot of effort went into putting these documents together and developing the survey tool. Wilson, fantastic, thank you very much from all of us.

And, again, thank you to the whole group for their continued participation and help. We're making great progress. As Don said we're getting good feedback and I've had some feedback too from other corners so I feel very gratified that we're accomplishing what we set out to do.

All right so I'll see you - some of you in Prague and look forward to continuing to talk to you on the list and seeing you at the next meetings.

Avri Doria: Good travels to those that are traveling. Bye-bye.

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Bye-bye.

Berry Cobb: Thanks everyone.

END