WHOIS Survey Drafting Team
TRANSCRIPT
Thursday 10 November 2011 at 1800 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-dt-20111110-en.mp3

On page:

http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#nov

Attendees

Susan Prosser - RrSG
Wilson Abigaba - .ug ccTLD registrar
Michael Young – Individual
Anne Naffziger - IPC
Cintra Sooknanan - ALAC
Werner Staub

ICANN Staff

Liz Gasster
Berry Cobb
Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies:

Don Blumenthal – Ry
Steve Metalitz - IPC
Avri Doria - NCSG
Elisa Cooper
Julie Hedlund

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the WHOIS Survey call on the 10th of November 2011. On the line today we have Susan Prosser, Anne Naffziger, Michael Young, Werner Staub and Wilson Abigaba. From staff we have Liz Gasster, Berry Cobb, and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

We also have apologies from Don Blumenthal, Elisa Cooper, Julie Hedlund and Steve Metalitz. I would like to remind you all to please state your names when speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much.

Michael Young: Okay. Thanks everyone for coming to the call. I appreciate your efforts as always. This is a volunteer effort so we should always acknowledge and thank everyone for every one of these meetings that we attend and the work that they provide.

Unfortunately it looks like we'll go through our agenda I guess but, you know, to note off the top we're missing two of our co chairs. And I am, you know, happy to say that Don and I will be meeting Monday in Toronto so that...

Liz Gasster: I think you've got the other two now. I think you've got two and you're just missing Don. Werner and Wilson are both on.

Michael Young: Oh Werner joined, oh great.

Werner Staub: Yeah.

Michael Young: Fantastic. Welcome, Werner. So just to say Don - I have an opportunity to catch up with Don on Monday and so some face to face work on the items that we're dealing with here. So that's good news in that Don did have some things going on on a personal level that kept him away from the working group for a bit but those have been resolved. So we can expect him to - he's

excited - I talked with him and he's excited to pick up and get back involved again.

So shall we start with the agenda-bashing? Has everyone reviewed the agenda? Does anyone want to add or change anything to the agenda?

Liz Gasster: Well it's Liz. I think we've agreed to add the - just as a discussion item the Board request on SAC-51, the SSAC taxonomy report.

Michael Young: Correct, okay. So that we'll slot basically for six for new business; we'll come back to that. Anything else from anyone? Okay so why don't we - hearing nothing why don't we go our - I think we have Wilson and Werner on and so we'll start with Werner if that's okay?

Werner Staub: Yeah. Can you hear me?

Michael Young: I can.

Werner Staub: Yeah, okay. Unfortunately I have nothing to report because I was unable to handle the last couple of things, you know, in the ICANN meeting. There was - I had a conflicting meetings, wasn't able to make it. And then this was actually the situation thereafter; this is a situation I've never had before in terms of the amount of pressure that's building on for the new gTLD program.

So I'm even worried a little bit about the future because this does not seem to be - to abate. So I would like to discuss about how we can handle this because - because of the amount of time that is not expected would be taken (unintelligible) and probably also many people here also would expect the new gTLD program.

So I still want to do as much as I can on this but I'm not at all satisfied about the, you know, my own inability to have - to contribute as much as I wanted to.

Michael Young: Werner, would - I totally understand; I think we all, you know, well at least some of us in the groups have direct pressures from the new program. Some of us, you know, volunteer in different ways around ICANN; some may not.

Would you want to consider talking to the members of your subgroup and seeing if somebody wants to switch up the leadership role with you?

Werner Staub: That might be an idea, yes. That might be an idea because it's really - there's not, you know, I've taken this responsibility and realized it is no longer compatible with the situation. And so it would, you know, have - need somebody who can lead this and not be drawn away all the time with other urgencies that have built up to a degree that I've never seen in my life actually.

Michael Young: Okay. Refresh me on who we assigned into your group again.

Werner Staub: It's short - I don't even know it by heart. I have to go back to that pool.

Michael Young: To that email, yeah.

Werner Staub: Yeah.

Michael Young: Yeah, I don't know if I have any. Liz, do you have those lists handy by any chance?

Liz Gasster: Yeah, I'll get it out while you're chatting.

((Crosstalk))

Liz Gasster: Oh someone has it.

Anne Naffziger: This is Anne. I have the email handy here. I believe it's - and if I'm (unintelligible) Cintra Sooknanan, (unintelligible)...

Michael Young: Sorry, I couldn't hear you there. You kind of faded out.

Anne Naffziger: The email that we have dating back to August is Cintra Sooknanan, Elisa Cooper and myself, Anne Naffziger.

((Crosstalk))

Werner Staub: I mean, Cintra is trying to get on the call but she needs somebody to call out to her. She just sent me a note. I'm sure that is in the process or has already happened.

Liz Gasster: Didn't know, I don't think. Nathalie, do you recall getting a request for a callout for...

((Crosstalk))

Nathalie Peregrine: No I didn't...

Werner Staub: She just - she wrote - she sent a message to Gisella.

Nathalie Peregrine: Okay.

Werner Staub: And anyway so I'm not sure - I can ask her...

((Crosstalk))

Liz Gasster: ...if you could send it to me.

Werner Staub: Who's speaking, is it?

Liz Gasster: Liz, sorry.

Werner Staub: Oh Liz, okay. Okay...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Yeah.

Werner Staub: Okay.

Michael Young: Werner, can we leave you with that...

Liz Gasster: ...and have her call out?

Michael Young: Yeah.

Werner Staub: Yeah. Okay I'll try to handle it with the members of the group. So, you know, we don't have to take bandwidth right now for the (unintelligible).

Liz Gasster: But also, Werner, if there's a way for...

Michael Young: Thank you, that'd be great.

Liz Gasster: ...the staff to help in any way let us know.

Werner Staub: Okay I appreciate that.

Michael Young: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: And if nobody in the group, for whatever reason, wants to assume leadership position let us know and we'll open it up again to the entire group and see if somebody wants to swap around into that.

Werner Staub: Okay. Thanks a lot.

Michael Young: Thank you. Thank you for, you know, just putting that on the table, Werner, because it's much more helpful if people can just be very straightforward about what they're able to do. And, you know, we accommodate accordingly.

And I know your voice will still be in there. I mean, even in the peer reviewing position you're very knowledgeable in this space and it would be helpful for your feedback.

Werner Staub: Well it's - I think many people would have possibly participated if it hadn't been like (unintelligible) fairly small group. And it must have already have an effect before that in terms of the numbers participating because so many people are drawn away.

Michael Young: Yeah, I mean...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: ...our first call had a whole - our first couple of calls had a - what seemed like a lot of people interested. And that faded quickly once the program got approved, didn't it?

Werner Staub: Yeah.

Michael Young: So, okay. We will make do with what we have and push ahead. So on that note I guess we'll go to Wilson and then I'll talk about - we'll go immediately to three after Wilson because we can talk a little bit about what we're going to

try and do to accommodate and the fact that we have a bit of a smaller group now. So, Wilson.

Is - I don't see Wilson on the Adobe Connect anymore. Did we lose him?

Werner Staub: I think we did, I (unintelligible).

Liz Gasster: Yeah.

Michael Young: Yeah. Okay well why don't we just to three and when he pops back on we'll engage him. So what we decided to do with the meeting schedules just to simplify things because everybody is - things are so much more faced paced and people are struggling with different responsibilities with the program - the new program underway that we thought we'd simplify the meeting structure again and just go to entire group meetings every two weeks.

And ask the subgroup efforts to organize themselves in between those two weeks to accomplish the action items that we agreed that they're going to get done before the next call.

And so they can either, you know, communicate via email, put together a call if they think that that's necessary or go point to point amongst themselves to get things done. But as the entire group we come together every two weeks. And if we need to go, you know, an hour and half in that call that's fine. Better to do that once every two weeks and have a regular meeting time that people can address or work around versus the kind of overlapping structure we were doing before.

So that's what we discussed at the last meeting. We have a few more people on the call now from the last meeting so what do people think of that especially the new people to the call; are we still okay with that structure?

Werner Staub: Yeah, this is Werner. I think this is a good idea specifically in view of the, you know, dire resource situation that we face.

Michael Young: Right, okay. And, you know, we'll still try and keep the subgroup structure going to do the parallelization of work but it may just turn into in some cases assignment of work items out to even individuals, you know, for an action item to turn back by the next meeting sort of thing.

And so we'll combine our project management efforts on every call then. And the agenda will have, you know, updates from anybody who is in a leadership position or in a direct deliverable for that call at the beginning of the agenda.

And then we'll move through to develop our next deliverables for the next meeting or subsequent meetings. And then we'll go in general to any kind of ancillary things whether or not something has come up like this SSAC report or, you know, a new piece of business if that makes sense. Okay.

So that's kind of what we're trying to do today that same sort of structure. So in that vein I'd like to jump into saying, you know, if we break this down a little bit realistically what can we get done for our next meeting in two weeks?

And so I'll throw out a few things I had in mind and see if the - to get the conversation started and see if others can join in and offer things that we can get done and get momentum.

As an action item for myself I'll volunteer to go through the related SSAC documents. And I think Liz said that they would review - the staff would review that as well and try and pull out anything that we need to do in regards to that.

Another work item that we'll talk about in five, just to clarify, but we have - we owe a response back to the request from the GNSO Council that we talked about at the last meeting. So not everyone was on the call so we'll review that

request again and just clarify that. So I'll volunteer to take care of working with Liz to draft a response to them for that. And those are two action items I can take.

I'd like to know if - and we don't have Wilson on yet but if I have to reach out to the individual, Wilson, and Don obviously I'll talk to on Monday. But I'd really like to see if we can get the work scope done for our three areas of work initially by next meeting.

So, Werner, if you're looking for a - you know, someone to swing into the leadership position one of the key questions is do they feel they can, you know, develop that for the next meeting or at least an outline.

Werner Staub: Okay.

Michael Young: Okay. Does anyone have any other work goals in mind in keeping with, you know, what we've agreed to as a group to do that's attainable before the next meeting?

((Crosstalk))

Werner Staub: ...look at the next meeting if it's - when would that be? That's two weeks from now.

Michael Young: Yes.

Werner Staub: Can we talk about the 24th, something like that?

Michael Young: Correct.

Anne Naffziger: That is a US holiday.

Liz Gasster: Right, so we have to talk about still the scheduling of the next couple of calls because...

Michael Young: Yeah...

Liz Gasster: ...the next...

Michael Young: We'll assume we'll balance Thanksgiving.

Liz Gasster: ...would be Thanksgiving Day and then the following week staff is off site for the whole week and won't be available to staff any working group calls.

Michael Young: Oh okay. So let's pull up calendars then and, you know, while we're on the subject why don't we try and figure out the date of the next call then?

Werner Staub: Well the one thing that worries me a little bit is the big ICANN deadline in the context of the (unintelligible) RFI which has - there's a couple of other things developed of course but...

Michael Young: Yeah.

Werner Staub: It's...and the pressure is terrible.

Michael Young: I can totally sympathize. So what's that deadline again?

Werner Staub: I think it's the 30th he's gotten us - he's gotten the 18th, I believe he's got (unintelligible) is a telephone conference has to be prepared and then there's, you know, the - I think the 30 is the deadline for the response.

Michael Young: Okay so do we want to target - obviously that's a bad day for you. The 1st and the 2nd of November I have pretty much all day commitments on. But I could, you know, I could do the - you know, I'm safe earlier than that but obviously we have other problems with the holidays and then staff support.

So if we look at the week of December 5th I have travel starting on the Tuesday but I could do a call on the Monday, December 5, if that would work for people.

Werner Staub: I think that would be more comfortable for me, yeah. Yeah and - but then again, you know, we never know what's going to happen...

Michael Young: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Werner Staub: We'll say the end of November is going to be pretty hellish.

Michael Young: Yeah. So I think that's probably a - is everyone okay with trying to shoot for that day for the next meeting?

Anne Naffziger: (Unintelligible).

Michael Young: I just heard somebody talk but I couldn't make out what they were saying.

Anne Naffziger: Yeah, that's fine with my schedule.

Michael Young: Okay great.

Liz Gasster: This is...

Michael Young: Liz, does that work okay for you - for staff?

Liz Gasster: Yes it does.

Michael Young: Okay. So why don't we do a Doodle for the exact time?

Werner Staub: Okay.

Liz Gasster: And then just to move one step ahead, if we could, do we want to then try to get back on an every other week...

Michael Young: Yeah.

Liz Gasster: ...like what would be the next - would we go for the 15th then and try to get back on Thursdays?

Michael Young: Yeah, I think Thursdays are probably generally a better day in the week for people. You know, it's a safer day in the week for people than a Monday.

Liz Gasster: Okay so the 5th and then the 15th and then we're probably skipping two weeks and going into January...

Michael Young: Right.

Liz Gasster: ...for the next call.

Michael Young: That sounds about right.

Liz Gasster: Okay. Very good. I just want to get us on a regular schedule so the 5th, the 15th and then the first Thursday in January.

Michael Young: First Thursday in January, yeah, sounds good. Okay.

Liz Gasster: Very good, thank you.

Michael Young: Thank you. And we've got our action items for the next meeting. And so let's go onto five...

Liz Gasster: We'd like to talk a little bit though about what you said - this is Liz now speaking - about the access - the request that we got from the GNSO Council and the - you mentioned that you would work with staff to develop a response to the Council on that. But I think it's important for us to discuss as a group for the group to agree that that's the case that they...

Michael Young: Yeah.

Liz Gasster: ...think that it's probably beyond the remit of this group. So you might have intended...

Michael Young: Yeah.

Liz Gasster: ...still to have that conversation but I just want to be - to emphasize I think that's important before we start to actually draft a response to...

Michael Young: Absolutely, Liz.

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: So that's five. And I think we actually said, you know, we need to do a formal - I think we should do a formal vote, actually, as a working group or at least verbal response that it's not in our remit.

Liz Gasster: Okay.

Michael Young: Liz, do you have that language? Can you throw that - oh there it is on the side. Okay. So, guys, if you're looking at Adobe Connect the specific phrase that we're troubled with - where is it here - resolved in response - request - oh, the GNSO Council requests the WHOIS Survey Drafting Team to consider including the issue of WHOIS access as part of the survey it has been tasked to develop.

And we certainly are considering it as a technical requirement but we want to - we want to - it's more of a clarification than to say it's not in our remit, I think, Liz.

And that is we want to give a response back just stating that reiterating that the work we're doing is about technical requirements, technical functionality that we're asking questions about versus, you know, passing any kind of policy judgment on whether or not access controls should be, from a policy point of view, should be part of a WHOIS implementation or not.

Certainly I think we - wherever functionality can be turned on and off it's just - it's prudent to that have as an option in any system. But - so I think we just want to give them back a clarifying statement saying that this is what we believe is our remit; that we're looking at the - this a requirement or functional request versus any policy or even really, you know, how we would hardcore specifically technically, you know, apply it because that's out of our remit as well to get into the details of the implementation.

So does everyone agree that, you know, that's where we should be focusing and that we should be being clear to the Council that this is not - that we're staying clear of the policy decisions around WHOIS access?

Werner Staub: Sorry, could you just repeat the last sentence. There is...

Michael Young: Werner, what I'm saying is the thought I'm asserting is that, you know, sure we'll consider WHOIS access; there are questions surrounding the WHOIS access that will be part of the survey because it's part of the report that we're building the survey from.

But we want to make it very clear to the Council and put a response back to them saying, look, we're looking at it as functionality; it's not our remit - the remit of our group to judge whether or not WHOIS access, you know, is turned on or off or, you know, in use by some registry operators and not in

use of others. We will make sure that we remind them that we're staying clear of the policy questions around that.

Werner Staub: And, yeah, the thing is I'm unsure about that actually because it is kind of (unintelligible) is related to many other things; that's why I'm a little bit unsure just - whether I'm comfortable with it or not.

((Crosstalk))

Werner Staub: I understand also we have to limit the remit of our group which is of course...

Michael Young: Yeah.

Werner Staub: Yeah.

Michael Young: Yeah.

Werner Staub: It's actually a really difficult question. It's a really difficult question but it's, you know, where should we limit the remit and are we making a mistake of suddenly (unintelligible) something. But...

((Crosstalk))

Werner Staub: ...thinking about - we were thinking about that. And also to see what other groups are looking at that because it's such a complex set of issues be handled by different working groups.

Michael Young: Right.

Werner Staub: So maybe, yeah, I would like to see - I think, hear what staff who have a better overview of all the different things think about I somebody will handle the subject, you know, if we don't handle it.

Michael Young: Well - and I'm not saying we wouldn't handle the subject, Werner, there - a requirement around WHOIS access is in the WHOIS requirements report. So I think it's in our remit to look at that like we agreed we'd check back in with stakeholders. But to constrain our questions around the actual functionality; not whether or not - let me be clear - not whether or not the functionality should be turned on or off by various registry operators. You see what I mean?

Werner Staub: Yeah.

Michael Young: I mean, it's - you've built many systems. This is about, you know, is the function there? Great. But whether or not you choose to use that function is another question. And that's really a policy - in some legal jurisdictions it's a legal question, right?

Werner Staub: But do you put that under the word access? I mean, would it be...

((Crosstalk))

Werner Staub: ...but is what made me hesitant, you know, because we have the problem of people not being provided access or access for some people and other people who should not have it.

Michael Young: Right. So, yeah, I mean, our questions, I think on the survey would be all around what levels of WHOIS access, you know, give you an example. A general question would be maybe, you know, do you believe that there should be access controls around WHOIS?

Do you - what, you know, what type of access controls would they be? Group-based? Would they, you know, could the - do you believe that the different accesses should provide different data responses? You know, are all kind of around functionality, right?

Whether or not you choose to use them or not is another question, right? But...

Werner Staub: Okay so it is having it is one question which we would of course address having access whether, you know, nobody obliged you to use it.

Michael Young: Correct.

Werner Staub: Of course. But then if you say certain piece - certain data should only be available to certified law enforcement people, for instance.

Michael Young: Yeah, I mean, I don't know that we need to be that explicit in our questions. Our questions would be more like do you believe we should have different defined groups of WHOIS users? And those different defined groups should have different access by definition of their groups to different data responses. Right?

And so our questions would be - we'd stay out of the political of, you know, specifically asking whether or not law enforcement, you know, should get...

Werner Staub: Yeah, I know.

Michael Young: ...you know, yeah. So that's - I think that's something we'd want to clarify with the GNSO and say, you know, we're going to stay away from being specific and defining the actual groups.

I mean, the system should be configurable to create, you know, one or 100 groups if that's what you want, right?

Werner Staub: The question is of course will it still be understandable if you do the survey and be so generic that nobody understands what they mean by differentiating by groups.

Michael Young: Well that's a good question. And I think, you know, what we'd want to do is find the most - I think we would ask the generic question and then under the generic question ideally when we write these questions is we would try and give an example.

Werner Staub: That's a good idea, yeah.

Michael Young: You know, and make the example as harmless, you know, as noncontroversial as possible, right?

Werner Staub: Yeah, exactly because if you make a controversial example then people will - the reason - do the reasoning on the basis of the example instead of the principal, you know, you're right.

Michael Young: Yeah.

Werner Staub: Yeah.

Michael Young: So this is actually the response back the GNSO Council would be, you know, frankly a little tricky to write to make sure that they understand where we're coming from. But I think, you know, it's important we try to make that clarification because I think there's already talk - talking to people in general who have been working on like, you know, around WHOIS policy and so forth, you know, I've talked to a few including Kathy recently.

And I had to explain to her kind of, you know, that we're concerned with requirements and functionality versus, you know, the right - how it should be applied, right? Which is what the policy folks are worried about.

And so Kathy Kleiman - it took me about 10 minutes of kind of just reiterating it in different ways until she really, you know, got what I was saying. So I think we have to try and draft something very carefully here.

And, Liz, you offered to help draft this. So given it's going to be a tough one to draft and make it comprehensive I really appreciate that.

Werner Staub: Yeah.

Liz Gasster: Yeah...

((Crosstalk))

Werner Staub: I mean, specifically in this case, you know, it's...

Liz Gasster: ...he and I have been jabbering and he definitely has a couple of ideas about how to articulate it so we'll work together on it.

Werner Staub: But, you know, there is...

Michael Young: Right.

Werner Staub: ...I just can, you know, take this example of where people could misunderstand each other. For instance...

((Crosstalk))

Werner Staub: ...differentiated access, you know, differentiated responses, you know, as such is a good idea with respect to the serving different needs. However saying that on the same address, you know, upon the same request at the same address you would give differentiated responses depending on who, you know, who is asking would actually be technically, you know, a bad solution, you know.

We'd rather say okay you create different questions and some people would be able to ask the more in depth questions or (unintelligible) response or not whereas other people wouldn't. But if you say this - the same place but give

different answers is actually technically bad solution because many misunderstandings.

Michael Young: Yeah.

Werner Staub: So we have to be careful in terms of how we ask that question so people don't misunderstand it as, you know, are we proposing a flawed technical solution.

Michael Young: Right exactly.

Werner Staub: As opposed to a policy question.

Michael Young: Right. So we have two groups to communicate carefully here; those that are actually implementing and the technical folks on one side, make sure they understand that we're not trying to dictate the implementation. We're trying to talk about the functionality.

And then same issue with the policy folks, you know, we're talking about the functionality here; we're not talking about whether or not the functionalities should be turned on or off is another question.

So okay so that's a very good point. And the draft I'll try and, you know, mostly with the Council - I don't think we're looking at a, you know, just a small number of truly technical people on it but because the response could be viewed by many we'll try and make sure that it's clear to both the technical and the nontechnical communities. That's going to be a fun one to write.

Werner Staub: Oh yes, yeah.

Michael Young: Yeah, okay. So everyone has been listening to the conversation back and forth with Werner and I. Does anyone have anything to add or do they think that that covers it?

Okay hearing nothing it sounds like I'm going to take that as, you know, permission from the group to go ahead and draft the response in that way. And then once we have it we'll circulate it on the list and ask people to - we'll give you a time period to come back and say if you want to adjust it or have suggested edits and if everyone's okay with it we'll move ahead and submit it.

Werner Staub: Okay.

Michael Young: All right and, Liz, the new business was the SSAC report and direction.

Liz Gasster: Right.

Michael Young: Yeah. You...

Liz Gasster: So thank you so much. This is (unintelligible) for circulating a notice that's been sent to the - all of the SOs and the ACs from the Board which is in receipt of a paper that the Security and Stability Advisory Committee published called the SSAC Report on Domain Name WHOIS Terminology and Structure which is referred to as SAC-051.

And this report has several recommendations in it that are spelled out in the email that we forwarded to all of you. I think it's probably easier to follow this by looking at what the recommendations are that have been extracted into this email which is at the end of the email.

Recommendation 1, has to do with specific terminology that the report explains that it thinks is useful for talking about what - different aspects of WHOIS, being clear about when we're talking about something at the protocol level versus the directory service level.

The second recommendation says that the community should evaluate and adopt a replacement domain name registration data access protocol that

supports the query and display of internationalized data. And that's a, you know, the DNRD is explained as one of the taxonomy elements above as well as addressing relevant recommendations in previous SAC reports - previous SSAC reports that also talk about deficiencies in WHOIS. And those are referenced there.

And then there's a third recommendation that recommends that the ICANN community develop a uniform and standard framework for accessing this data that would provide mechanisms to define and implement a range of verification methods, credential services and access control capabilities.

So here you see in the SSAC recommendations themselves rather specific language in the sense of really encouraging the adoption of some replacement protocol so technical replacement capabilities that I think, you know, is directly relevant to the work that we're doing here in trying to define what those technical elements should be.

And then I think I want to just draw your attention to the fact that this - these recommendations were submitted by the SSAC to the Board. And then the Board in Dakar resolved in its second resolve clause, which is - you'll see further up in the email, again that we circulated to you today - the Board directs staff to produce, in consultation with the community, a roadmap for the coordination of the technical and policy discussions necessary to implement the recommendations outlined in SAC-051.

So the staff is tasked with consulting with the community about what this roadmap should contain. But developing a roadmap to submit to the Board for, you know, how to coordinate the technical and policy discussions necessary to implement this. And I think there is definitely some relevance to the work of this group there.

The Board also asked for the report - the SSAC report - to be circulated to the different SOs and ACs. And that's what this email actually does is it's the

official request to the chairs and vice chairs of the supporting organizations and advisory committees to review the SSAC report and to provide comments to ICANN staff within 60 days; not later than January 9, 2012 it should be.

And Julie Hedlund is coordinating that just the gathering of the input from the SOs and ACs. I would suggest that this working group consider proposing to the GNSO that it consider providing some comments or at least providing input to the Board that describes what the work of this group will be and how this group thinks it could provide input over time to what the Board is hoping to accomplish here.

I mean, I think they are relevant and that's something that I would suggest that this group communicate to the GNSO Council. And we can talk a little bit more about that at our next meeting if you agree. But I do want to thank Susan again for bringing this to the group's attention.

And I do encourage you to look at the report and the Board resolution and we can talk - I'm happy to answer any questions you have. I have the primary authors of the report on an upcoming call. And - to handle any next steps you all think are appropriate.

Michael Young: That sounds great. It also sounds like we're getting some...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: ...some steam.

Liz Gasster: ...you know, applicable comment it's encouraging that the Board has identified this as a priority issue that, you know, part of what's set into this, for those of you who are involved in the internationalized registration data working group that's got a draft final report that's seeking comments now, there is attention from several quarters on the fact that there's going to need

to be a coordinated sort of technical effort, you know, and potentially policy effort too with regard to a new protocol.

But I think that the Board would definitely be appropriate for this group to provide guidance to the degree that it can.

Michael Young: Okay. Any questions? All right, Liz, thank you for that, that was a really good update. I think we have to go through the materials and also think about in general how - you know, I do think it adjusts the work that we're contemplating. And that these efforts, to some degree, should draw together because otherwise we're going to end up with some duplicate work or effort.

You know, typically there, you know, this survey I think was meant to be a larger scale outreach in order to confirm some understanding about, you know, what we all think that the basic functionality should be in the next WHOIS service or, you know, what should be at least included. Again whether or not it's turned on or off is another question.

But, you know, I think what this represents - what we can do as a group for this effort is, you know, make sure that any key questions that need to go out to a broader outreach community gets included in our survey. And they could use this as a conduit to deal with the larger outreach, you know, requirement or desire that would happen in this work you just mentioned, bind it into what we're doing and then, you know, do both kind of in one effort versus having, you know, multiple efforts.

Susan Prosser: This is Susan. I just - I'm concerned - I agree with you, Michael, that it might take more on. But the - my concern is the group is rather small as it is. And I think we would need possibly some more participation if it does expand. Is my kind of...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: I'm absolutely with you. If they want to do more of an effort I think, you know, part of that would be twofold. One, we would expect to get more volunteer resources. But then also I think this starts to become such a large initiative and such an effort that we'd have to actually ask for some - we talked in the past about making some resource requests around consultancy help in terms of reviewing our survey and so forth.

But, I mean, we'd just be getting to a work scope size where we're going to need more support like that I think.

Susan Prosser: Right.

Michael Young: Actually - yeah, paid support per se - that we have people's time...

((Crosstalk))

Susan Prosser: ...volunteer type we have?

Michael Young: Well the volunteers would be absolutely, you know, imperative to maintain the bottom-up mechanism, right. But, you know, it's - volunteers in some - when you get - when the work gets up to a certain level you want the volunteers to be directing, reviewing and approving or, you know, modifying or editing and so forth versus a lot of the groundwork or the research or whatever or the initial draft writing.

And that we could use - if we could get funding for it we could use paid resource for it.

Susan Prosser: I agree.

Michael Young: Okay. That's - those are - it sounds like - does anyone want to offer any other thoughts on that? Okay.

Hearing none I think we've come to the end of our agenda. I'll ask one more time does anyone have anything else that they want to add to the overall meeting?

Susan Prosser: This is Susan again. I have a quick question. I'm part of the - Wilson's subgroup. And obviously he's dropped off the line unfortunately. How do I find out what the next steps of our subgroup are? Should I reach out to him or is that something, Michael, you're going to try and wrangle the subgroup chairs together?

Michael Young: I would suggest both.

Susan Prosser: Okay.

Michael Young: Yeah. I'm going to - Werner has got an action item. I'm going to be seeing Don in person on Monday. And I will try and get a call going with Wilson as well between now and the next meeting. But, Susan, I wouldn't hesitate to reach out. You should probably be having ongoing conversations directly with your - with your sub-chair.

Susan Prosser: Yeah, I don't think he's been able to utilize his subgroup as much as he could.

((Crosstalk))

Susan Prosser: ...members.

Michael Young: Yeah, you know, feel free to contact me directly if, you know, if you're finding you need any assistance with that.

Susan Prosser: Yeah, no, I'll reach out to him. And I know that Steve was also having a challenge. So we'll make sure that he knows that we are available to him in our subgroup and in any effort.

Michael Young: Great. I'm very interested to be kept up to date on how that goes.

Susan Prosser: Okay I will.

Michael Young: Great, thank you. All right...

Werner Staub: Okay.

Michael Young: So thanks everyone. I guess, Liz, we're going to wrap it up...

Liz Gasster: Okay.

Michael Young: ...unless staff has anything more?

Liz Gasster: Nothing more to add. Thank you all very much. And, you know, look for the
                    Doodle just to confirm the time for our next call which will be on the 5th of
                    December. Did I get that right?

Michael Young: Yeah.

Liz Gasster: Yeah.

Werner Staub: Okay.

Michael Young: Thanks everyone.

Werner Staub: Okay thanks.

Michael Young: Take care. Bye.

Liz Gasster: Bye.

((Crosstalk))

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, (Tonya). You may now stop the recording.

Coordinator: Thank you.

END