WHOIS Survey Working Group
TRANSCRIPT
Monday 23 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-20120123-en.mp3

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees
Steve Metalitz - IPC
Avri Doria - NCSG
Cintra Sooknanan - ALAC
Paul Brigner
Susan Prosser - RrSG (adobe connect)
Michael Young - Individual
Wilson Abigaba - .ug ccTLD registrar
Wendy Seltzer - ALAC

ICANN Staff
Berry Cobb
Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies:
Liz Gasster
Anne Naffziger – IPC

Coordinator: and all participants, this conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time.

You may begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much (Kelly). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the WHOIS call on the 23rd of January, 2012.

On the call today we have Wilson Abigaba, Cintra Sooknanan, Avri Doria, Michael Young, and Steve Metalitz.

We have apologies from Liz Gasster and Dan Nattinger, and Wendy Seltzer has one that she will be 30 minutes late to join the call today.

From staff we have Barry Cobb and myself Nathalie Peregrine.

I would like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes.

And for (Paul) (unintelligible) just joined the call too. Thank you and over to you.

Barry Cobb: Great. Thank you Nathalie. And Susan Prosser will be about 10-15 minutes late as well.

So Michael, this is Barry. I've got the agenda posted over to the right, and action items. And like I mentioned, let's go ahead and just kick right off into the action items real quick. And we'll let Wilson provide us an update if you don't mind.

Michael Young: Sounds good.

So Barry...

((Crosstalk))

Wilson Abigaba: …now, or...

Michael Young: Yes. We can go - we're...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Go ahead.

Barry Cobb: Yes. So Wilson there were two action items. Go ahead Wilson.

Wilson Abigaba: Yes, this is Wilson. I do not have much to update about because I just schedule - I just went to - I won't complete the call, so I just went (unintelligible) - I - if there's urgent comments I could attempt it in the first few minutes.

Regarding my two action items, now I was provide guidance on the subject with some structure and form of a questions. That I prefer to defer that one until the persons have - (unintelligible) come up in most of the questions, because most of the persons I see are the - whereby respondents have to choose that option and they read the questions one, four and then get reasons.

I don't - the only comment I have to make is that we should avoid open-ended questions (unintelligible) unless we are (unintelligible) the last item of other or even it up on somebody. Open-ended questions I (unintelligible) analyze and that's the only comment I have.

Otherwise, the rest of the questions are okay, whereby I'm - where the (unintelligible) is required to choose any of the options. And we welcome any kind of questions (unintelligible) by the respondent doesn't need to take.

They can be multiple select or single select, or even read and narrate as long as the respondent doesn't have to type on the keyboard.

That's all.

Then, for B - is that fine Michael?

Michael Young: Well, you - just trying to understand - did I understand you correctly Wilson? Does that mean we lack the ability to take comment boxes or guided comments? Like if people want a free form text?

Wilson Abigaba: For the comment boxes, yes they can be there, but they are not advisable. They are not advisable because is difficult to analyze using a computer program - to analyze the responses in comment boxes.

Michael Young: Yes, I got it.

Wilson Abigaba: (Unintelligible). Yes, that's the only reason why they're not advisable. Otherwise, (unintelligible).

Michael Young: Okay. So...

Wilson Abigaba: But we can design them because (unintelligible).

Michael Young: Well Wilson on the last call that you didn't attend because we realized it far too late and we're going to see what we can do about that for you. But what we talked about was you know, can we afford not to allow people to do a little bit of free commentary would they get - would they feel that, you know, we're guiding them too much in the survey as to the questions, and therefore the answers?

So - but we also were really struggling with the thought of exactly what you're saying. How do we process free form comments in any kind of meaningful way without creating a massive amount of work that goes beyond the scope of our group?

And we thought, well, rather than necessarily process them per se, perhaps we could allow some free form text. You know, obviously avoiding it as much as possible, but we could allow some free form text in some of the questions where it seems pretty appropriate to allow people to voice themselves.

But, also ask them to categorize - like give them categories that they can select along with the free form text box to say - and we would create some categories such as you know, "This comment is a clarification." "This comment raises - falls into the category of new ideas."

Or along those lines so that we could just correlate, not necessarily - you know, not necessarily even comment in detail on the comments, but rather just present them in an order that people who want to dig into them in reviewing the report has the opportunity to look at that as maybe a sorted attachment of comments.

Wilson Abigaba: Yes, that's - well, that's a good suggestion. I - it's possible. Where - if I honestly wanted (unintelligible). For those free comment boxes, someone can have an option of classifying the comment - each comment. Like maybe we said any idea if (unintelligible) a complaint or something like that. To classify their comment in the - where they can, that's very possible. It would be helpful.

Michael Young: Okay.

So could you look into the feasibility of that and - so that we have that as an option if we - if we really feel strongly as a group we need to allow some free form text on one or any of these questions - I mean obviously, we're going to try and avoid it. But if we feel it's necessary, then we have that structure in place to help, you know, manage the return comments.

Wilson Abigaba: Yes.

Michael Young: Okay.

Wilson Abigaba: Yes, we can have that structure in place for the next call which I think will be the next two weeks?

Michael Young: Okay.

Wilson Abigaba: If I could get some sample questions for that? Like for example, for (analyze) category, it would be (unintelligible). In this - these other questions are - we had the question that falls under that category already.

Michael Young: Okay.

                   So if anyone on the call has a question amongst theirs that they feel really requires you know allowing some free form text, if you could please forward it or identify it on the list? Wilson, I'll look for them as well. And you know between you and I and people identifying - self-identifying some of their questions, we'll see if we can pull some of them out of the list and try working with them - which comment boxes.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay, sure.

                   Okay. Something I'll also try to do for our next call is that I will put all these other questions that have been worked on so far in the tools so that you can look at them when they're in the tool already.

Michael Young: Awesome. Okay. That was another thing I was going to ask you. So if you were prepared to do that, that would be fantastic.

                   Do you have any thoughts on - and the people working with you so far, did you guys have any thoughts on how - like we should - is there a common structure we should try and put the questions into? They vary quite a bit right now, and I think we were all willing to try and rework our questions into kind

of a common mechanism or methodology. You know, maybe like a priority ranking answers.

You know, I did some of mine as multiple choice and some of them as multiple choice just being yes, no, or indifferent.

But you know, I don't know if it's - if you think it's feasible that they all follow the same type of mechanism or if it would be even easier for you to go through and sort them into a common mechanism and work with the individual authors of the questions to sort them into a common mechanism? And I'm quite willing to help with that too.

But what do you think would be - would work the best?

Wilson Abigaba: (Unintelligible) that question (unintelligible), could you please repeat again please?

Michael Young: Let me try and explain myself again.

So there's simpler ways to format these survey questions, right? You could have a question and then four or five choices, right?

Wilson Abigaba: Yes.

Michael Young: The answer to the question could be how do you feel about structured queries in WHOIS? Do you feel it's really important? On a scale of 1 to 5, mark how important you think it is to have this. That could be another way of formatting the questions. And, do a 1 to 5 scale, right?

Wilson Abigaba: Yes.

Michael Young: And there's a variety of different formats to the questions that all of us have come up with. So we're looking for your guidance as part of your working -

your subgroup's mission is to kind of help us corral the rest of us into a common format, if applicable. Or maybe there's two or three types of questions we should all be trying to format our questions into. We just don't want to have I think 15 or 20 different types of questions. Do you see what I mean?

Wilson Abigaba: Okay.

Yes, I get what you mean. We can - okay, I'm going to use the - I'm going to use these questions (unintelligible) so far to come up with at least maybe at most four types of formats.

Michael Young: Perfect. Okay.

And then we'll structure - if you give us the four, you know, applicable formats, we can all go through the - the folks that have already generated questions or will be generating questions, we can all go back through our questions and make sure they fit one of the approved formats.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay, sure.

Michael Young: Okay. That would be great.

Wilson Abigaba: Yes, I'll do that. Okay.

And then if that's concluded, regarding the formats, the second - the action item from you was to determine if the online tool will (unintelligible) to or most of our comment for additional information (unintelligible) they need to understand the question. That is possible if you - that's possible, which I'll do that.

Michael Young: Okay.

Sorry, that was the pop up...

((Crosstalk))

Wilson Abigaba: Yes, that was - yes. It will be a pop up if it's required from your - when you hold it on the question, the explanation will come and then we can also put at the end of a question a small icon. Be sure that you can hover on it or click on it to get more information.

Michael Young: That's great. Okay.

Wilson Abigaba: There was - yes, there was as addition of having footnotes to explain what were the question, but - because that - because people no longer pay attention to the footnotes and - yes, to the footnotes, so it would be hard for people. But if there's a (unintelligible) it will be easier for the respondents.

Michael Young: Great. Okay. That was very helpful.

Does anyone have any comments or you know - I mean, I'm trying to represent what we talked about on the last call and run through it with Wilson, but feel free to jump in if I've missed anything or you want to add something.

Okay. All right, so it seems like we're on track with that. All right, do we have anything else for Wilson?

Barry Cobb: No, that's it for Wilson's assignment, and I can just start running through the other ones real quickly and then we can jump right into the survey questionnaire.

Michael Young: Okay. And Wilson, I mean if you want to hang in there for the - to go through the questions, that's great. If you're getting too tired and you want to exit out at that point, you know, feel free. We don't want to have you staying up until all hours.

Wilson Abigaba: Yes. I'll stay on the call for about 30 more minutes, and then leave the call.
(Unintelligible) about 30 more minutes.

Michael Young: Perfect. Thank you.

Barry Cobb: Great. Thank you Wilson.

So this is Barry, let's run through the rest of the action items real quick. The
first one was assigned to me, and that was to request a public session for the
Costa Rica meeting. The schedule that they have working now is strictly in
draft form, but it looks like if we do choose to have a public session, it won't
occur until Wednesday. I believe there's been a - there was some conflicts
with the Monday, given our regularly scheduled time. I'll keep trying to press
for a Monday, but chances aren't looking too god right now, so I'll keep
maintaining that.

Secondly, from our last call, there was also a discussion about trying to do a
road show across the SO's and AC's, and I'm not sure if we want to do both a
public session and the road shows. But just to chat about it real quick, we do
have a temporary placeholder for Saturday to give an update to the GNSO,
but I'm still working on the other SO's and AC's about how that road show will
work and working through it, so this one's still open.

Any comments about our having a public session during the Costa Rica
meeting? And I'll follow that up with, which is the next action item. I did send
out a Doodle to see who is attending Costa Rica and not. And right now,
we're at five and four with a few that didn't fill out their Doodle, so we're about
50/50 almost.

Michael Young: Okay.

Barry, just a question. I think I've got a conflict on the Saturday and I won't be getting into the Cost Rica meeting until either Sunday night or Monday morning I think. So in terms of giving an update to the GNSO, can I do that remotely?

Barry Cobb: I would - I think we do have remote participation set up, so I couldn't imagine it being a problem. And if not, I can also try to lobby to get an update on Sunday if that'll make it easier, but I'm not - I don't own the schedule, so I'll have to figure that out.

Michael Young: Yes. The - either one will probably work. If I am scheduled to come in on Sunday, I can try playing around with my - I'm willing to come in a day early to try and make sure I'm there for the Sunday. But you know, it's probably best or safest on the remote participation if we can do it that way.

Barry Cobb: Okay. Very good.

Michael Young: And I don't think this is a very controversial update or anything anyways. It's more just to - more - probably more of a progress report than anything.

Barry Cobb: Very good.

So as far as the road shows for the other SO's/AC's, is that still something that the working group would like to have move forward as well? Or, do we just stick with our public scheduled meeting?

Michael Young: Barry, I'll throw my two cents in if anyone else wants to get in the queue as well. I'm concerned because you know, I haven't seen a lot of feedback from the outreach side of things. And the folks - I know (Don) has got some good resources on that now, but I'm just not sure that - where we're at with that.

And you know my own experience has been you know, when someone shows up in your constituency group and gives you a brief on something,

that's probably the most effective way for you to understand it or to be aware of it. We really didn't have good attendance in the last, you know, public meeting we had. Maybe we would have better attendance if we had just issued a report, particularly if for some reason we - you know, had been working group that issued a controversial report it'd be different.

But, I don't think we fit into either of those categories, so I don't know that we're going to get much community outreach - you know, feedback from that set of stakeholders we're trying to check back in with unless we go to them.

Barry Cobb: So this is Barry. If I understood that correctly, then you're leaning more towards the road show and not so much the public session?

Michael Young: That's my opinion. I'd love to hear what other people think.

Barry Cobb: And this is Barry. I'll just also add is - you know, if you do maintain a schedule, we can get a draft of our questions complete to send out. I think we did have the intent to also open up a public comment section to draw visibility to some of the survey questions as well. So that would - if we continue on this schedule we're at, we can make that public comment period, you know, be open before and during the Costa Rica show. And then - you know, then it would probably close shortly afterward.

Michael Young: Yes, that would help I think get attendance, or attention to it. So if we can succeed with that, then yes. I think then we're probably okay with the public meeting schedule.

I have - I was going to bring this up in either new business or the agenda (unintelligible) side of things, but I just have confirmation back from registry stakeholders group. I tried to book some time with them to clarify their comments on the original requirements report to make sure that we understand it and see if they feel that there should be any questions generated out of those comments.

And, they were quite responsive. So they've got me scheduled in on February 1st to have that conversation with them.

Maybe we should just - you know, with (Don)'s help and (unintelligible) - I can't do all these meetings, but maybe if we could start to you know split up some of these meetings and ask for a bit of time in the various stakeholders and constituency groups regular scheduled calls, and not trying - you know, plan to get it all done on that Tuesday.

But you know, starting now to start rolling forward through them and making sure they understand what we're doing and what's coming and getting their feedback. And, making sure that they're aware - have their eyes open when the comment period opens, that could be effective.

Barry Cobb: This is Barry. Very good. I'll keep this action item open. And like I said, I'll continue working with Liz to try to get - figure out how we get that stuff scheduled for the other stakeholder groups, et cetera.

Michael Young: Me - Avri, Steve, you guys in particular have a lot of experience with getting people's eyeballs on things. Do you think that is - what do you think?

Steve Metalitz: Well, this is Steve. I think the - at least for our constituency, the time to get on the agenda is usually quite - at an ICANN meeting is usually quite a bit of a premium.

I think probably the best thing to do is for me to update my constituency, the Intellectual Property constituency in our meeting prior to the Costa Rica meeting.

But we often have - well, it varies. Attendance varies, but we often have more attendance on those calls than we do at the (unintelligible) meeting. At least

of IPC members. So I think that would probably be more efficient than trying to get on the agenda in Costa Rica.

Barry Cobb: Okay.

Michael Young: I agree. That's what I was thinking. So if we can - I guess Barry, you know, there's - well, let me open it up to the group. Steve, you volunteered for your constituency. If we can get people to step forward for groups that they're associated with. I'm already talking to the registry stakeholders group, so I can deal with them because I already have a meeting scheduled there.

If we can systematically get people volunteering for the different groups, and maybe that's an action item for (Don), Barry, to make sure that we have a volunteer for every group to talk about at their regular scheduled calls. Not wait for Costa Rica.

Barry Cobb: Okay. I'll put us both down, and I'll kind of put together an assignment matrix so we can track that and send it to the list.

Michael Young: That's great.

And you know, I also volunteer to - you know, I know the registrars quite well also, so I could brief them as well.

Barry Cobb: Okay, very good.

Shall I move on to the next action item?

Michael Young: Yes.

Barry Cobb: Okay. Number 2 is complete - like I said, that was the Doodle for the Costa Rica meeting.

Number 3 was to Susan to complete the survey respondent profile questions. That has been added to Page 1 of our master list, so that's complete.

The fourth one was for the entire working group, which is to search, collaborate, brainstorm for ideas on how to best handle comments within a survey. I think we just kind of talked through that a little bit with Wilson. And per what you had said Michael, try to minimize where possible. But knowing that we do have them and then figuring out a way to include them as an attachment to the metrics of the survey so they can still be reviewed. So I'll go ahead and close that one out if that's acceptable.

Michael Young: I'm okay with that approach if everyone else is.
We do have an action item that we need to keep on there, Barry, to decide what the categories are that we're going to create our comment boxes. So maybe that's something - does anyone want to take that one?

Avri Doria: Can I ask a question? It's Avri.

Michael Young: Go right ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes, I don't know what you mean by categories around the boxes.

Michael Young: So Avri, what we were talking about earlier was trying to create some generic categories that people can self-select their comments into.

So if I make...

Avri Doria: Oh, okay. So that's what we're calling categories. I see. Okay.

Michael Young: Yes.

Avri Doria: So that thought has evolved. Okay.

Michael Young: Yes. I mean...

Avri Doria: I had missed that. I thought we were just using previous people's comments could be repeated by others. I didn't realize that we were predetermining a set of categories of possible extra comments. Okay.

Michael Young: Well, we're trying to get ahead of the curve. And you know if we get - if we have to take some comments, we have to take some comments. But if we can get the people writing the comments to at least categorize them into some generic categories we provide them, it helps us process them.

Avri Doria: Well, okay. That's fine. That's one way to do it. Yes.

Michael Young: I mean, I'm more than open to any better ideas, but right now that's all we seem to have on the table. So if you come up with something, that would be great.

                   You know, that and the strategy of trying to minimize open comments.

Avri Doria: I guess my issue was just I don't see how categories is any different than the questions. In other words, when somebody has a comment to make, they're saying that the straightjacket you've presented me as a set of questions does not fit. And what you're saying by having categories sounds like you're saying, "And here's a couple of other straightjackets that you can try on. See if it fits.

Michael Young: Yes.

Avri Doria: But you'll still give them other, because that won't fit.

                   I think there's things that you can do after the text when you've got these collected texts. Yes, I know people just read them and doing that, and doing a

synthesis of them is difficult. But there's also these things too of lexical analysis of how often terms show up.

One of the things we had talked about was if somebody presents a comment and someone else can see that - and we were keeping them short. We had talked and talked about the notion that a comment couldn't be any longer than a Tweet or perhaps something shorter.

Michael Young: Yes, I like that idea.

Avri Doria: Somebody could say - and then you could see the comments other people had put in and you would have the option to say, "Oh, yes. That one." Or you'd have the ability to stick your own Tweet-length comment in this, then other people could see and pick on. So you'd have a self-generating list of things that are different that people could subscribe to or add their own.

And then as I say, there's a lot of after textual - I mean you know, that's what the whole Web browser, et cetera, world is all about is doing lexical analysis and finding these categories.

Michael Young: Right. Okay.

Avri Doria: So you know, that would just - I guess I'm looking at it backwards. Thanks.

Michael Young: No. No. I think that's actually quite brilliant. So what if we - so let's talk that through a bit more, that idea and that approach.

So one, we make the comment boxes relatively short. Two, we allow people to - I guess - and Wilson, I guess this is a question whether or not we can show this. But if I'm taking - if I'm filling out a new survey form and I go to fill out a comment box, I guess there should be some kind of link that - or drop down that allows me to see other previously - you know, previous comments.

So I could just, you know, select an existing comment that already basically says the point I wanted to make. And it simply, you know, does a plus one. You know, so another person supports an existing comment. Am I paraphrasing this right Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes. No, that's the kind of - yes, that's put more succinctly than my wandering around the bush with it. Thank you.

Michael Young: Okay. So - no, I like that a lot. And, that gives us actually - what it is is this self - a self-ordering or self-alignment of people filling out the surveys. You know, once one person already gets down what they wanted to say, you can get 20 more people basically joining the - joining that particular comment.

So Wilson, can you look into the - how we structure that or make the survey to actually do that?

Wilson Abigaba: Yes, I'll look into that for - I will be (unintelligible) at the next call to explain.

Michael Young: Okay, perfect. Great. All right, I like that much - I personally like that much better. So that's great.

Anyone want to comment on that?

Cintra Sooknanan: This is Cintra. I have my hand up.

Michael Young: Go ahead Cintra.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay. I do feel that Avri's suggestion is quite worthwhile, but I see an issue as to how do we propagate the first set of comment? Is this something that we suggest? Is it - you know, how do you identify a unique comment then from a full set of comments or...

Michael Young: We don't I don't think. We just display all the comments that were done. If people want to pull - a drop down - I think Avri's going to explain this. Go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes. I was thinking...

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you.

Avri Doria: ...before the first person makes an extra comment, the list is empty. It just says, "Enter your comment". And as other comments are added, the last entry remains, "Enter your own comment," but you see these others in the back - in the drop down before it.

So yes, first person is taking the thing, and it's quite possible that you go through all the way through on a set of questions, or no one would have anything extra to say. That the questions covered it all. They found the right answer there. There was no need for them - and so, that question may indeed have no extra comments.

But, there could be others where what we came up with didn't fit for the people at all and they had other things to say. But they might be self-selecting into groups that while the ones we put there didn't fit, the first guy that came along that said, "This is absurd. You should be talking about Y instead of X." And everybody else that comes along says, "Yes. Yes. Yes." Then, we know that that was a significant comment.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay.

One other question. Sorry.

Michael Young: Cintra, was that clear?

Cintra Sooknanan: Yes, it's clear.

Michael Young: Okay.

Cintra Sooknanan: But I just want to just go forward one more step with that. How do we know - this is an anonymous survey?

Michael Young: Right.

Cintra Sooknanan: Yes, right?

So...

Michael Young: Yes, I think we determined that people can either be anonymous or I think if they want to post who they are, they have the option to.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay.
So may I also suggest that where people do post that they are anonymous, that they be given a new option as well as what stakeholder group they belong to?

Michael Young: Well, we have - I haven't been through Susan's you know starter questions or baseline questions yet, so I was thinking that would be where that would be, right?

Avri Doria: That's in there.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay, great. Thank you.

Michael Young: Okay.

Any other comments on - Cintra, your hand - your virtual hand is still up.

Cintra Sooknanan: I will take it down. Thank you.

Michael Young: Any other questions on that one?

                  Okay, back to you Barry.

Barry Cobb: Great. Yes, so I'll remodify that one but keep the categories just - the
                  conversation we just had open.

                  So basically, the last two action items, the Number 5, which it's really ongoing
                  that we get the survey complete, and that's just for the owners of their
                  requirements questions to update and revise, and submit so that we can
                  continually evolve the draft.

                  And then the last one was me to just send out the next version of the draft as
                  we get closer to the next call.

                  So that takes care of all the action items. And really, Number 2 for the
                  agenda, and I think we've also covered Number 3 on the agenda. So back to
                  you Michael.

Michael Young: Great. So let's get into the - going through the new questions, unless anyone
                  - we kind of jumped through agenda bashing, so I just want to turn it back and
                  see if anyone wanted to add anything to this list or just wait until new
                  business?

                  Okay, then let's get into the questions.

                  So Barry, I guess we start with Susan's profile questions.

Barry Cobb: Correct.

Michael Young: Susan, can you walk us through the questions and your thinking behind
                  them?

If you're talking Susan, you're muted.

Barry Cobb: I see here logged in to Adobe Connect, but I don't think she's dialed in just yet.

Michael Young: Okay. Maybe we should put something in the chat window to grab her attention.

Barry Cobb: Well, she did say she was running late on a call, so we can maybe just come back to the profile section and just start with Question 1.

Michael Young: Okay.

Barry Cobb: Which starts on Page 2 of the document.

Steve Metalitz: Didn't we discuss this last time?

Michael Young: Yes. We discussed these ones last time.

Barry Cobb: Okay.

Question 2 then.

Michael Young: Yes, R2.

So the first question for this is just a baseline question. Is there an appetite for a standardized query structure? So that's very straightforward.

The second one is to try and qualify the - build on that and qualify the answer. And I've provided some examples of benefit for people to select from. We could also have a comment box, and this one would probably be appropriate, because people might feel it's a strong benefit that's not in the list.

Question 3 was actually an attempt to make people tick, because Question 2 allows you to select multiple items, and then Question 3 was to say, "Well, okay. If you had to just pick one of these, which is the one that's the most important?" Which if we get enough survey respondents it would give us a nice statistical curve to let us know where people are focusing on amongst the areas of benefit for standardized query structures.

And then in 4, I tried to - without being too technical in the question, I tried to basically do it effectively as a technical question that less technical people can understand. So emphasizing that they can identify IDN registrations when they query an RDDS server, by doing so in (unintelligible) code, which is in ASCII, beyond that is native multiple language support (unintelligible).

So you know, they - what's that's asking is a much more technical question basically just saying, "If you want a query structure, (unintelligible) allows you to input in Unicode and other such elements. But I don't think we need to dig into the depths. I know I'm not the only technical person on this call, so - but I don't think we need to dig into any deeper than that, we're - for this audience.

If we see that they're - and maybe we should have a comment box on this one so that they can actually put some thoughts down on what they exactly need.

Then I tried to reach into some stuff that's raised in the Application Guidebook. I guess we can't call it the DAG anymore because it's not a draft anymore. But there's you know, a lot of focus on searchable WHOIS, which I guess now is searchable RDDS, which means the ability to search on attributes or linked data elements. And I used an example in this question so people understood and try and get a sense.

In combination with the profile, answers that we get on people, and we can who's actually - you know, what kind of group that they're from or what kind of

stakeholder interest they might represent. Their answer to this will be kind of interesting in combination with who we think they are, even if it's anonymous.

Because you know, we can anticipate that certain stakeholder groups don't really have much of a use for a - for searching on attributes, like a street name or postal code. Whereas others very well may have a great deal of use for it.

So you know for example if you're trying to correlate - you know, you see a fishing domain or something you're trying to correlate similarities with registrations, associate with whoever made that fishing registration in the first place.

So - and domain abuse control. This could be a really interesting tool, and I'm sure the IP and the legal communities in general are very interested in those features as well as you know, law enforcement agencies.

And I'm just sticking very deliberately to the beneficial use with this question, because I don't want to get into sounding like, you know, we're judging you know the value proposition of whether or not people - I don't want to say whether or not someone is doing, you know, marketing.

Ultimately I don't want to challenge whether that's right or wrong. I don't want to challenge whether it's right or wrong for law enforcement to have access to the same - on a premium basis. I'm trying to avoid any of these questions. That type of opening of that can of worms basically because I don't think that's our job to.

And I think that's all R2 questions I generated Barry. Anyone have any questions or - I see Steve's hand up. Go ahead Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, thank you Michael. This is Steve Metalitz. I agree with you on your last point by the way. That we should steer clear of it.

I had two comments on these. One is that I appreciate that you tried not - to keep these as untechnical as possible, but I think they're still way too technical. You need to go through them and kind of dumb them down.

Michael Young: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: You know for example, RDDS should be spelled out.

Michael Young: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: And the last question, I don't understand it certainly, and I think we need to just...

Michael Young: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: You know, we could take a little time to actually explain these questions. I don't like this - you know, we have some restrictions on the length of the answers and that type of thing, but the questions could be a little bit longer than they - you know, in order to explain what we're asking about.

Michael Young: Okay. So I'll take another shot at rewriting them to make them even simpler.

Steve Metalitz: And my other observation was on Question 5. Does this overlap with one that Susan did? I think it's under R5, where she asks about do you want - do you just search WHOIS records by data elements other than domain name? And that includes you know, contact - I'm just not sure if this is - are you asking something different there, or are you asking - does this kind of overlap with the question she's already put in there?

Michael Young: In some cases, these are going to overlap a little bit. My question is from the perspective of structuring the query versus you know, whether or not you feel the data is valuable, or something.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Why would you want to structure the query that way if you didn't think the data was valuable?

Michael Young: No. I mean the actual construct of structuring the data. So this set of questions or this section are to - is really for a technical audience. So it's for operations folks basically that have to generate automated queries against Port 43, and they don't want to have to have a different query structure for, you know, 50 different WHOIS implementations.

Steve Metalitz: Okay.

Michael Young: It happens to cross over other areas that - you know, other areas actually talk about the WHOIS response being a similar structure or not, right?

Steve Metalitz: Well, some of it does. Let's see here. And maybe her question is out of place. Let's see.

                    But it's, "Do you need to search WHOIS records by data elements other than domain name?" So that's a search - that's a query, right?

Michael Young: Right. I'm not talking about whether or not you need to search it. Whether or not - if you are going to search it, is it valuable to have a standardized structure for the query?

Steve Metalitz: Yes, I understand that. But then your last question, in asking about whether that standardized structure should include the ability to search on attributes such as street name or postal code, right?

Michael Young: Yes. So basically maybe I need to just emphasize that a little bit more and say you know, assuming that there will be searchable WHOIS, would you like - would you feel it's valuable to standardize the queries for such functions such as searching on postal code or searching against street name?

Steve Metalitz: Yes, that might be better to distinguish it from the other question. That might be - might...

Michael Young: Okay. I will tweak that then. Sure. Thank you.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you.

Michael Young: Okay.

Avri Doria: It's Avri. I have a quick point, and it's more on an issue about duplicate questions than about the particulars of the questions.

Michael Young: Okay.

Avri Doria: And basically, I would argue for not avoiding the duplicate questions. I think there's a lot of information that one can get from knowing that there are questions that are duplicate, except maybe for the context they're situated in and taking a look at how those answers come out that also have value in understanding what's going on.

So I - I mean, sometimes in putting together a survey, you intentionally put in duplicates of the same question with perhaps slightly different wording or context to sort of pull out all sorts of you know, outliers and just understanding of what's going on at various points in the - of the survey. Similar to a testing situation.

So I would argue that if there's a good reason for a duplicate, let's be aware of it, but not necessarily remove it.

Michael Young: Yes. No, I think that's very valid. It'd be very interesting to see Avri if - you know in Context 1, someone says as yes, and in Context 2, basically to a similar or overlapping question they say a no.

Avri Doria: Exactly. Yes.

Michael Young: Yes. Okay.

Let's - so I'm going to make a suggestion then to - and to support that thought, let's not - at this stage of the survey effort, let's not squash what looks like overlapping questions just yet. If they require clarification like the one I - like you know Steve just helped me with, I'll make it more clear. But let's assume that overlapping or similar questions are okay for the time being, until we get all our questions generated into a reasonable satisfaction otherwise.

And then let's look at the ones - let's identify the ones that we think are - overlap or are copies and talk through them as a group of questions and see what strategy we can arrive at around them and see what benefit we could get out of them.

Does that makes sense? That strategy?

Steve Metalitz: Yes, this is Steve Metalitz. I'm okay deferring on that until we have all the questions and then...

Michael Young: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: ...looking at all the duplications.

Michael Young: But we should flag them. Like any time we see something that we think is a duplicate question, we should just mark it - area as duplicate - possibly - possible duplicate. And then we'll go back to them at the end and...

Steve Metalitz: Okay.

Michael Young: Cintra, I think you're up next. R3.

Cintra Sooknanan: Hi. Thank you. This is Cintra.

Okay, so Avri's going to help me with going through the documents, right? I'm just going to look at it on words. It is easier for me.

Right. Okay, so let's go through R3. R3 is defining a standard data structure for WHOIS responses. The data structure would contain a uniquely - and uniquely identify the data elements that must be returned in a manner that assures there is no ambiguity across elements, correct in facts, and correct semantics.

So my questions are one, do you support a standard formal (expandable) data structure and a scale for (unintelligible) responses? And this is Yes/No.

Secondly, should the data structure allow for interpretation of all sorts of WHOIS responses for non-English and not Latin languages? And this is also Yes/No.

Now if - I don't know if this is entirely clear. We have put it here that - it could be for interpretation as well as output, or if I should split that. So I wasn't sure about that one.

Michael Young: Yes. Cintra it's Michael. I think 2.1 is a really good question. I think it's - I understand it. I think as you know Steve pointed out, I'm not sure - so let me interpret it the way I understand the question. Are you basically saying based on either where the client's coming from, the response gives a different language answer potentially?

Cintra Sooknanan: Yes. Or allows for interpretation in a different language.

Michael Young: Okay. So I...

Cintra Sooknanan: So it's...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: I don't think most people would understand that. You might have to give more of an example.

Cintra Sooknanan: Right. Okay.

So for instance, I can set that I am querying the WHOIS in a particular language, and you know it's like saying in other words that I want to see in French. I want to see Chinese. You know, should we build that into the system, or should I ask you know, would you like us to build that into the system? Or would you like the system to try to interpret what language you would want?

Michael Young: I think it's a really interesting question. And I think yes, you should build that - personally I think yes, you should build it into the questions. I just think you need to maybe make it its own question.

Cintra Sooknanan: Yes. Because it's two things where - I mean first of all, we're dealing with something that is for human interaction, and then also to be machine part. So I'll try to separate this a bit and you know, just allow for some - for a system that can be built really for more human and user interaction rather than just machine possible.

So I think too, I will need to do some more work to split that up.

Michael Young: Okay.

Cintra Sooknanan: Because it's not just - it's - I think I'm mixing the two things about interpretation as well as output, which should be separate, (unintelligible).

So okay. Let's just...

Michael Young: So Cintra, I see Steve's got his hand up. Maybe we - Steve, you want to go ahead?

Cintra Sooknanan: Oh, I'm sorry. Steve, please?

Steve Metalitz: That's okay. Thank you. Yes, on this Question 2, I guess I had two questions. One is Cintra as you describe it, is that really a query function or is that an attribute of - would you - would this extend to querying - to making a query in different languages or different scripts? And if so, does that belong back in the previous section? That's one point.

And the other is I think there is an overlap here with Questions - with R7. It's really with the internationalized registration - or the IRD working group has been kind of struggling with for many months.

So again, I'll just flag it as a potential overlap or duplication. But I think it's - I mean, I think it's a very good question. And if it can be drawn out into simple questions, I think that would be very useful.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: But again, it might partly belong in R2 as well as in R3.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay. All right.

So what I'll do is I'll speak to Michael a bit later about this question specifically, because I do have to speak to him on 8.2. So if he's handling R2 - (unintelligible) yes?

Okay. So should I just...

Michael Young: Okay.

Cintra Sooknanan: ...move on with my questions then?

Michael Young: Yes. Keep going.

Cintra Sooknanan: 2.1 and .11? Okay.

So I say it's yes, right? Should this interpretation or output of WHOIS responses be based on localization of the client software? Yes/No?

Now I don't know if I should go through those to ask about privacy or that kind of thing. I don't know if there's any suggestions coming out of this call as to, you know, if - that was the recommendation of the working group in the PDF document, but I don't know if there are any alternatives that we want to suggest there instead of just...

Michael Young: Yes. I think the privacy stuff is covered in other sections.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay.

Michael Young: So I think you're okay there.

Cintra Sooknanan: All right, fine.

Then it goes to 2.1.1. If no, please recommend this reason. What are the most suitable (mechanisms) for this interpretation or output of WHOIS responses? And this is an open answer, and definitely we can use Avri's suggestion. That you know there's a mechanism for just having one pervious recommendation.

Michael Young: Okay.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay.

3. Should this - should the data structure be flexible for human (unintelligible)? Yes/No?

4. Should it be - the structure be flexible for program support? Yes/No?

Michael Young: So in 3 you mean human readable and 4 you mean machine readable.

Cintra Sooknanan: Right.

Michael Young: Okay.

Cintra Sooknanan: So what I will do is I will set up 2 as - just like how I've set up 3 and 4.

Michael Young: Okay.

Cintra Sooknanan: 5. Should the data structure be XMLD? Yes/No.

If no, please recommend with reasons another suitable data structure. And this as well is an open answer.

Michael Young: Yes, I think you have to have that open. People may have an opinion there.

Cintra Sooknanan: Right.

Michael Young: Okay.

Cintra Sooknanan: Are there any other thoughts? Any other questions that anyone else can think of that should fall under this section?

No?

Michael Young: No. Other than the stuff around 2, it's pretty clear to me. And I don't see anyone else's hand up, but does anyone have any other comments?

Okay. So let's go onto the next section. I don't know if Barry's back at his computer yet or not.

Cintra Sooknanan: The next section is R4, and that's my section as well.

Michael Young: Okay. You know what? Folks, I don't - I don't know if anyone else can scroll this Adobe screen, because I don't seem to be able to.

Avri Doria: Nathalie is also a host. She should be able to press the Synch button.

Michael Young: Okay.

Barry Cobb: I'll be back in just a second.

Nathalie Peregrine: I can scroll down if you just tell me when to stop.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay. That's fine.

Michael Young: There we go.

Cintra Sooknanan: Yes.

So this section is a lot shorter than the last, and it's because I didn't know how deeply we'd want to go into the actual processes and that sort of thing in terms of getting - receiving error messages and handling errors, exceptions, and that sort of thing. So I'm guided by the group.

R4 deals with the definition of a set of standardized error messages and standard handling of error conditions. Examples (unintelligible) error includes

queries exceeding the limits, no records found, unable to process query, et cetera.

So my questions are 1, do you support standardized error messages for the WHOIS system? Yes/No?

2. Do you support standardized handling of error conditions within the WHOIS system? Yes/No?

The third one is please detail the most common error conditions within the WHOIS system. And I did miss a little bit there where I should've said where you would expect or where you would like to see standardized error messages. Sorry, standardized - yes, error messages for - so this is an open answer. I don't know...

Michael Young: I agree.

Cintra Sooknanan: (Unintelligible) from this point.

Michael Young: Yes. Cintra, it's Michael. I agree with your adjustment to 3. It's just got to emphasize the most common error conditions that you would like to report on within the WHOIS system. Because I can tell you for example, some systems with the rate limiting are very deliberately designed not to give a specific indication that you're being rate limited.

In fact what they'll - how they'll do the rate limiting is just hold the connection responses back for a period - a longer period of time than you would normally expect, even though it's still a valid session, and then basically sleep you if you will. And they don't necessarily want to say anything, because they don't want to make it easy for people to understand algorithmically how the rate limiting is actually being triggered so that they can side-step it.

So I think that clarification about you know, error conditions that you want to report on is important.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay, thanks Michael.

Is there any other questions, or comments, or any additions? Because, I do find it's a bit sparse and I do think that maybe - I don't know if we should go so far as to start going into these examples of error messages and you know, generate some questions on (unintelligible). Would you guys say that? You know, just to find out you know how useful they might be. I don't know.

Michael Young: I don't know. I mean, I'd have to take a look at this section and give you from my perspective. What do other people think?

Okay, no other opinion?

Cintra, I guess you know this is a tough one, because you could delve into great detail if you open that can of worms. So I'll tell you what. I'll volunteer to take a look at the section with you and see if...

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you very much.

Michael Young: Yes. If there's any other obvious questions that jump out at me.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay. I really appreciate that Michael. And if there are any other comments on these two sections, please feel free to let me know on the maligning list. And that's it for me for now. Thank you.

Michael Young: Barry, you want to go to the next section?

Barry Cobb: I think the - yes, I think the last meeting we had reviewed through Susan's, and then she provided updates from the prior version. She's still not on the call.

Michael Young: Okay.

Barry Cobb: So we - so next...

Michael Young: Why don't we do this with Susan's stuff because these are rephrased, and then we have the intro baseline questions? Why don't we ask people to put their comments to the list on the revised R5 and also the profile baseline and make that an action item for all of us before the next call? And, that ought to keep our time rolling here.

Avri Doria: Hey, this is Avri. I didn't do any of my homework on this stuff, so it is as it was last time.

                   I thought about pop ups and things like that, but I didn't think about this stuff. I kept meaning to but never did, so there's no change. I haven't taken any of the notes or anything into account. I'm still curious - it looks like - at least I'm hoping that we will be able to have scale 1 to 5 questions as one of our four flavors. And so I'll continue working on these with the assumption that a 1 to 5 scale scaled question is okay.

Michael Young: I think that's a safe assumption.

Avri Doria: Okay.

                   And I will really try to get to it this week. I just didn't get to it.

Michael Young: I was working on mine this morning Avri, so I totally understand.

Avri Doria: I planned to. I planned to, but then a couple other things came through and it was time for this meeting.

Michael Young: Well you know what? It won't stop me from badgering all - everybody to get their work done, but I do sympathize. We are all struggling with the - the changes going on in the industry right now has made it very busy.

Avri Doria: True. Thanks.

Michael Young: You know - all right, Steve you had a very interesting email. If you could walk through your stuff and explain it to us, that'll be great.

Barry Cobb: I think Steve had to drop off the line. Yes, he's disconnected now and he said he'll try to join again before the bottom of the hour.

Michael Young: Okay. So you know what? If we get him back on we don't, but let's just tag an action item for people to again comment on the list on his additions specifically Barry. And if he joins us, then that's great; otherwise, we have it as an action item. I want to try and use people's time as efficiently as possible.

Barry Cobb: Okay. The same I think applies to R8.1. This is what was provided by Steven and we reviewed through on the last call. And I think he had some revisions that he was going to do, but we don't have those yet.

Michael Young: Okay. Well he happens to be in my neck of the woods, Barry, so - and I'm going to run into him actually body - in person tomorrow, so I will hammer him to get those revisions in.

                   Okay. Cintra you and I were going to talk some about this after the call, but I did throw some questions in for today just to get it going. And, this is really about - this is a - you know, a very interesting contentious area, so I tried to phrase the questions to separate the - whether it's right or wrong to require - to have different levels of - different permission levels and different access to WHOIS data and talk more about the mechanisms of it.

So in Question 1, I tried to word it that way. Basically say assuming the features are configurable and not mandatory, do we believe a standardized permissions framework will be valuable? And the data - and I tried to separate the idea - the data elements being tied to different permission levels - user permission levels.

So - and - okay. So I tried to keep this just simple, and maybe I need to add more of an example to make it understandable. But the answer is you know, really clearly you either care or you don't, or you haven't even thought about it, doesn't matter too.

Q2 is a more specific question around this, and that is I think there's more than one way to apply this, but people assume I think sometimes. When we talk about, you know, permitted access to a WHOIS system, people kind of assume that means that the people with the logins are going to be known. So - and people are worried about privacy of - on the client side. You know, WHOIS people believe that they have a right to check WHOIS data without necessarily having to identify themselves.

And so, this question is trying to make people think about the fact that you can have a WHOIS service that requires everybody to have a login, and yet they can still be anonymous. And so, it's kind of a roundabout question to educate and ask people you know, "Now that you understand that you can maintain your anonymity, do you have a problem with having to you know, expect people to use a login?" Because it's - it can be very operationally useful for people to manage WHOIS services.

And in this respect, you know, I'm thinking about rate limiting in IPD 6. I won't get into all those technical details. But right now rate limiting is really focused on IP address and source IP addresses, and that becomes much more challenging with IPD 6, so this is another way to focus it on people's user identifications.

So that's why I ask the question. And I left it as a comment box because more technical people and operationally focused people may have a lot to say about this that's useful.

Okay, and so jumping down to Q3. A scale question, 1 to 5. Avri you're going to like that. So where do they feel this kind of whole feature set is on their radar? Is it a really important one or is it down the scale?

And then I thought it would be interesting to ask people whether or not this - because I've heard a lot of - you know, I sit in other forums and listen to a lot of people that are trying to operate WHOIS services in various ccTLD's and so forth.

And you know, I've heard a lot of discussion about privacy and data issues and stuff in regards to local law. Not that I am a lawyer or anything, but you know I'm listening to a lot of lawyers talk about this lately. And this might a question (unintelligible) and excellent just to ask people to get a sense of is this an absolute requirement for some WHOIS operators because of local law?

And that was it that came up for those sections.

Barry Cobb: Okay.

Michael Young: Any comments?

Barry Cobb: Michael, this is Barry. I - something that's popped off the top of my head, but it probably goes more down to policy. Would it benefit to have an open comment box here so that whoever that user is, they could list their jurisdiction?

Michael Young: Yes, that'd be a good one. Yes. I think so. Let's put a comment box and say, you know, additional comments or please list your jurisdiction. That'd be really good.

Actually what the idea is that we could have a drop down bar for people to identify their jurisdictions so then we can actually calculate it. It's almost - you know, or maybe we should be capturing that in Susan's questions.

You know what? Barry, that's probably fair to capture that in the baseline questions.

Barry Cobb: Yes. I'll make a note of that.

Michael Young: Okay. All right. Do we have any other new question sections with people that are on the call and we didn't get feedback yet?

We had Wendy on and off for a bit there.

Barry Cobb: Yes.

Michael Young: Can people - sorry Barry.

Next...

Barry Cobb: Wendy had to drop.

Michael Young: Yes, she did.

So let's do this. Next time we go through the questions and we have new additions, let's please do a little round circle and see who's going to drop off first. And rather than going through them like top to bottom like we did, let's just go through them in order of when people have to leave the call? Because we've lost Steve, Wendy, and (Paul), so...

All right, I guess for the remainder of these questions, Barry, we're just going to ask that - can you flag them specifically and put a call out to the list to ask people to comment on them on the list?

Barry Cobb: I will. I'll list which ones we didn't get to review through today, which'll probably be more than what we did. But, I think we're just about complete with at least the first draft of each one.

Michael Young: Yes, we're making really good progress here.

Barry Cobb: Yes. Steve did a good example for R11, and then I believe you had mentioned you're getting with the registries tomorrow or sometime this week regarding these last few comments.

Michael Young: That first.

Barry Cobb: So, good.

Michael Young: Okay. All right.

Does anyone want to run through the action items so that we finish up on time and let people go?

Barry Cobb: Very good. So the first action item I have is to send out another Doodle to maybe review a time change. And like I said Michael, I'll get with you offline about that before I send out the Doodle.

The second action item is still figuring out how we're going to do the road shows with the SO's and AC's. I did just send a message canceling the Wednesday public session, and Glen was going to - she responded back and said she'll help me out with trying to get on some of the agendas.

And I think also we're going to try to look at also building a matrix of all the stakeholders and constituencies and trying to work through our representatives with each of their respective groups as well to provide an update.

The third action is kind of general and open for everybody with a specific one assigned to Wilson with respect to how we categorize comment boxes, for lack of a better word. But some of the elements to that would be a combination of a lexical analysis, short comment boxes. And then the specific assignment to Wilson is to see if we have the ability to see other comments submitted in a dropdown box.

And...

Michael Young: And very specifically, not just see the other comments, but you know if I like comment - the third one down from the top, I can indicate that somehow, you know, there's two votes for Comment Number 3.

Barry Cobb: Okay, very good.

And then the fourth one will be open to everybody, and that's to review through the requirement questions that we didn't cover on the call today. But really, it'll pretty much be a review of the entire questionnaire now that we've got - (done) every section filled.

The fifth action item will be to add a jurisdiction in the profile section of the survey at the top.

And then just a reminder that when we - in our next session when we go to review through these questions, we'll call for order on who must drop first and then review those questions accordingly.

Michael Young: Okay, great.

Does anyone have anything else? Going to new business one more time.

Okay, I hear nothing so let's wrap up the call. Thank you everyone once again for your time, effort, and energy, particularly in this busy time. It's fabulous that we have this incredible knowledge set that people are willing to bring forward and contribute toward the Internet community.

And for myself, you know, this is a real passion for me to straighten the next generation WHOIS, or RDDS now, and you know I really appreciate everyone's hard work. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Barry Cobb: Thank you everybody.

END