WHOIS Survey Working Group
TRANSCRIPT
Monday 09 January 2012 at 2100 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. 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-20120109-en.mp3

On page: http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jan

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees
Susan Prosser – RrSG
Michael Young – Individual
Don Blumenthal – Ry
Steve Metalitz – IPC
Anne Naffziger – IPC
Avri Doria – NCSG
Rafik Dammak – NCUC
Stephen Van Egmond - Individual

ICANN Staff
Liz Gasster
Berry Cobb
Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies:
Wendy Seltzer – ALAC
Paul Brigner

Coordinator: All recordings have begun.

Nathalie Peregrine: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the Whois call on

the 9th of January 2012. One the call today we have Rafik Dammak, Michael

Young, Susan Crawford, Ann Naffziger, Avri Doria, Don Blumenthal, Steve

Metalitz, Steven van Egmond.

From staff we have Berry Cobb, Liz Gasster and myself Nathalie

Peregrine. We have an apology from (Paul Greenland). 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: Okay. Thank you very much. First of all as always thank everyone for contributing your time to this working group. It's appreciated and the community benefits as a whole when people like yourselves contribute your expertise and you time and your effort. So let's just right into the agenda using - and try and use your time efficiently.

So agenda bashing. Anyone want to add anything to this agenda today or remove anything or adjust anything? No. Okay. So why don't we jump to the next item. And Berry can we review the action items of which I know I'm remiss on one because I was struggling with some nasty flu. But please go through the list.

Berry Cobb: Okay. Thank you Michael. This is Berry. Basically we had four from our last meeting before the close of 2011. The first one was to send out the requirement survey question assignments. So that was sent out and people are working on those and some have submitted.

Second action item was for the working group to complete their question assignments per their assigned requirement. (Less) of that is started. We've had a few submit and we still have more open. And we'll discuss that a little bit later in the agenda about setting a future deadline date and expectation.

The third is we sent out a doodle poll for the January 9 meeting and actually that timeframe is what we'll probably stick with for the remainder of this schedule. If there are objections to this new time, we

can try to work through it over the next meeting or two and then of course correct if needed.

And then the last one is to - was assigned to me as well and that's to compile the first draft of the requirement survey question. And what you have before you in the Adobe Connect room is the first version of that with the collection of the questions that were submitted.

And that pretty much closes out all the action items. I'm sure we'll have some more as we conclude this meeting today. Back to you Michael.

Michael Young: Okay. Great. Anyone want to clarify any of Berry's updates or on the action items or did we capture everything as - is that correct according to everyone? Okay. Good. So we'll assume that update is fully accurate and correct.

Berry, do we want to jump right - sorry, someone trying to speak? No. I guess it's an echo on my side. Berry, do we want to - we want to take up the next item then with the response to the GNSO Council? Review their response?

Berry Cobb: Yes. Thank you Michael. This is Berry. Basically before the conclusion of the last year, we sent out the revised response to the GNSO Council with respect to the RAP recommendation for Whois access. Didn't receive any additional feedback from the rest of the team.

So the original assignment was that we were going to pass it over to the GNSO Council on last week, Friday, the 6th. But we wanted to give the team just one more time and talk about it here if there were any other changes that were necessary.

The only change from the last draft is actually no change at all. What we were waiting for was just a response from the compliance team with respect to the Whois monitoring tool. And for the most part they gave it a blessing with the description that we provided, which is basically and extract out of that annual reports that they post with respect to the Whois monitoring tool. So the WMS.

Outside of that everything is pretty much the same. And I just wanted to get the working group's blessing to send it over to the Council. I think given the light crowd we have today at the conclusion of this meeting I'll send out one more final draft to the mailing list.

And I'll probably set a target date for Wednesday that we send it to the Council. And if there are any other last minute edits, then please provide those over the list. And if anybody has any questions or concerns, speak now please.

Michael Young: Berry, the only thing I saw in the last draft that I read was a - and I'm trying to remember. It was a typo thing. It was either a missing word or an additional word that was kind of out of place. I don't know if that got cleaned up but I'll take a look at the draft and see whether or not it reads clean for that. That was the only thing.

Berry Cobb: Very good. You know, I should have had this uploaded into the Adobe room. But like I said, I'll send it out on the list for some last minute call items. And I think the way it's structured now provides pretty conclusive information that the GNSO Council can further make a decision about this and be able to move forward.

Michael Young: All right. So shall we move on to four then Berry?

Berry Cobb: Yes. So for the agenda Item Number 4, given our current schedule and our milestone of March 1 to have the first draft of the survey questions completed and passed to the Council for their review, wanted to ask the working group if there was a need to have a public meeting for the upcoming Costa Rica meeting in March.

We probably ought to make this determination now or sometime this week as we as ICANN staff have a deadline next Monday to begin submitting time slots if we feel that we need a public session. And so just wanted to throw that out to the working group. If we feel it's necessary, then we'll look to try to find an appropriate time that's, you know, not at (oh dark) 30 and not on an earlier day.

If not, then imagine probably our only requirement will be to provide an update to the GNSO Council on the Saturday or Sunday sessions, which will probably be the most appropriate. So I'll just throw that out to the working group now.

Michael Young: Berry, can I just ask you a question? Is it typical for - so we submit a draft to the GNSO Council with the same draft after they've looked at it in time for the Costa Rica meeting. I guess, would it - would you typically post that draft as well for public comment or would you wait until a subsequent draft? Or is that within something we still have to decide?

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: No. This is Berry. It's at the discretion of the working group. It's - and actually I see that Liz is online as well and I'll probably defer to her expertise as to whether we should conduct a public comment period for the draft or not. And then again, kind of just - it's really at the discretion of the working group as to whether we want to hold the public session or not.

Michael Young: Well so Liz, I'll just give you my thinking and Don. I'm wondering if we did post it publicly and then had a public meeting - if we could post it publicly before having a public meeting at Costa Rica, it might Don help you more efficiently achieve some awareness and support your outreach and feedback efforts.

Don Blumenthal: Good point. Yeah. Certainly we're hoping to be doing - it's Don for the transcript. Be doing more of that well before that but it will give us a chance to solicit more and also maybe do the face to face with a lot of contacts that I know are going to be usual electronic and, you know...

Michael Young: Right.

((Crosstalk))

Don Blumenthal: ...seeing people we're talking to face-to-face gets more information (sort of terms).

Michael Young: Right. Okay. Liz, what do you think? Would that be appropriate to do that - to go that route?

Liz Gasster: Yeah. I think it's really what - I don't recall a specific requirement in the charter. I think what - I think what you did commit to just time wise or

target was a draft to Council by then. So it probably somewhat depends on the next item on your agenda, how far along you think you are with the draft questions and whether you would want to include that as a step prior to Council review.

You know, as part of your due diligence internally. I think it's, you know, unless it's specified in the charter, which I don't recall that it is probably is your discretion - how you'd like to collect that input and the timing for that.

Michael Young: Well I'm a big believer in putting out early drafts of things. On one hand yes, it sometimes causes so much conversation, it can actually slow things down.

But on the other hand, you know, it also can sometimes speed things up because you get - if people have issues or concerns it would make us kind of redirect how we've been doing things. It's better to hear about it earlier while we still have some time in our, you know, in our allocated time to get this entire work zipped up.

The other thing is is I think it's very challenging with everybody's activities around the application period to get people's attention to something like this for Don to be able to get people's attention for conversation. And certainly a publicly posted document or comment area - public comment area would be - help getting their attention. So okay. So I take that as we can do it if we want to.

Liz Gasster: I think the only thing is -- it's Liz -- that I would, you know, mention to you is that we have a formal public comment process that now that was established as a result of the affirmation of comments that looks,

you know, for official public comment forums that are called for, you know, requires a 30 day period for comment and then a 15 day reply cycle.

And this group might prefer something more informal than that and you could consider reaching out to for example to SO and AC list, make sure there's community, constituency and stakeholder group input because that is a, you know, once you go that route there's a, you know, more formal and protracted timeframe that you'd have to factor into your overall decision making. So again, entirely up to you but just something to keep in mind.

Michael Young: But there's no reason we couldn't continue refining questions or adding more questions while that public comment period is open, right?

Liz Gasster: That's right. That's right.

Michael Young: Okay. So...

Liz Gasster: That may be even useful to you and you may prefer to utilize that mechanism. So...

Michael Young: Well that's what I'm thinking. It's kind of - it kind of gives us a ongoing feedback mechanism while we're still doing our work, which hopefully would inform us and allow us to speed up.

The other thing Don I'm thinking is if we've to it posted publicly, maybe if you feel you could spare the time at the Costa Rica meeting we could do a little bit of a road show across the different stakeholder and constituency groups and explain what we're doing.

Don Blumenthal: Sure.

Michael Young: And encourage them to comment on it.

Don Blumenthal: Yeah. I should be able to.

Michael Young: Okay. Liz if we do that, would you be able to help us try and schedule meetings with all the different groups on Constituency Day or wherever is appropriate for me or Berry?

Liz Gasster: Yeah. I mean we can help.

Michael Young: Okay. Okay. Cool. And...

Berry Cobb: And so Mike - Michael, this is Berry. So if you went that route, that would be a preference over actually scheduling a specific hour for the schedule of the meetings itself - a dedicate hour that would be like a public working group session.

Michael Young: I'd like to hear what everyone else thinks but I'm of the thinking that we would get much more participation and constructive feedback if we could get, you know, 15, 20 minutes in each stakeholder's group and just give them a little spiel on what we're doing and ask them to comment on the document. Then if we expect them to come to us and happen to notice that public open meeting is one of many, many scheduled events.

Liz Gasster: I mean they're not - there's some other ways to solicit input that way. I mean you have representatives in this working group -- it's Liz again --

who are members of those - each stakeholder group and constituency to varying degrees of activity where maybe if, you know, you wanted to solicit views say in advance of that you could utilize - I mean that is a role that many participants intend and want to play anyway in these working groups.

Michael Young: I'd like to...

Liz Gasster: So depending on the timing that would be another way to start the input earlier is just to ask the working group participants to solicit the input from their representative stakeholder groups and constituencies.

Michael Young: Yeah. I think I was assuming to some degree we would do that Liz. But...

Liz Gasster: Yeah. Yeah, that's what I was - but again, it doesn't hurt to say it.

Michael Young: Yeah. Yeah. No. Thank you for raising that. So we certainly do that. And then I think the road show just helps as well. And, you know, if we go - one of our working group members happens to be into a group that we walk through and Don I would help you with - do the spiel for sure.

So but if it got, you know, one of our members in a particular group, then they can sit and help with the 15 minute kind of presentation. Maybe take a lead in that presentation in that particular group.

Liz Gasster: I think the other thing -- it's Liz again -- is just that I've noticed that Constituency Day could be packed with issues. And I suspect that many of the stakeholder groups and constituencies go through some

prioritization in trying to deal with how they're going to allocate their time then.

And so I'd just - we can certainly formalize a request and circulate it but I just think it's going to be important for each of the constituencies, you know, those of you who are involved there if you think it's a priority to convey that.

Michael Young: Yeah.

Liz Gasster: There's a lot of competing.

Michael Young: I mean...

Liz Gasster: There's so much to do on that day. And again I'm not arguing against it. I think it's a terrific idea. I'm just trying to think of kind of balancing what's likely to be on everyone's plates on those - that particular day and utilizing every opportunity we have to get input.

Michael Young: Yeah. And you're right. There's going to be a lot of stuff flying around but I guess we have to make a shot at it and do the best that we can. Liz, would it be - so if we hand this off to GNSO Council, at some point will they want us to actually also engage them in conversation and brief them on it?

Liz Gasster: Typically there would be or there could be depending on the status of working group's work an update on Saturday or Sunday preceding the ICANN meeting. It could get done by the working group chair or by the liaison to the Council who in this case is Wendy Seltzer. I don't know if Wendy's on today.

Michael Young: (Not) right now.

Liz Gasster: So that - those would be two, you know, but I think also once again, those Saturdays and Sundays are extremely full. And I - not discouraging us from thinking about a briefing at that time but I think what's important is conveying, you know, that this is at the stage where it really needs specific Council review and that you're looking for something specific rather than just a routine update.

There may be more of a priority to making sure that there's ample time on the schedule to take the review that's necessary. So I know we're still kind of at the early stage of drafting the questions and we're trying to anticipate where we're going to be in a month and a half, which isn't so easy.

But I think that's where we'd want to make sure that you do have the time to solicit the Council's input and a draft that they can review in advance to give them the opportunity to develop their thoughts beforehand.

Michael Young: Okay. So with that though in mind, we are absolutely going to have a draft ready well in time. We're 20 questions in now and it's January 9. So I think it's doable. Maybe we should just jump to starting to review the questions so we can really ensure on telling the truth right now.

Don Blumenthal: And on that note I'm going to have to drop. Right about when the fun starts.

Michael Young: Yeah. Good timing Don. All right.

Don Blumenthal: Right, sorry.

Michael Young: That's okay.

Don Blumenthal: No.

Michael Young: So as far as the position of how we do the public meetings and stuff like that, let's think about everything we talked about and let's punt the decision to the next meeting.

Don Blumenthal: Okay. Sounds good.

Michael Young: Okay. And...

Don Blumenthal: I'll listen to the recording later.

Berry Cobb: Michael, this is Berry. I'd just like to remind you though if we don't think we're going to need an actual public session, then we're good to go. But if there's a hint that we might need one, we're going to need to submit that as soon as possible so that...

Liz Gasster: Berry, I would suggest for now go ahead and submit one - a request.

Berry Cobb: Okay.

Liz Gasster: And I'll help you with that - it's Liz. We'll have a - we can always cancel it later if we find it's unnecessary or redundant. It's a good time. You know, we've always been a group that's considering that most people will either be there or be available by phone to participate remotely,

you know, essentially would be a working group session to solicit feedback, you know, from the broader community if possible.

I don't see a problem with moving ahead with just trying to hold a timeframe now.

Berry Cobb: Okay. We'll just...

Michael Young: Liz, would we be able to maybe get the - so right now we are for Eastern Standard Time on Monday. Would it be possible to get a - the same time slot?

Liz Gasster: It's probably possible but I'm not sure I'd (unintelligible) it only because there may be other meetings at that time that many of you might also want to participate or that could draw participate based on this session. Because I think for example traditionally on the Monday afternoon I know there's going to be use of the DNS workshop. And there may be other things that might draw some of you away.

So I don't want to rule it out. If you think that's the best place to propose a meeting, but you may prefer to have it at a time that doesn't conflict with other activities that your participants may also want to attend.

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Last time it happened to our working group for just (unintelligible) to go to the meeting. If it's going to be a similar type of situation, then, you know, I'd rather favor the people and keep it to their regular schedule

because I, you know, we'll prioritize it as a working group meeting first and foremost.

You know, asking people to jump around - I mean last time we - I think we just sat in a meeting that didn't turn out to be a particularly good time for anybody. (Unintelligible).

Liz Gasster: I think I want to take a poll and see who's planning to be in Costa Rica for...

Michael Young: Yeah.

Liz Gasster: ...starters because I think (unintelligible)...

Michael Young: Let's do that. Let's figure it out.

Liz Gasster: ...there. They may be drawn to other meetings but if they're not there, they may be inclined to, you know, keep to the regular session. Entirely up to you and the team. I just wanted...

Michael Young: Okay. Well...

Liz Gasster: ...to offer that because it's come up (the other team too).

Michael Young: Yeah. That's a good idea. Berry, do you just want to run a doodle on that?

Berry Cobb: Yes. I'll take that action. Thank you.

Michael Young: Thanks. Okay. Shall we jump to the questions? All right. I guess the best way to do it is have the people that wrote the questions actually in - we'll have to try and interpret Don's because he's not here. But have the people that wrote the questions walk us through them. So Steven I see your name up here.

Steven Van Egmond: Okay.

Michael Young: If you want - you want to start?

Steven Van Egmond: Yeah. Let me just find my - my doctorate with my questions in them. Just a moment. (Unintelligible).

Michael Young: If you want to long into the Adobe Connect session, it's on the page there too. That's easier.

Steven Van Egmond: Oh, that'll take way longer than this. Just a moment. I know I sent it to some (of the people). Just a moment. Oh, my Mac has let me down. Well I know that Question 1 was regarding identifying Whois servers numerically.

And based on the feedback I've gotten -- I've just kind of showed it to a couple of people just informally -- is this needed to be made a bit more to (client turned menu ish) as in the multiple choice as my original questions are fairly open ended. Is that your impression?

Michael Young: I think, you know, so I'm looking at this thinking the first question is so open that I wonder if we couldn't narrow it down to some more options I the multiple choice and then allow them a comment box as well. I'm

just inclined to see if we can't get a little bit more automation in the answers if possible.

Steven Van Egmond: All right.

Michael Young: What does everyone else think?

Susan Crawford: I agree. This is Susan.

Michael Young: And so Steven, with this question, are you trying to - let me ask what you're trying to get at with it. Are you trying to get at whether or not there's a difference between registry Who is requirements and, you know, a regional registry authorities and RIRs needs?

Steven Van Egmond: Well those are the different audiences that we have access on the grids, right. And this relates - the specific question relates to automatic identification of Whois servers. Right.

Michael Young: Yeah.

Steven Van Egmond: So the range of use kits that are occasionally needed for that - sometimes people using like (unintelligible) Whois tools or Whois services. Other people are using kind of like supply libraries or they just need to (roll) their own tools.

Michael Young: Okay. So why wouldn't - if that's what you're trying to get at, then maybe we should break this into two or three questions that explain that pulled together.

Steven Van Egmond: All right. I can do so. Can't do it off the top of my head but I can certainly do so.

Michael Young: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: Michael, this is Steve Metalitz. Could I follow up on...

Michael Young: Absolutely. Go ahead Steve.

Steve Metalitz: I think because as you point out that this does talk about three categories of entities that operate with servers, the registrars, the registries - actually it talks about registrars, registries and ccTLDs - gTLDs and ccTLDs. But we could include RIRs in there.

All I say is it might be worth just breaking those. Would you - do you think it would be useful to have such a facility or such a list or registrar? Do you think it'd be useful having for gTLD registries? Do you think it'd be useful to have it for ccTLDs? Do you think it'd be useful to have it for RIRs?

So then you might...

Michael Young: Right.

Steve Metalitz: ...get some - some might be more than others. It might be useful that way.

Michael Young: Yeah. And one question Steve I think would be interesting to get at is - I mean we've always assumed that, you know, one ring rules them all to be a little geeky here.

But, you know, should it be - should we be trying to write one which services satisfies all those different customer cases or is it appropriate for something that's, you know, more specific maybe a variant of Whois that's specific just for the RIRs? You know. I wonder if that's worth asking. Do we want to open that can of worms?

Steven Van Egmond: That is quite a can of worms.

Michael Young: It is. (Spill them out). Do you think we should ask questions along those lines, right?

Steven Van Egmond: Certainly could.

Michael Young: And maybe Steve a clarifying question - opening question saying is your interest in Whois across all these different areas or do you - are your concerns regarding Whois specifically for, you know, as a registrar or is it a...

Steven Van Egmond: Yeah. (Don't) perhaps argue for perhaps like a section zero so to speak in this questionnaire regarding the respondents collected - their industry and their focus.

Michael Young: Right.

Steven Van Egmond: Right. Indicate if they are a registry or a registrar or an RIR or who know, right.

Michael Young: You know what Steve, I think you got a good point. Maybe we should kind of add an R zero and just kind of just like, you know, respondent baseline questions.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah. This is Steve Metalitz. I think that's - I agree. That's a good idea I'm sure for demographic information and then you can kind of sort it different ways. You might take a look at what was done in the Whois survey that was done in 2003 or 2002 where there are a number of categories were listed, you know.

Steven Van Egmond: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: We have to figure out what are the right categories. But it would be good to know not only what type of respondent we have but maybe how much they access Whois data.

Michael Young: Right. Some people are going to be consumers of Whois data. Some of them are going to be providers, right.

Steve Metalitz: That's right.

Michael Young: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: And for the consumers it might make a difference if they access it once a year, once a month, once a week, daily, 1000 times a day.

Michael Young: Sure. Okay. Berry, can we add that as an action item to create some baseline questions for the respondents? And does anyone want to take that or do we have any volunteers?

Susan Crawford: This is Susan. I'll take it.

Michael Young: Great. Thanks Susan. Appreciate that. Okay. All right Steven. We kind of hijacked you a little bit there. But that was - but you got...

((Crosstalk))

Steven Van Egmond: No. That's no problem.

Michael Young: That's good. Do you want to talk about the next question?

Steven Van Egmond: The next focus is - sorry I mean - we was on Section 8.

Michael Young: Oh, I was just looking at Question 2. Does anyone have any comments on - you got two questions there in R1.

Steven Van Egmond: Yes. But I split that into two questions.

Michael Young: Yeah. Does anyone have any comments on that?

Steve Metalitz: Do we want to have that - this is Steve Metalitz. When we have this, you know, question about different options, do we want to also leave a space for people to suggest other options than the ones...

Steven Van Egmond: Yeah. In all cases I wanted to get their - so surely be submit additional options.

Michael Young: Okay. Yeah. Okay. Again Steve, is there anything we can do with this question? I guess, you know, it's a technical question that just there

are going to be some people that don't understand this one that take the survey. And I don't know that there's much we can do about that.

Steven Van Egmond: Well I mean it is a technical questionnaire, right about...

Michael Young: It is. So in some cases - in some elements it's very technical.

Steve Metalitz: But again we're not administering this - this is Steve Metalitz. We're not administering this questionnaire just to people with a technical background. I mean there may be questions they can skip over if they don't understand it or don't want to answer it. You don't have to answer all the questions. But I do think we should be aiming for a broader scope of respondents.

Michael Young: Should we - okay. So here's an idea. When we have a question that's more technical like this, what do you think if we have a tick box option that says I'm skipping this question because, you know, it's technical and I don't have a technical background.

Avri Doria: Avri, I raised my hand.

Michael Young: Yeah. Go for it.

Avri Doria: Yeah. This is Avri. I don't know that we'd want to be that specific about why someone was not answering a question. Because later ones there might be someone that is technical but doesn't have a policy background.

Michael Young: Okay.

Avri Doria: So you may want to come up with, you know, a - choose not to answer, you know, no opinion, whatever...

Michael Young: Yeah.

Avri Doria: ...and leave that as indeterminate as opposed...

Michael Young: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...to say I don't understand.

Michael Young: So rather than have them leave it blank, just have an opt out box. What if we - what if we gave them a few like opt out, I don't understand, I don't have an opinion?

(Ann Mastiges): And this is (Ann). I think maybe a non applicable and then maybe they don't really feel that's applicable to their issue, which is sort of the same as opt out.

Michael Young: Yeah.

(Ann Mastiges): But I think that, you know, someone might not find it relevant and that would be interesting information to have.

Michael Young: Yeah. So maybe a - yeah. Steve, do you want to noodle on that a little bit more and suggest the structure we could use on every question?

Steven Van Egmond: Sure. Glad to.

Michael Young: Thank you. That's Steve Metalitz.

Steven Van Egmond: Oh sorry, Steve Metalitz.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: No. I'd be happy to. I'm delinquent already in what I - in writing the questions but I'll be glad to suggest something there too.

Michael Young: Great. Thanks Steve. Okay. Berry, you want to drop down to the next questions.

Avri Doria: Can I ask - since we've done that, this is Avri again. Can I ask...

Michael Young: Yeah.

Avri Doria: ...what I wrote in the comment as a meta question because what Steve just got...

Michael Young: (Here we go).

Avri Doria: ...volunteer to do or accepted volunteering to do presumes and answer to it. Are we - have we made a decision on what type of question? As I look down this list I basically see different types of questions. There's the multiple guess, there's the true and false. I know in the questions I wrote that I submitted too late to make the cutoff, I used a one to five scale from completely disagree to completely agree.

There's different ways to do this. I'm assuming we need to pick one method of framing questions and that we don't want to have each question using a different questioning methodology. So I guess I just

wanted to put that on the table. And I wasn't going to bring it up as allowed question but the one - the question we just got into of how to include a not applicable on this - that made me think that maybe I should throw that on the table. Thanks.

Michael Young: Avri, it's Michael. So I think that's part of (Wilson)'s group's guidance as part of how, you know, advising us how to structure the survey.

Avri Doria: I see. Okay. Thanks.

Michael Young: Yeah. Because one of the things that we asked them to do was can you - can they help us consider a structure to the questions that would allow us to build some metrics about it.

Just like you said, you know, scaled metrics or something like that with a particular eye toward whether or not we can grasp some kind of, you know, prioritization to importance on certain elements or requirements from asking these questions so we can get, you know, a prioritization ranking as far as the respondents are concerned.

Avri Doria: No, this is...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: So the form we're writing these in now is pretty much irrelevant...

Michael Young: Yeah.

Avri Doria: ...because that'll change based on what that group comes up with.

Michael Young: Right. Right. So the idea would be, you know, get the elements on here that we want to ask questions about, you know, try and refine what we're asking questions about right now. And then have all the authors try and fit them into the, you know, some sample structures that (Wilson) and his team put together for us.

Avri Doria: Okay. Sorry for the tension.

Michael Young: Oh no problem. I think we had this discussion before you got - you were actively involved. So that's no problem. Okay. Susan, do you want to walk us through your questions?

Susan Crawford: Sure. So admittedly I had a rather easy one I think because mine were pretty easy to my item in a yes or no format. So basically I had to or I'm querying the recipient - survey recipient would ever want to search through a Whois record for something other than by the domain name.

And so I just took the requirements on standard Whois servers, the data points and data elements contained within them and did a yes/no on those. I don't know if we need to go to every single line item in all the various Whois server formats. But I threw them all out there for now just because that's available.

But my idea was if they said yes then it would display all the options available. But if they said no, it would go nowhere and then just go onto the next question because not everybody is going to either want to search within the Whois record.

But I made a comment in my questions because if we do this, we allow them to search within a record, the - whoever they're searching it

through, the registry or registrar, it's going to have to be able to produce the report in a multiple format stage and I know registrars will balk at this. Knowing the registrars that I do, they will not be interested in doing something along these lines.

Michael Young: Yeah.

Susan Crawford: So I wasn't sure to what degree we needed to go down this road or if we needed to throw that out there ahead of time or what.

Michael Young: I mean like asking about all these data elements but I think we need to - in order to not corner somebody into - sometimes it's a yes with a but or...

Susan Crawford: Yes.

Michael Young: ...it's a no with a but or people will start to go oh, how does this step on privacy law and stuff like that. So what if we did a yes and a no and then you can also check in combination - have a box that says special circumstances and you can pick a yes with special circumstances or a no with special circumstances or maybe we have a yes/no and a yes special circumstances, no special circumstances and then give them a - and then from, you know, comment bar at the bottom to elaborate on your special circumstances.

Susan Crawford: Yeah. I was - I've been trying to gear way from free form input boxes because they'll be hard to decipher when we get the surveys back.

Michael Young: Yes.

Susan Crawford: So I'm (just trying to say). I'm just not hiding around it.

Michael Young: Yeah. And, you know, to be honest just being a technical person by nature and by trade, I like definitive yes/no answers. But binary, you know.

Susan Crawford: I'm with you.

Michael Young: Yeah. But not the other. But I've been told by many people that do a lot of survey work as part of - there are a lot of marketers that do a lot of survey work as part of their trade that they - you know, unless they're trying to guide the results of the survey that, you know, you should include a comment - an optional comment box at the end of questions.

And so we're not trying to guide any answers here so I'm wondering if, you know, I'll ask this to the group. Should we be pretty much planning to have something of a comment box at the bottom of every question and realize that we may not be able to, you know, develop a metric around those comments or effectively and necessarily process all of them.

But at least we can look for ones that really point out something that was not considered and try and highlight those in our report eventually at the end of all of this.

Susan Crawford: That would be work for me, yeah. I realize we...

Michael Young: Yeah.

Susan Crawford:...people have - usually have an asterisk whenever they answer any question. I do myself so I understand the need. I was just trying to somehow work around it.

Michael Young: Yeah.

Susan Crawford:And if I said the inputs because there's not a standard form on the inputs, you know, address and phone numbers and things like that, make it very difficult to do searches throughout and get accurate results. So some of that kind of stuff in each - either considered or have a disclaimer on it. Maybe a yes/no with comments or comments or with input to actually what they need may be the better way of going.

Michael Young: Yeah. And, you know, one of the things I'm thinking about how we process those comments boxes at the end of it is maybe just try and sort the comments in some category is like, you know, have a - and present that as part of the report for anyone to read the comments that they want to. And not have us necessarily as a group try and interpret the comments specifically. Maybe a category of the comments we would.

So, you know, some of those categories on the line could be, you know, clarification. So we go through the comments and we try and sort out all the ones that are just asking - looking for clarification on something that's already been, you know, mentioned to discussed in regards to the survey information.

And, you know, or another category of issues already raised flag or discuss, right. And then another category of we've never heard of this before. This is a brand new issues, right, or...

Susan Crawford: Right.

Michael Young: ...brand new concept.

Susan Crawford: Right.

Michael Young: And then when we publish a final report we can - maybe the ones that we actually as a group make some comments back on, you know, maybe a couple of us could go through with the clarification ones and if they're comments that clarifications are (the stuff) towards us, then we can answer the clarifications.

If they're to someone else around Whois in the industry, I can post them, you know, and give an indication that these are common confusions or questions that people are asking.

Susan Crawford: Right.

Michael Young: Right.

Susan Crawford: So taking that into consideration, I would probably amend this survey on the questions a little bit and (unintelligible) on them because I think there's probably - being in the company that I am, I understand where people search priorities are and we could offer them like for or five of the top search priorities like registrant and registrar or some specific element and just leave it as a contact name, contact address and see if any of those kind of bubble up to the surface as being a priority input devices that they want to have to go to search through.

That would help define on the Whois server side the actual data server side what needs to be put together. (Unintelligible).

Michael Young: So would we try and combine this all in a single question or would we, you know, do a subsequent question that said okay, now you've said which ones of these you'll look up. You've had a special circumstances comment book now. Here's another question that says pick the top five and prioritize them. Is that what you're saying?

Susan Crawford: No. Just say I think you - and I apologize but I (must have) mentioned this but we do not usually line item every one of these inputs or data elements. I think we could probably...

Michael Young: Okay.

Susan Crawford: ...just do a yes/no and if it's a yes, okay, are you interested in dates? Are you interested in contact names? Are you interested in contact email addresses or contact phone numbers?

Michael Young: I got it. Okay. Yeah.

Susan Crawford: I'm (feeling a) little bit that we can kind of get an idea of what they really want to search through because they may not care about dates at all. So why put the hassle and requirement on the Whois servers to have to actually implement that? It's kind of over my head with that when I was doing this

Michael Young: Okay. Well we can certainly ask the questions.

(Ann Mastiges): And this is (Ann). Mike I am thinking the same thing that you just raised kind of in response to try and figure out exactly how we were going to reword this. But I do think it would be worthwhile to have another question and maybe it will pop up. Susan, if it does, I'm sorry if it pops up next.

But I do think it would make sense to say okay, now you've identified these things, prioritize them. Because I do think that would be helpful information. What do we really want to push to - that the - now if there's a consensus around that we want to be able to search by date or by name, then I think it would be helpful to have that information.

Susan Crawford: Well maybe going back to what Avri was suggesting having the scale.

(Ann Mastiges): Yeah.

Susan Crawford: If we give you five, rate them one to five.

(Ann Mastiges): Yeah.

Michael Young: Yeah.

Susan Crawford: Something like that.

Michael Young: Yeah.

(Ann Mastiges): I think that makes sense.

Susan Crawford: And then I see Berry just scrolled down. Once you put this in there, the next question begs to, you know, comes up whenever you do searches

if you need includes and excludes, joins and things like that. Do we need to go to that level of question on the survey or is it something we could deal with after we know the answer to that above, then we could figure out from the next stage of this process with the system from being able to offer those parameters. Does that make sense?

Michael Young: Yeah. I think so. I like this question. What's going to - but what's actually going through my head is again, you know, there's new - there's a lot of newcomers I think we'll expect at the next meeting and jumping into the ICANN space now with the new registries coming along or at least the new registry applications coming along.

So I'm looking at stuff that I've known these terms as long as I can possibly remember but will other people understand them by default. So I'm wondering if we shouldn't star things like non-ASCII, wildcard, you know, search parameter and have definitions and footnotes for all that kind of stuff.

Susan Crawford: Or use non-technical terms.

Michael Young: I think include and exclude search parameter options. Yeah. I think for something like that line, I don't see any other way that any less technical way to ask it but maybe for - but it's not so technical that you couldn't - with a little definition you couldn't maybe explain it.

Susan Crawford: Right.

Michael Young: So do we do explanations where we have things like that that are so - a bit technical but not so far gone you couldn't explain it to the non-

technical that we star those and we - at the bottom of the question we put a footnote that explains - gives a definition.

Susan Crawford: Or we could give an example, something like that. Yeah.

Michael Young: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Wildcard. What's a wildcard? Right.

Susan Crawford: Yeah, I know. Sorry.

Michael Young: Yeah. I mean we're all very used to this stuff. It's like breathing for us. But yeah.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz if I can get in the queue.

Michael Young: Yeah. I think you're the only one Steve so go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Yeah. Just two thoughts really. One is kind of a placeholder. I think we have a question that comes earlier than this one or maybe it's later than this one. Asks people if they think there are other data elements that should be collected in Whois and made available in Whois.

So it may be that they want to be able to search on those elements too. So there needs to be some way to incorporate that if - whether it's in this question or in the other question. I guess it's R6B so it's a later question. But one place or the other they need to be able to say I think you should include this other data element and I'd like to be able to search on it.

The second thing is, you know, again I'm thinking back to the experience of the 2002 survey. We did have open-ended questions there and we - or comment, you know, ability for people to comment in prose. And it was very time consuming - very time consuming to go through all those and try to categorize them as you said Michael. It - I remember many hours of us doing this.

Now partly that's a question of how many responses we expect to get, which is another interesting question that we should probably talk about at some point. But I think - and I understand that you want to, you know, people will probably rebel perhaps if there's no ability to add some type of free form comment.

But I think we should really try to minimize that if we can especially if we are expecting to gets thousands of responses, which we had in 2002.

I think it would be - if someone - I don't know who - someone would be spending a great deal of time going through those and putting them in different categories.

Michael Young: So, Steve, I agree with you 100% on both counts. I think we're on a bit of a knife edge here. I don't think we can take away comment boxes because like you said that upsets people. On the other hand it's a huge effort to process it. So can we narrow it a bit somehow?

I'm going to suggest that we all think about that. I mean, I know a number of people that work heavily with surveys and I know some of you do. Why don't we put that as an action item to - for us to all go away, think about that, talk with other people, get - see if we can come

up with some ideas on how to find a balance and bring that back as a discussion point in the next meeting. See if anyone comes back as discovered any brilliant ideas.

Steve Metalitz: I think that's a good idea.

Michael Young: So, Berry, you could add that to our action list. That's for everybody to go away and ponder and see if they can brainstorm or refer to other resources or other - see if someone else's brilliant has solved this problem.

Berry Cobb: Got it.

Michael Young: Okay. All right now you've got - you have me all apprehensive, Steve, about - we're just trying to get the survey out the door and now I'm already starting to worry about how we're going to process it. Okay.

Any other comments on this question? Should we go onto the next ones? Okay, Berry, shall we slide on down? Okay, Avri, these are yours.

Avri Doria: I thought I hadn't made the cut and so I was free from having to talk about them.

Michael Young: No such luck.

Avri Doria: And I had just really gotten started and as I say I had figured - I had looked at it on a scale of 1-5, you know, and then basically a set of statements each of which would have, you know, the scale, disagree

completely, agree completely and I think adding the sixth one that is either not applicable or no opinion or whatever is a good idea.

So then I went through and was taking my first guess at some of these. I think I need to do more work on it but was looking at statements - oriented around statements. In order to improve the Whois service capabilities we need this (unintelligible). We need this. We need that. And getting the views on that particular issue I don't know if we need.

And then on 6b I had just really gotten started on it when, you know, I said gee if I have any chance at all I'd better send this in. So that's the approach I was taking but I really need to go a little further. I think even on the first one - so I looked at, you know, is a formal definition needed? If there is a formal definition should it be done in a modeling language?

Should it be done by ICANN? Should it be done by IETF? But not asking a question making a declarative statement. You know, should ensure the data is entered in a defined manner; should allow for some fields to be made mandatory; should require that all fields be made mandatory.

You know, and then on the 6b current one sized fits all model for Whois is sufficient for today's - is sufficient for tomorrow's needs. Should be possible...

Michael Young: Right.

Avri Doria: ...to include other forms of contact. It is appropriate to include social media as a method of contact. So that - so I was going through the two

of those looking for declarative statements that one might make based on 6a, 6b or at least that's the approach I was taking.

Michael Young: I like this because, you know, it allows you to - I mean, in, you know, a set of these you could put out statements that argue against each other if you want it to, right? You know, it's really great you could have six or seven items in a question like this and 2 could be the opposite of 5 and it gives people their chance to align themselves with an assertion, right?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Michael Young: It's good, it's good because we can also, you know, it gives us automation in qualifying some of the data. The only risk in a question like this is did we miss an assertion - an important assertion, right?

Avri Doria: And part of that comes out of testing the question and it is one of the steps that, you know, we've talked about and perhaps this is one of the other subgroups is it has to set and you test the coherency of the question. And...

Michael Young: Yeah.

Avri Doria: ...and so on. And that's when, you know, you make sure that you haven't left things out but yes.

Michael Young: Yeah and that's why we had planned to have some consulting help with having the review of our survey. And also we wanted to use ideally the - maybe some council members or even the Council to - as a, you know, a beta test before we release the survey and get their

feedback on, as you said, Avri, how comprehensive the questions; are we missing something? Was something hard to understand so forth.

The other thing that goes through my head is again I'm thinking about how hard it would be for certain people to answer a question like this. Like, you know, so 6a when I look at this, you know, some of these - some people have no idea what, you know, really what the IETF is, right?

Therefore why should a model include it? You know, some people have no clue what - really what a modeling language really is. And - but they'll be interested in other questions in the survey.

So I almost think - have you ever seen on how-to Websites where you go and you look up home renovation stuff or fixing your car or something they'll often have a scale of 1-10 on easy to do yourself, degree of difficulty an 8.

And, you know, I'm sitting there looking at these thinking, you know, I'm almost tempted to rank the questions on how technical they are, right, in order to answer them. But I guess we (all) still want to prejudice the questions by doing something like that.

Avri Doria: Yeah, and I think that if you add the consideration we had earlier of, you know, either the not applicable or just no answer and you have the other section that you talked about where people define themselves then you have the ability to say ah-has, Question 6a, you know, the people that define themselves as a lawyer and non-technical did not answer.

And so that gives the people that are doing the metrics if you both have a - this is how I characterize myself section and did not answer then, you know, the people that are playing the statistical survey analysis on it, you know...

Michael Young: Yeah.

Avri Doria: ...obviously it's not going to get (unintelligible) style thing. But the people that are doing that can sort of say for this population we see that the tendency is this with a standard deviation of that and a variance of the other. We see this for this population, there were certain areas that did not, you know, they didn't see as applicable or did not feel confident to answer and so on.

So, you know, you give yourself a chance to - especially with many questions you give ourselves a chance to do a bit of survey analysis on the data - automated...

Michael Young: Right.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...on the data.

Michael Young: Yeah, no that makes sense. That's good. I see Steve Metalitz's hand up - virtual hand up.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah. Thank you. Just a couple of comments. I think we definitely should consider this, you know, 1-5, agree, disagree system. But we do then have to be prepared for the fact - and I think people will tell you

this is a fact - you're going to get a certain percentage of people who will, you know, say if you question if the sky is blue and they strongly agree and your next point is the sky is orange they will also strongly agree.

So I think this is just inherent in - it doesn't always resolve all the contradictions. That's just human nature I guess. But the other thing is, again, I think we need to be very careful about technical language here and make sure to unpack exactly what we mean to say. One size fits all could mean a lot of different things to a lot of different people.

And in particular the question is about work on the model should be done by ICANN or work on the model should include the IETF. I thought we were focused here more on trying to figure out what are the requirements for this service.

And what is the people who use the service or who provide the service think ought to be included or not included in it. And the question of who develops some of the models that are needed to support that I think that's a separate question. I'm not sure we should have that in this survey.

We should be focused more on what, you know, what capabilities or what functionality do you need or not need or can you provide or not provide and leave aside the question of what should be done by ICANN, what should be done by the IETF and so forth. I'm just not sure that that's - that would be very useful in this survey. But...

Avri Doria: Can I respond?

Michael Young: Yeah, go ahead, Avri.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay. Yeah, I think you may be right. And I think that perhaps the question is - and what I didn't think through when I was writing it - and certainly, you know, the idea about writing 10 questions is - break out some - is what I was looking at is especially when we're talking about a structured data model which is sort of a different question than what the capabilities are is this is a policy-oriented model? Is this is a technically-oriented model, but, yeah.

The other thing that I was thinking in terms of the first part of your question is I'm wondering in terms of - again this is probably a problem for the how to do the question people - is if this is an online questionnaire is there a value in doing it in such a way that you put your mouse over a word and up pops something that gives you a little bit more information, defines the word, defines the concepts, whatever so that the people that are doing it do have the definitions available without having to go elsewhere.

I know it makes doing the survey perhaps slightly harder, more expensive, what have you but then it also though makes sure that when somebody looks at one size fits all and - or whatever words we put in there - they know what's being said.

Michael Young: I think that'd be great if we can - if we can get that done. Berry, is something you can list as an action item for Wilson? I'm sure he'll look at them after - even though he's not on this call and see if he can look at the tools and see if they can support that.

Berry Cobb: Yes will do.

Michael Young: Okay. And while you guys were talking an idea popped into my head on the comments of one way to help clean them up a little bit or help us process them rather. What if we predetermined our categorization for the comments and asked people filling out the comment box to self-categorize. That would save us some effort. Steve?

Avri Doria: You mean in words? Self categorize in words?

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Well yes...

Avri Doria: I'm an itinerant...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: So I have a - sorry, go ahead. We're both talking at the same time, go ahead.

Avri Doria: In other words the self described - and self for example I would write down I'm an itinerant researcher.

Michael Young: No, no I'm saying so remember we talked about sorting the comments into like clarification comment...

Avri Doria: Oh okay.

Michael Young: ...new issue, right. We could have - a row of options underneath the comment box that allows them to tick off one of them.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah that might be worth - this is Steve Metalitz. That might be worth trying. It might simplify but the problem is, you know, their characterization might not really be accurate. And you might end up reading a lot of other things anyway or else missing a lot of things. But I think it's worth - it certainly would be worth trying that to see whether that helps make it more manageable.

Michael Young: Well and at the very least I think if we take that approach and we do miss something because of it we can say look, I mean, we did our best, we gave you the opportunity to self declare how you want us to look at it, you know, we made every effort. But, you know, we can't - you put it into the wrong category so we if misunderstood it sorry. Right?

I want people to - I think I'd like people - I mean, I think we'd all like people to come away feeling we did our very best to listen to what they had to say within reason.

Steve Metalitz: Right.

Michael Young: Okay. Steve, your virtual hand is still up. I don't know if you want...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: No, no, I'm sorry. You could take it down. I'm sorry, I forgot to do that.

Michael Young: That's okay.

Avri Doria: I'll do more cleanup work on these - on these points over the weekend taking into account things that Steve said that are...

Michael Young: Right, great. Shall we go onto the next one? Is this Steven van Egmond's I think?

Steven van Egmond: RA1?

Michael Young: Yeah.

Steven van Egmond: Yes.

Michael Young: Okay.

Steven van Egmond: So...

Michael Young: Steven, are you running out of time you mentioned?

Steven van Egmond: Shortly but I can probably get this done in the meantime.

Michael Young: Okay great.

Steven van Egmond: My questions focused on the need for elevated access to Whois data. So rather than only seeing public data or dealing with rate limits that are available to the public these questions are designed to elicit use cases where someone has the right to exceed those limits or to exceed typical anonymous access.

So we asked for the use case, if they have a use case (unintelligible) a little bit of access. If those access rights are circumscribed in any way as in either only in response to a court order or if it's part of their regular work - day to day work and whether it's constrained to a certain set of TLDs or if it's a class of all TLDs.

And in the case where it's a computer system that has elevated access if there are any preferred mechanisms for providing that access - the elevated access either through cartography, username password credentials, special, you know, systems set aside and so forth.

Michael Young: Okay. Steven, I'm thinking on 3 there maybe it would be good to in brackets give it a little example like you just gave to us to help the comprehension of that particular question.

Steven van Egmond: Sure.

Michael Young: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I think, yeah, I had a little trouble understanding this also. And in some cases - I'm - when you say elevated access it sounds like you're saying more than the status quo. But I thought the idea here was not to say do you like the status quo or do you think, you know, it's to say what should be the requirements.

And so I suppose one way to look at that is to say do you think anybody should be able to have access to all the Whois data or do you think there is some subset to which not everybody should have access or only authenticated people should have access?

So, I mean, I think that we want to kind of capture the whole range don't we of elevated access or diminished access or whatever compared to the status quo which is unauthenticated - in the gTLD space it is unauthenticated access to a defined set of data elements.

Michael Young: Right.

Steve Metalitz: So I'm just thinking maybe the approach should be instead of saying more than that or less than that you should be - first of all if we are going to take the more than that, less than that approach we need to define what the status quo is. But maybe we should say, you know, authentication or non - you know, access even if you're not authenticated and then would it be...

Steven van Egmond: Right, right.

((Crosstalk))

Steven van Egmond: And Question 1, does - are they into - identify if they have access - if they have the right to elevate an access rights.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: Elevated compared to what is the question.

Steven van Egmond: The public?

Michael Young: Okay so that means we're back to having to try and define the status quo though right?

Steve Metalitz: Yeah.

Michael Young: Should we try and define the status quo and then ask this question?

Steve Metalitz: The status quo if pretty easy to define, I mean, you can look at it and, you know, it's in the affirmation of commitments, it's in the Whois review team report. So you could do that and then say do you think there should be more or less?

But another way to do it would be just say do you think people should have to identify themselves and have their identity authenticated before they gain access to some or all of the data? You'd have to sort of unpack that but I think that's really what this - what this requirement is driving at isn't it? Anonymous access, verification of identities using a range of authentic - authentication methods and credential services.

So anonymous access is at one end and then authenticated access would be the other side of the spectrum. And what methods should be used and what - should there be credentialing. I mean, I think those are kind of the options that this requirement suggests.

Michael Young: Yeah, Steve, it's Michael speaking. I agree with you in that regard. So, Steven van Egmond, I think to kind of expand a little bit on what Steve is saying with some examples so even - there's a question with rate limiting, you know, upcoming rate limiting challenge with IPv6 addresses whether or not even anonymous access should require use credentials.

So for example today I don't need any user credentials to do a Whois lookup but maybe in the future I need to go sign up for an

(anonymized) user ID or credential and then I can do my Whois lookup. And that's to allow Whois rate limiting services to track sources, right, instead of...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: ...on IP addresses. You know, that'd be an example.

Steven van Egmond: Yeah.

Michael Young: So if we could expand these questions to a bit wider of a scope to cover both the positive and the negative sides of it?

Steven van Egmond: Okay. All right good. Thank you.

Michael Young: Okay. Anyone else have comments on these questions? Okay. All right so I think we're done with those ones. So, Steve, if you have to run...

Steven van Egmond: I do. Thank you.

Michael Young: Thank you for your work and your help.

Steven van Egmond: No problem.

Michael Young: Okay. I'm just looking at Don's stuff here now. Don's not here. Do we just - do we just have Don's questions left, Berry?

Berry Cobb: Yes these are the last ones.

Michael Young: Okay and so what have we - can you just scan down the page to see what we've got left here really quickly? And that's it for today?

Berry Cobb: Correct.

Michael Young: Okay. You know what? We're at 5:15; we scheduled 90 minutes. I'm going to suggest what we do is we bounce these ones to the next meeting so that Don can walk us through what he was thinking.

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Okay. All right so hearing Steve's support and no objections I'm going to suggest we do that. And, Berry, that means we'll close off Number 5 and open up new business. And see if anyone's got any new business they'd like to add? Okay.

I'm going to - hearing nothing I'm going to kind of jump to 7 and start kind of talking about what we have on board for the next meeting. Some of us like myself owe some questions so I expect that we'll have Don's stuff plus some more submissions.

I think the existing questions have had comments back so I guess we'll - I expect some revised ones from people by the next meeting on their questions if they could do that that would be great. If anyone doesn't think they can do that please let me know now.

Okay hearing nothing I'll assume that you can get your revised ones done by the next meeting. I will get my questions done. Don will have his to go through. And that should give us a full meeting again of work to do two weeks from now.

Are there any other action items that people want to - we'll get Berry to go through them actually first and then I'll ask that question. Berry, can you list off everything you've got?

Berry Cobb: I guess. I've got the first two. The first one is dealing with logistics for the Costa Rica meeting. We're going to go ahead and get a placeholder for a timeslot. Try first preference on Monday at our normal meeting time and see what happens from there.

We'll also look to reach out with some of the SOs and the ACs for a possible road show if we decide not to do the public comment period. The second action item is complete and I just sent out a poll to determine if the working group will be attending Costa Rica or not.

Third action item is to Susan and I believe if I captured this correctly is to capture a survey respondent profile. Is that a fair statement?

Susan Prosser: That's what I understood it to be.

Berry Cobb: Okay great. Fourth is a carryover from our previous action item list. And this is for the working group assignments for each requirement. And, Michael, you kind of said by next meeting what do you think would be a fair date that I can send out across the list in which to have new or requirements yet to be filled out, complete as well as those that will be edited between now and then?

As you mentioned the 23rd is our next meeting. Shall I post maybe the 18th, next Wednesday, as the deadline to have the next version or new

version submitted? And that will give me time to fold them into our next draft.

Michael Young: Yeah, Berry, I think that that's reasonable.

Berry Cobb: Okay.

Michael Young: And I think some of us will get in on time. And unfortunately you'll always shave one or two stragglers so if that's - if that's the case and someone is straggling but (does) have questions done in time I would ask them to at least post them to the list prior to the meeting and we may not get them on Adobe Connect but at least if everyone circulated them we can still try and go through them in a worst case.

But it is very nice if you can get them to Berry in time for him to have them up on the Adobe Connect all consolidated like this.

Berry Cobb: Great, thank you. The next action item is mine and that's just to compile the next version of the survey question drafts. Sixth action item is for the entire working group and that's to search, collaborate or brainstorm for ideas on how to best handle comments within a survey.

The seventh action item is for Wilson and this is to determine if the online survey tool will have the ability for either popup comments or links to more detailed information that will allow the respondent to gain further details around technical requirements or some of the less explanatory phrases that are used in the survey questions.

Michael Young: Okay.

Berry Cobb: And I think that's it.

Michael Young: The other thing I was going to say can we add to Wilson's task list? If he could give us guidance possibly by the next meeting or come to the next meeting with a suggested framework for the questions. The sooner we get into a more consistent mechanism of structuring them probably the easier it is for all of us.

Berry Cobb: Will do; I've got that added here.

Michael Young: Thank you, Berry.

Berry Cobb: Okay so that's all for the action items. And the only other thing I'll conclude with, as I mentioned, the next meeting will be on the 23rd of January; same time as this. And as a friendly reminder there is only three meetings scheduled until the 1-March deadline to have the draft to the Council.

Michael Young: Right. And so, you know, on that note I'll ask everyone to really make these count. I think we got a lot of work done today so that was good. At this rate I think we'll make kind of a decent draft and we will note it's a draft only but we should have a decent draft. And that's another good reason, Berry, why we should get into the new format before - by next meeting for the questions.

                         The other - this is kind of a question for you, Berry, but to be answered to the group is do you have a preferred way of us marking up revised questions? Do you want us to send you the entire list of, you know, if I do one set of questions, I revise them but I only change 3 out of 10 questions do you want me to give you the whole list again with a new

date on the file so it's easy for you just to cut and paste it in again or how do you prefer?

Berry Cobb: Just like you said; I'll cut and paste. But please provide the entire next version of your questions and I'll just cut and paste that entire chunk into this master copy.

Michael Young: Perfect, okay. Great, thank you. Okay did we miss any action items? Does anyone want to add anything? Okay hearing nothing I'm going to thank everyone for their - for their effort and their clever thinking and I feel like we got a lot of good thoughts on the table today and we're making progress. Thank you everyone and have a very good day.

                                        END